

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

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: CEL/DCE Date: June 15, 2018
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Mark Blanke
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> Participants in CEL 481 complete a form titled "DCE Intern Assessment of On-Site Supervisor" 100% of all CEL 481 participants must complete the assessment of their site supervisors, obtain the supervisor's signature indicating that they have participated in the assessment with the student, and bring the completed form to the Mid-Year Conference.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can a students enrolled in CEL 481 (DCE Internship) demonstrate the ability to assess supervisor capabilities using specific criteria an, most importantly, communicate the assessment directly to their supervisors? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> All CEL 481 participants completed the assignment as directed and returned the completed forms to the Mid-Year Conference 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> This assignment creates much anxiety on the part of the students. It is difficult to provide positive and negative feedback to one's supervisor. The returned forms indicate that the evaluations contained feedback that was critical while being constructive. The ability of students to complete the assignment provides hope that they will be more effective in communication with team mates in future ministry positions. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Click or tap here to enter text.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> At the Mid-Year Conference <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> CEL 481 participants, instructors <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Blanke, Rippstein, students
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> Continue in current format, instruction priorities b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Continue c. <i>Program:</i> No needed changes d. <i>Assessment:</i> Continue site supervisor assessment activity 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Continue effective team communication preparation 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? Perhaps additional feedback from the site supervisors on a similar form
Submitted by: Mark Blanke Assessment Committee Reviewed: 6/14/18
Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18