

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

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: ARC

Date: 5/29/18

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Bethany Landrey, Angel Hoppe, Nancy Elwell

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 % of no-show/with notification appointments was calculated and compared per semester.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):

"Does the implementation of a focused verbal and written message at the beginning and middle of the semester, concerning the importance of meeting cancellation notification, increase the % of students who notify the ARC that an appointment is going to be missed?"

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.

In Spring 2017 we began the verbal/written reminders, but only did this at the first meeting of the semester. Then, in the first of our weekly meetings in both Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, we implemented both a verbal and written reminder to individual students to notify us if they would be missing any of their scheduled meetings during the semester, and we added an additional reminder to these students mid-semester. Data: Spring 15 = 6% missed and notified; Fall 16 = 5% missed and notified; Spring 17 = 25% missed and notified; Fall 17 = 32% missed and notified; Spring 17 = 36% missed and notified. When we implemented both a verbal and written reminder to students in Fall 2017 and Spring 2018, we observed an increase in the percentage who notified us that they would be missing any of their scheduled meetings. In comparing data from Spring 2017 and Spring 2018, where students who meet are primarily those on academic probation, we observed that the percentage increased from 25% to 36%.

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

In Spring 2017 we implemented a verbal and written message concerning the importance of students notifying us if they needed to miss a scheduled meeting, and noted an increase in the percentage of students who notified us. For Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 semesters we wanted to know if an additional reminder mid-semester would increase this percentage of notifications. The data clearly shows that in both Fall 2017 and Spring 2018 we had an increase in the percentage of students who notified the ARC that they would be missing a scheduled meeting. The data would suggest that students tend to respond positively to clear communication of expectations.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) If asked before we counted the numbers, Angel would have predicted this semester to be a lower percentage, but the numbers actually showed higher. This reiterates the importance of looking at objective data and not relying on perception and assumptions.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/29/18

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Met as a department

Who were results shared with? (List names): Landrey, Hoppe, Elwell.

Discussion of Results – Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:

a. Teaching: We will continue with the reminders each semester as a matter of course.

b. Assignment/course: N/A

c. Program: We will continue to track the no-show/notification in subsequent semesters for our own departmental record-keeping.

d. Assessment: N/A

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* With reminders, we anticipate that students will continue the trend of notifying the ARC if they need to miss a scheduled meeting. It would be interesting to see at what point this percentage levels off.

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). 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? [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

Submitted by:Bethany Landrey and Angel Hoppe **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: 7/1/18