

**#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:
Student Outcomes – Gen Ed**

Department: ECTA Date: 5/12/17

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: B. Moore, E. Lamm, P. Koprince, G. Haley, L. ZumHofe, L. Ashby

See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*
Persuasive speech outlines were collected by the instructors from two sections of CTA 211 Intermediate Speech and scored using a rubric that examined use of sources. Scores were compiled on a spreadsheet. We examined the scores to see if 75% of students achieved a score of 2.75 or higher on the rubric.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

Are students able to communicate use of sources in a speech outline?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

We received the ECTA Gen Ed Assessment data from Erica and Bryan. The assessment was asking if students were able to communicate use of sources in a speech outline. They scored a total of 23 artifacts from CTA 211 using their rubric (a score of 4 being the highest possible average).

The scores were sorted from highest to lowest so that we could see how many artifacts received a 2.75 average score or higher.

Fourteen out of 23 artifacts received a score of 2.75 or higher. Thus, 61% of the artifacts scored 2.75 or higher. Our goal was that 75% would score 2.75 or higher, so we were short of that mark.

Here are the details: Nine artifacts scored 4. Five artifacts scored 3. Nine artifacts scored 2. No artifacts scored lower than 2.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

Fourteen out of 23 artifacts received a score of 2.75 or higher. Thus, 61% of the artifacts scored 2.75 or higher. Our goal was that 75% would score 2.75 or higher, so the problem is that student performance did not reach the goal we set. In our discussion of the assessment, the instructors noted that some of the outlines were not as fully completed as they could be. In other words, the students sometimes cited sources or used organizational devices in the spoken presentation but did not include them on the outline. We also noted that we needed to emphasize more fully that source citation in the outline is essential and required. Some students did not use the required number of sources. They were required to have five sources. If they used only four sources, their score automatically dropped to a two.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* There was an item on the rubric that was based on the number of sources and it needed to have more gradations in the ranking. We need a gradation where students can score a 3, not just 2 or 4 on the scale.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/12/17

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) met as a department

Who were results shared with? (List names): Moore, Lamm, Koprince, Haley, ZumHofe, Ashby

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*

We plan to improve student use of sources by integrating further informational literacy teaching from Billy Moore at the library. We plan to provide more details in the assignment instructions about the number of sources and that sources need to be cited and highlighted in the written outline. We will

review these assignment details in class and in the written form of the assignment.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

We anticipate that the library instruction will help students locate more sources of high quality. The library instruction will also show students how to use database tools to create written source citations easily. These citations will be more likely to appear in the outlines if they can be more easily placed there. The renewed emphasis in assignment details and in class about citing sources will result in more citations of good sources in the outline.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* none

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? We would like to investigate this learning outcome and assess it again next year. In order to see it more fully in our gen ed classes, we will gather artifacts from CTA 211 sections and from CTA 103.

Submitted by: Laurie ZumHofe
(date): 5/17/17

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Comm Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/17/17