

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment:

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: History, Geography, Criminal Justice Date: 6/12/18

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

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 420: Immigration/Ethnicity 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 2017-2018 school year, which focused on communication, the department of History, Geography, and Criminal Justice chose to assess the question: "Can students in Hist 420: Immigration and Ethnicity 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: 3

Average Overall Score: 6.9

Based on the results the class as a whole missed the target goal, as three students did not meet the seven point minimum. However, two of those student came within one point of the goal and the final student was only two points away.

Results within categories (Out of 3)

Delivery: 2.3

Content and Organization: 2

Enthusiasm and Audience Engagement: 2.6

Compared with the results from the previous year Delivery fell by .3, Content fell by .7 and Ethusiasm and Engagement improved by .5.

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

Students performed best in the enthusiasm category, which was not the case the previous year. In fact, no student scored below a 2 in that category. Average scores fell slightly in Delivery and Content, although the class still maintained an average score above 2 in each category. In the Content area two

students scored in the 1 category. Possible causes for these results are possibly an overcorrection on the part of the instructor who spent a good deal of time emphasizing the "performance" component of the presentation. Anecdotally, based on student citations of sources, it also appears that a good amount of the research that students presented on was generated in the final days leading to the presentation. Thus, enthusiasm may have been replacing thoughtful delivery and content.

While the class did not meet the designated goal, the overall average was nearly a 7 (6.9). Going forward instructors should perhaps spend more time emphasizing the ideal outcomes for each category.

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

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/7/18

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, Jamie Hink

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 alone will not necessarily remedy student deficiencies in oral communications. Although outside the scope of this assessment, tracing individual student performance throughout their career might shed more light on how to improve overall communication ability.

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

To continue 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
6/14/18

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: 7/1/18