

#2. 2017 – 18 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes

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

Department: ECTA	Date: 6/5/18
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: G Haley, B Moore, T Beck, L Ashby	
See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; b) <i>Background</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; d) <i>Methodology</i>	
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Two faculty members scored the artifacts using a rubric. The scores for each artifact were summed and then converted into percentage scores. Our goal was for at least 75% of the students to achieve a score of 75% or better. We analyzed the scores to see if these percentages were met, which they were.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to construct a portfolio project that demonstrates professional and educational skills acquired in their academic career here? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Out of nine students total, seven of them scored in the 90% or above range. Two students scored in the 60% range. Thus, 78% of the students scored 75% or higher, which meets our goal. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> Our department discussed that we were pleased with the results. Students are able to construct a portfolio project that demonstrates professional and educational skills acquired during their college career here. We noted that the students who scored lower overall were students who struggled with the start and implementation of the project. Some of this was due to lack of decisiveness and time management. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) n/a</i>	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 4/18/18 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Met as a department <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> G Haley, B Moore, T Beck, L Ashby, E Lamm, P Koprince, L ZumHofe	
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> We will continue to emphasize time and project management skills in the course. We will include more meetings with the instructor or project mentor in the course. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> We want to make the presentation part of the portfolio even more significant. c. <i>Program:</i> We will further emphasize the importance of underclassmen attending the presentations so they can start thinking about their own capstone projects sooner. We will also emphasize the capstone projects in our academic advising. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Our assessment rubric 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Students will get off to a better start and manage their projects better throughout the semester. Students in future academic years will also have a better idea of their project very early in the semester or even before the class begins. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a	

course). n/a

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? How well are students able to present orally their professional and educational skills?

Submitted by: Lisa Ashby

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6-7-

18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:

na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7-1-18