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

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

|  |
| --- |
| **Department:** **Natural Sciences Date: 28 June 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:** **Dr. John Jurchen, Dr. Kristy Jurchen, Dr. Rob Hermann, Dr. Brent Royuk, Dr. Kyle Johnson, Dr. Connie Callahan, Dr. Tim Huntington, and Jen Fruend** |
| **See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology* |
| **Analysis of artifacts:**  *1).* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* A representative sample (six to ten in most cases) of lab reports or papers from upper-level science lab courses in which students were expected to make appropriate conclusions from their experiements was collected. Conclusions were read and scored collectively by the department using a Likert scale from 1-5 (5 being best), where scores of three or above (moderately, well, or exceptionally well done) were judged to have succeeded to have made the appropriate conclusion. The courses supplying rubrics were: Fall 2015: Bio 208, Chem 231, Phys 382; Spring 2016: Chem 331, Phys 399. |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:**  *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*  Are students in science labs where data is collected making appropriate conclusions about what was examined in their experiments or are they just repeating their results?  *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*  Overall, with a total of 32 artifacts assessed, we found that 84.5% of them achieved a 3 or better; that is, they made at least moderately appropriate conclusions rather than just repeating their results.   |  |  |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | |  | Evaluation of Conclusions | | | | | |  | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |  | Not done | Minimally done | Moderately done | Well done | Exceptionally well done | | N | 1 | 4 | 9 | 4 | 14 | | % | 3 | 12.5 | 28 | 12.5 | 44 | | % | 15.5 | | 84.5 | | |   *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  We found that generally students were able to make appropriate conclusions from their data. There was a concern originally that students merely parroted their results in the conclusion of the lab report, rather than using higher-level thinking to analyze what the results mean. Over the years that the department has assessed this question we have found improvement in the results, suggesting that we are doing a better job of helping students to understand that this final step is an important part of doing science, and students are learning to do it.  *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)  We still have an issue that different instructors and different courses expect different things from their conclusions, making the evaluation difficult. |
| **Sharing of Results:**  *When were results shared? Date:* 28 June 2016  *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* We met as a department to evaluate, score, analyze, and discuss the assessment.  *Who were results shared with? (List names):* **Dr. John Jurchen, Dr. Kristy Jurchen, Dr. Rob Hermann, Dr. Brent Royuk, Dr. Kyle Johnson, Dr. Connie Callahan, Dr. Tim Huntington, and Jen Fruend** |
| **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 have found that we are able to improve students’ performance in a critical area of writing conclusions. We will continue to emphasize this both in the classes we assessed and in other classes.  *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*  Our hope is that students will continue to be able to make appropriate conclusions from their results in the lab.  *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?*** Having achieved fairly good results from this question, we plan to move to a different question next year: Are students able to correctly use statistics to make appropriate inferences from data? |
|  |
| **Submitted by:** Rob Hermann **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/29/16** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed: 6/29/16**  **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**  **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/29/16** |
|  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Natural Sciences Department Program Assessment Rubric** | | | | | | |
| **Learning Goal Assessed:** Analysis: to recognize, understand, critically evaluate, and synthesize the components of a topic using logic and the scientific method | | | | | | |
| **Student Outcome Assessed:** Students should be able to make appropriate inferences and interpretations from scientific data | | | | | | |
| **Semester:** |  | | | | | |
| **Course:** |  | | | | | |
| **Artifact Assessed:** |  | | | | | |
| **Rubric** | Quality of student outcomes (made appropriate inferences and interpretations) will be assessed in artifacts using the Likert scale below | | | | | |
| 1- not done at all; 2 - minimally done 3; - moderately done; 4 - well done; 5 - exceptionally well done | | | | | | |
| **Artifacts** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **Comments** |
| **1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **2** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **3** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **4** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **5** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **6** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **7** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **8** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **9** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **10** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Summary** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | |
| **Conclusions:** |  | | | | | |