

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

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

<b>Department:</b> Human & Social Science	<b>Date:</b> 5-15-17
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Sara Brady, Thad Warren, Kathy Miller	
<b>See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:</b> a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	

### **Analysis of artifacts:**

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA\*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*

Students will be able to Analyze, Synthesize and report subject specific information.

Kathy Miller & Thad Warren Sara Brady assessed the artifacts using the attached rubric following the Spring Semester. A sampling of shared scoring was used and discussed along with averaging of scores to account for interrater reliability. These scores were then compared to the standards of each criterion to see if they met an 80% threshold. Scores were tabulated establishing both a mean score for each criterion along with averages of counts for each criterion both meeting the the proficient level and those not meeting the proficient level.

### **Summary of RESULTS\*:**

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

Were students able to analyze information relating to a specific topic at the proficient level?

Were students able to synthesize information relating to a specific topic at the proficient level?

Were students able to create an applied summary demonstrating analysis and synthesis of information in a well-organized presentation at the proficient level?

Artifacts collected were scored on a four point scale with a 3 meeting the proficient level.

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

Each research question was correlated with a criterion of the assignment and assessed with a rubric (Attached).

Mean scores were tabulated for each criterion none of which demonstrated an overall proficient level for any of the criterion. All mean scores fell below the threshold of a 3 indicating that the group as a whole did not meet threshold. When looking at the data including counts of individuals not meeting the threshold for each criterion once again the averages did not meet the 80% threshold.

N=35

Identification of premise and supporting points-- 24 of 35 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.857

Application of Analysis-- 22 of 35 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.74

Critical Thinking and Synthesis of information-- 16 of 35 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.6.

Organization -- 27 of 35 students met the threshold of 3 on 4 point scale. Mean score 2.885.

Grammar, Style & Spelling-- 20 of 35 students met the threshold of 8 on a 10 point scale. Mean score 2.542

APA Format -- 9 of 26 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.257

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

Each question was directly correlated with a key criterion of the assignment and assessed with a rubric.

The assignment last year was an iterative process so scores would be expected to be higher than this year as this was a first draft scored so data year has a discrepancy. In each category there were individual scores that were above the expected score but overall the assessment shows that less than 80% of the students are not meeting the expectation on the first draft of this assignment. .

The criterion of 80% meeting the proficient level on a first draft is an aggressive goal considering the numbers from last year and scoring a second draft. When looking at mean scores you can see that overall the class did not meet the criterion but when count is considered the numbers are a little closer to the goal.

Of interest is that the assignment is one of the first exposures students have to critical application of research information. This could account for the lower number of students meeting the threshold due to lack of exposure to this type of writing and critical process. The class size and iterative process requiring more investment of the instructor and lack of time to respond to each student need to be considered when planning class size.

Once again this is one of the first exposures to this type of critical analysis and the need to reflect the students noted implications of the research.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* Inter-rater reliability was assessed by comparing scores of the raters which all fell within a few points on each scale. Of note that probably introduced bias was that we included the instructor in the scoring of the assessment rubrics. This could account for lower or even perhaps higher scores as expected.

There is a moderate confidence level in the scoring.

**Sharing of Results:**

*When were results shared? Date:* 5-17-2017

*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Inter-department communication (email any corrections or questions were facilitated via electronic communication with a follow up meeting for review)

*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Elwell, Warren, Miller and Brady

**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?*

The department shares this course as a writing intensive course and will continue to build in the iterative nature of the assignment to assure students level of competence in reviewing and analyzing research articles and making application to the social sciences. Special note is made to emphasize the skills identified as areas for improvement in this course and across the curriculum,

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

Encouragement to instructors should be given to continue the process of iterative instruction regarding research in the field and working through application and reporting of findings. This on the surface with limited review indicates that we need to expand our target of meeting these goals into other course content bringing in a more iterative approach of instruction.

**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). The nature of the assignment requires many hours of review and feedback to and with students. Class size is of concern and as the programs grow consideration of class limits and possible multiple sections will need to be considered to most effectively facilitate student learning in these regards. Additional staffing may need to be considered.

*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?* The department would like to continue the assessment to see if there is consistency with differing instructors as we have had a shift in the department regarding the teaching of this course. The department will revisit the structure of the assignment and assessment for better consistency across the assessment cycle.

**Submitted by: Thad Warren**  
**5/17/17**

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):**

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: The college dean will continue to discuss the staffing situation in the 2017-18 academic year.

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