

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

### Student Outcomes – Gen Ed

**Department:** Human and Social Science      **Date:** 6-15-18

**Members involved with analysis of artifacts:** [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**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).*  
- 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 a student articulate a coherent and thoughtful reflection? Can the student demonstrate good writing mechanics? Can the student demonstrate writing in a basic APA format (see rubric)? Can the student demonstrate organizational skills in writing?

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

For organization, 93.5% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For level of content, 96.7% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For content (i.e., critical thinking, synthesis), 100% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For grammar and mechanics, 100% of students scored at or above the proficient level. For APA format 100% 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

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* The majority of students met the level of proficient very few students met a level above proficient.

#### **Sharing of Results:**

*When were results shared? Date:* 6\15\18

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

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

#### **Discussion of Results – Summarize your conclusions including:**

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

a. *Teaching:* Students are meeting a proficient level of work in each of the criterion. While overall this is a good sign we need to make improvements in addressing shortcomings in order to better prepare our students for graduate school.

b. *Assignment/course:* The assessment gives the department a baseline to measure future courses via these criteria.

c. *Program*: Overall the assessment indicates the program is meeting a basic level of instruction for the stated general education outcomes. Little is known how these outcomes are being met across the whole curriculum including additional General Education courses.

d. *Assessment*: The assignment used for the assessment in this course lends itself well for this type of an assessment

2. **IMPACT\***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Continued monitoring of these outcomes will be important. So further review of these outcomes is needed and likely. If not this particular assessment a revised one should be conducted.

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?*** How does this assessment compare across other departments? Do our students improve from the baseline that was established via this assessment?

**Submitted by:**Thaddeus Warren **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 7/3/18

**Department Chair notified/additional action needed:**na

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** na**Approved & Posted to**

**Assessment site:** 7/3/18

## Rubric

	<b>Inadequate (Below Standard)</b>	<b>Adequate (Meets Standard)</b>	<b>Above Average (Exceeds Standard)</b>	<b>Exemplary (Far Exceeds Standard)</b>
<b>Organization</b>	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.
<b>Level of Content</b>	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.
<b>Content</b> 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
<b>Grammar &amp; Mechanics</b>	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.
<b>APA Format</b> -Times New Roman 12pt -Double spacing -Running Header -Proper use of in-text citation -1” margins	There are extensive errors in APA formatting, citations.	There are multiple errors in APA formatting, citations.	Paper has minor errors in APA formatting, citations	Paper is free or almost free of errors in APA formatting, citations.

**Attachment 2 (data):**

Number	Course	Organization Adequate	Content Adequate	Content Adequate	Grammar Adequate	APA Adequate
1	NA	1	1	1	1	1
2	NA	1	1	1	1	1
3	NA	0	1	1	1	1
4	NA	1	1	1	1	1
5	NA	1	1	1	1	1
6	NA	1	1	1	1	1
7	NA	1	1	1	1	1
8	NA	1	1	1	1	1
9	NA	1	1	1	1	1
10	NA	1	1	1	1	1
11	NA	1	1	1	1	1
12	NA	0	0	1	1	1
13	NA	1	1	1	1	1
14	NA	1	1	1	1	1
15	NA	1	1	1	1	1
16	NA	1	1	1	1	1
17	NA	1	1	1	1	1
18	NA	1	1	1	1	1
19	NA	1	1	1	1	1
20	NA	1	1	1	1	1
21	NA	1	1	1	1	1
22	NA	1	1	1	1	1
23	NA	1	1	1	1	1
24	NA	1	1	1	1	1
25	NA	1	1	1	1	1
26	NA	1	1	1	1	1
27	NA	1	1	1	1	1
28	NA	1	1	1	1	1
29	NA	1	1	1	1	1
30	NA	1	1	1	1	1
31	NA	1	1	1	1	1

*Note:* For the first four "adequate" columns, 1 = artifact was scored adequate; 0 = inadequate. For the last four inadequate.

Percent Adequate	93.50%	96.70%	100%	100%	100%
------------------	--------	--------	------	------	------