

#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: CEL **Date:** 5/15/2017

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Mark Blanke

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).*
Instructions are given supervisors (site and university) to rate the students according to a 1-5 Likert scale, with "3" indicating an "appropriate level of competency" The completed evaluations were reviewed by the DCE Program Director. Copies were made of the most recent (as of 5/15/17) evaluations and they will be compiled in a separate file so they can be analyzed as a compilation of CEL 481 participants.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

Do students in CEL 481 function at an appropriate level of competency (based upon a rating of "3" on a 1-5 Likert scale) in the expected areas of competency?

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

A review of the university and site supervisor evaluations for students in their later part of their CEL 481 experience found that students are performing at an adequate level of competency. Site supervisors evaluate the student on 45 different criteria (related to specific job performance) and university supervisors make use of 41 criteria (based upon competency in the university-specified roles and subroles). Most recent evaluations (as of 5/15/17) of the 516 rankings found only one ranking where a student received a ranking lower than "3" - and that ranking of "2" by a site supervisor was related to the criteria of "dresses appropriately".

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

The results indicate that students in CEL 481 do indeed operate at an appropriate level of competency as would be expected of a DCE Intern at the corresponding point in their internship.

A follow-up with the student on the ranking of 2 in "dresses appropriately" determined that the deficiency was likely due to her pregnancy and her inability to purchase professional clothing for use during pregnancy. .

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* None

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) the CEL 481 instructor reviewed the supervisory evaluations from site and university supervisors and shared the results with the departmental members.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Blanke, Warren, Rippstein

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 will continue to direct all of our supervisors in how to most effectively assess each student using

the standardized rating criteria.

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

We hope to maintain the current competency levels of students.

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? Are there any identifiable trends in competencies in one area that can be assessed prior to CEL 481 that would allow additional program intervention if deficiencies do exist?

**Submitted by: Mark Blanke
5/15/17**

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/15/17