

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Human & Social Science Date: 5-15-17

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Sara Brady, Thad Warren, Kathy Miller

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).*
The student will be able to write an applied reflection utilizing appropriate college level writing skills. 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 of score a 3 or higher. A four point scale was used with 3 indicating having met a proficient level. 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 articulate a coherent and thoughtful reflection?
Were students able to demonstrate good writing mechanics?
Were students able to demonstrate writing in a proper APA format?
Were students able to demonstrate organizational skills in writing?

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 the threshold for mean. 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=34

Organization-- 19 of 34 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.558

Level of content (Thoughtful reflection)-- 16 of 35 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.375

Development (Thoughtful reflection)-- 19 of 35 students met the threshold of 3 on a 4 point scale. Mean score 2.529.

Grammar, Style & Spelling (Mechanics)-- 17 of 35 students met the threshold of 8 on a 10 point scale. Mean score 2.558

APA Format (basic level) -- Did not score for APA as the assignment changed and data would not be accurate.

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.

In each category there were individual scores that met the proficient level of a score of 3 on the 4 point scale but over all the assessment shows that less than 80% of the students are hitting the proficient level.

The criterion of 80% meeting the proficient level on a first draft is probably a bit aggressive considering it is not an iterative assignment. When looking at mean scores you can see that overall the class did not meet the criterion. When count is considered the numbers indicate that effective communication skills are low.

The class size and iterative process requiring more investment of the instructor and lack of time to respond to each student needs to be considered when planning class size. Also of note is that communication is a cross curricular process and the standards we have in Human and Social Science may be different from those of other departments.

The report demonstrates that our department must better integrate communication skills into our classes if we hope to meet a goal of having effective communicators as graduates from the department. More writing with iterative feedback needs to be considered in other courses and across the curriculum

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 introduction of bias probably was introduced as we included the instructor in the scoring of the assessment rubrics. This could account for lower or 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) email and meeting

Who were results shared with? (List names): Elwell, Warren, Miller, 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 course across majors and will continue to build in the iterative nature of the assignment to assure students' level of competence in understanding and communicating 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 across the curriculum.

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). When considering the need for more iterative work with students class size must be considered as assignments become more timely to grade and to give effective feedback. Additional courses might need to be considered to better account for the content needed for our students to better grasp the content and nature of the subject matter.

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 year to year with student cohorts. 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: College dean will continue to monitor the staffing needs of the department in the 2017-18 academic year.

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