

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

Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

Department: Career Development Date: 5/18/18
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Corey Gray, 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). Survey response rate as outlines on the successful career outcome survey.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> The data from the career outcome survey is important as it is utilized campus wide for departmental academic review, university marketing and accreditation evidence. The response rate for this survey is currently 31.5%. The goal is to increase this rate to 40%. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Of the 226 undergraduates in the class of 2017, 84 responded to the survey. This is a 37.2% response rate. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Increased communication, the email to graduates, was impactful in increasing the survey response rate. The response rate did increase over 2017, but we are not yet at the goal of 40%. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> None
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> Spring 2018 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Met with each academic department. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Thad Warren, Andy Langewisch, Don Robson, Lorinda Sankey, Rob Hermann, Vicki Anderson.
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> Click or tap here to enter text. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Click or tap here to enter text. c. <i>Program:</i> We will continue with the additional communication to recent grads. Conversation regarding adding another communication touch point is under consideration. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Assessment will not be changed. We will continue to move to increasing the survey response rate. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Greater understanding on post-graduation outcomes. 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? Click or tap here to enter text.
Submitted by: Corey Gray Assessment Committee Reviewed: 6/19/18
Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18