

# #1. Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes

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

<b>Department/Program/Unit:</b> CEL	<b>Date:</b> 9/30/16
<b>Related: University Goal/Outcome(more than one may be selected):</b> Analysis    Application    Select    Select	
<b>Members involved with development of Program Assessment Plan:</b> Mark Blanke	
<b>Departmental/Program/Unit Student Outcome:</b> <i>What student outcome from the departmental matrix will be assessed? (It is suggested that you cut and paste directly from the matrix. Outcomes should represent the absolute priorities for learning- students must be able to do [this] when they finish our program). State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something].</i> Ability to work capably within a congregational setting	
<b>Background:</b> <i>What factors caused you to choose this particular assessment outcome? If you chose this outcome because of a perceived problem, please explain.</i> It captures the key outcome for the majority of our graduates. It is the expectation of the employers of most graduates	
<b>Question:</b> <i>What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)</i> Can a student enrolled in CEL 481 (DCE Internship) function with competencies of an entry-level DCE?	
<b>Methodology:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <b>OBJECT*</b> - <i>What data (i.e. artifact, exam score, detailed description of assignment) will be collected?</i> Evaluations from site and university supervisors<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. <i>How does this data address the assessment question?</i> Intern competencies are assessed according to the roles that a typical DCE is expected to manage<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>i. <i>Include/attach a description/example of assessment tool to be used.</i></li></ol></li></ol></li><li>2. <i>How will data be collected?</i> Bi-monthly from the site supervisors and two annual evaluations by university supervisors. Both evaluations are shared with the student.</li></ol>	
<b>Analysis of Artifacts:</b> <i>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - Discuss:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1) <i>How the artifacts will be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):</i> Instructions are given supervisors to rate the students according to a 1-5 Likert scale, with "3" indicating an "appropriate level of competency" The completed evaluations will be reviewed with the score of each student in each of the areas being noted.</li><li>2) <i>How you will know if it is good (i.e. score required by % of students):</i> 100% of our students will score 3 or higher in all areas being evaluated by site supervisors and university supervisors.</li></ol>	
<b>Submitted by:</b> Mark Blanke	<b>Date:</b> 9/30/16
<b>Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date):</b> 10/14/16	
<b>Department Chair notified of approval or additional action needed:</b> 11/29/16 - PLAN APPROVED - Revisions completed ----10/14/16 - Revisions needed <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. Submit the evaluations that will be used.</li><li>2. In the Analysis of Artifacts: This should discuss how YOU are going to analyze the evaluations once you receive them (not how the tool will be used.) Will you look at the scores in individual areas only or is there a total score that will be considered also?</li></ol>	