

#2. 2017 – 2018 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: ECTA Date: 4/18/18
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: P Koprince, E Lamm
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* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Pete and Erica each scored their sections of CTA 211 persuasive speech outlines using the rubric. Each student's overall rankings were averaged and the totals were analyzed as follows: We wanted to see if 75% of students achieved a score of 2.75 or higher on all components of the rubric.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to communicate use of sources in a speech outline? More specifically, we're asking: Can students correctly format an outline? Can they organize their ideas clearly? Can we tell from the outline that they are incorporating sources in their speech? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 91% of students scored 2.75 or higher on all components of the rubric. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results show us that the vast majority of students were able to communicate their use of sources in a speech outline, correctly format the outline, and organize their ideas clearly. 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> We met as a department. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> L ZumHofe, G Haley, E Lamm, P Koprince, B Moore, L Ashby
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> This was our second year of assessing this item. We were pleased that the results were much higher this year versus last year. We believe that we emphasized source selection, source citation and formatting much more this school year, which directly related to the better results. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> We will keep the assignment for next year and will continue to have more written explanation of the assignment's requirements. c. <i>Program:</i> Source citation and organization is a basic level skill, which we will continue to emphasize in this 200 level class. Differentiating source quality begins in this class but can be emphasized in the 300+ level classes because we're reassured that basic level source use is achieved in CTA 211. d. <i>Assessment:</i> We noted that Pete and Erica had a little variance on the scoring levels depending on which category we were looking at. They felt that this was acceptable given that each differs a little in their philosophy of teaching public speaking. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We would anticipate high levels of student achievement to continue next year in this area. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> 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? We feel that this learning outcome has been thoroughly explored and would like to investigate a different learning outcome next year.

Submitted by: Lisa Ashby **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 6/7/18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:** 6/7/18