

#2. 2017 – 18 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

Department: Human and Social Science

Date: 5/21/18

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Kathy Miller & Sara Brady

See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) *Student Outcome*; b) *Background*; c) *Question(s)*; d) *Methodology*

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*

Data were analyzed using the rubric (see Attachment 1). Scoring rubrics were assessed by two raters. Aggregated data between the raters is shown in Attachment 2. Percentages were created for each of the four rubric categories, which tabulated the proportion of students who were proficient or higher (1 = adequate or above; 0 = inadequate). For the purpose of the grading rubric, adequate (i.e., meets standard) was considered meeting the proficient level for that category. Although not directly related to the question, artifacts were also scored for the proportion of students who scored above average (1 = above average or higher; 0 = adequate or inadequate). To original goal of the assessment was to determine whether 80% of students will be able to score at or above the proficient level on each area assessment in the rubric.

Summary of RESULTS*:

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

- Can students analyze information relating to a specific topic?
- Can students synthesize information relating to a specific topic?
- Can students create an applied summary demonstrating analysis and synthesis of information in a well-organized presentation?

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

For organization, 92.9% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For level of content, 90.5% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For content (i.e., critical thinking, synthesis), 40.5% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For grammar and mechanics, 95.2% of students scored at or above the proficient level.

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

Based upon the research questions and the original goal of students scoring 80% at or above the proficient level, our assessment revealed that students can analyze information related to a specific topic. However, based upon the low proficiency levels for content (defined as accessing, referencing, and applying prior knowledge and synthesizing information to produce a novel argument), most students were unable to synthesize information relating to a specific topic. In addition, most students were unable to create an applied summary demonstrating both analysis and synthesis of information in well-organized presentation.

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

The assessment was distributed among two courses (SOC 331 N = 23; PSY 451 N = 21). Students were asked to participate in exchange for extra credit. Two artifacts were removed from scoring: one student was answered the assessment in both courses and one student refused to answer the written prompt.

Prior to assessment scoring, students' names were removed from their written responses. Artifacts were numbered and randomly scored by two raters (KM and SB). The first 30 artifacts were scored separately and then the raters conferred their responses and reconciled differences until the scoring was 100% accurate or close to it. The final 13 artifacts were scored independently (92.31% accuracy between the two raters).

After analysis of the data, no significant differences were found in the proportions between the two courses, $ps = ns$. In addition, when determining to what extent students scored above the proficient level, the following proportions were observed: organization = 14.3%, level of content = 2.4%, content = 2.4%, and grammar and mechanics = 21.4%.

Other observations included the fact that many students failed to answer all parts of the question, which often led to them missing the application and synthesis component in their written prompts. More direction needs to be given to students in class to assure that students understand that they should answer all parts of the question. Also, many students seemed as if they ran out of time to complete or add sufficient detail, suggesting that they may not have had enough time to complete the assessment.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/21/18

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) The results were shared in a departmental email.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Thad Warren, Kathy Miller, and Sara Brady

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

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

a. *Teaching:* Students in the HHS department are meeting the adequate level of expectation in for the criterion reviewed. In a closer look at the data the majority of students are only at the adequate level. This leaves room for improvement in our instruction t teach basic writing skills both in format and content .

b. *Assignment/course:* Two differing courses were included in the study in order to gain a departmental perspective towards a similarly taught concept. The information was helpful in helping us see that both disciplines are teaching the concept.

c. *Program:* See above

d. *Assessment:* The assessment procedure will need to be reviewed as many of the students did not have time to complete the full assessment. It is recommended to do the assessment with different expectations of completion.

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

As stated earlier the assessment was helpful for establishing a baseline of content taught but needs work to gain more valuable information.

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 at this time.

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? Consistency in application of learning outcomes across the department.

Submitted by: Thaddeus Warren
(date): 6/15/2018

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: n a

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/9/18

Attachment 1 (rubric):

	Inadequate (Below Standard)	Adequate (Meets Standard)	Above Average (Exceeds Standard)	Exemplary (Far Exceeds Standard)
Organization	Writing lacks logical organization. It shows some coherence but ideas lack unity. Serious errors.	Writing is coherent and logically organized. Some points remain misplaced and stray from the topic. Transitions evident but not used throughout essay.	Writing is coherent and logically organized with transitions used between ideas and paragraphs to create coherence. Overall unity of idea is present.	Writing shows high degree of attention to logic and reasoning of points. Unity clearly leads the reader to the conclusion and stirs thought regarding the topic.
Level of Content	Shows some thinking and reasoning but most ideas are underdeveloped and unoriginal.	Content indicates thinking and reasoning applied with original thought on a few ideas.	Content indicates original thinking and develops ideas with sufficient and firm evidence.	Content indicates synthesis of ideas, in-depth analysis and evidences original thought and support for the topic.
Content Critical thinking: as accessing, referencing, and applying prior knowledge and synthesizing information to produce a novel argument	Main points lack detailed development. Ideas are vague with little evidence of critical thinking.	Main points are present with limited detail and development. Some critical thinking is present.	Main points well developed with quality supporting details and quantity. Critical thinking is weaved into point.	Main points well developed with high quality and quantity support. Reveals high degree of critical thinking
Grammar & Mechanics	Spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors create distraction, making reading difficult; fragments, comma splices, run-ons evident. Errors are frequent	Most spelling, punctuation, and grammar correct allowing reader to progress though essay. Some errors remain.	Essay has few spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors allowing reader to follow ideas clearly. Very few fragments or run-ons	Essay is free of distracting spelling, punctuation, and grammatical errors; absent of fragments, comma splices, and run-ons.

Attachment 2 (data):

Number	Course	Organization Adequate	LevelContent Adequate	Content Adequate	Grammar Adequate	Organization Above	LevelContent Above	Content Above	Grammar Above
2	SOC331	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	SOC331	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
4	SOC331	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1
5	SOC331	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
6	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
7	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
8	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
9	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
10	SOC331	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1
11	SOC331	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
12	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
13	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
14	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
15	SOC331	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
16	SOC331	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
17	SOC331	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
18	SOC331	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
19	SOC331	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
20	SOC331	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
21	SOC331	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
23	SOC331	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0
24	SOC331	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
25	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
26	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
27	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
28	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
29	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
30	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
31	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
32	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
33	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
34	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
35	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
36	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1
37	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
38	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
39	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	1
40	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
41	PSY451	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
42	PSY451	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
43	PSY451	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	1
44	PSY451	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Note: For the first four “adequate” columns, 1 = artifact was scored adequate; 0 = inadequate. For the last four “above” columns, 1 = artifact was scored above average or higher; 0 = adequate or inadequate.