

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: History, Geography, Criminal Justice Date:

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Matt Phillips, Tobin Beck, John Hink, Joel Helmer

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).*
Using the attached rubric.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

Can students in Hist 487: U.S. Constitution communicate in an effective and professional manner?

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

Goal: Students score at least 7 of 9 on Oral Presentation Rubric

For the General Education Assessment in the 2016-2017 school year, which focused on communication, the department of History, Geography, and Criminal Justice chose to assess the question: "Can students in Hist 487: U.S. Constitution communicate in an effective and professional manner?"

Students presented their semester projects to the class.

Students were scored on a three category rubric in the categories: Delivery, Content and Organization and Enthusiasm and Audience Engagement. "Excellent" earned three points, "Good" earned two, and "Poor" earned one or zero points. The department goal was that all students would earn a seven or above. The class had a total of seven students.

Overall Results:

Achieved Goal: 5

Missed Goal: 2

Average Overall Score: 7.4

Based on the results the class as a whole missed the target goal, as two students did not meet the seven point minimum. However, no student scored below a six and the average overall score was a 7.4.

Results within categories (Out of 3)

Delivery: 2.6

Content and Organization: 2.7

Enthusiasm and Audience Engagement: 2.14

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

Students generally performed well in the Delivery and Content and Organization categories. The class as a whole, including the students who scored below a seven, earned weaker marks on Enthusiasm and Audience Engagement (2.14). Possible causes for this could be that the student spent his or her time focusing on what they planned on presenting instead of the manner in which they would engage the class. Possible remedies for this deficiency could include a model presentation for the class and/or a discussion on effective techniques for presenting.

While the class did not meet the designated goal, had the two students who missed the mark earned one more point in any category, the class would have achieved as hoped. Thus, the goal appears reasonable and the deficiencies can be reasonably remedied.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) na*

Sharing of Results:

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

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Via email and face-to-face

Who were results shared with? (List names): Matt Phillips, Joel Helmer, John Hink, Tobin Beck

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 learned that pre-presentation activities and/or materials demonstrating or discussing how to deliver a speech that is engaging would be beneficial to our students.

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

To improve student skills in orally presenting materials in our subject areas.

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). na*

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? na

**Submitted by: Joel Helmer
5/17/17**

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: 5/17/17