

**2018 – 2019/2019 – 2020 General Education Executive Summary**

|   |
|---|
| <b>Department:</b> Health & Human Performance <b>Date:</b> 5/9/19   |
| <b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Angie Boldt, Vicki Boye   |
| <b>General Education Assessment Plan:</b> a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology  |
| <b>Analysis of artifacts:</b><br>1). <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</b> * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i><br>Data was analyzed using final scores on a written "fat diet" analysis (rubric).   |
| <b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b><br>1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i><br>Can students identify key components of a "fad diet"? Can students evaluate components of a "fad diet" as to safety and congruence with weight reduction and dietary guidelines and recommendations?<br>2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i><br>Success for assessment was defined as 80% of the students achieving a score of 80% or better on the fad diet analysis. Analysis showed that 86%(13/15) of the students scored better than the 80% threshold.<br>3). <b>INTERPRETATION</b> * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i><br>A grade of a B or better (80%+) according to the 2018-2019 CUNE Undergraduate Catalog(p16) is categorized as "commendable mastery of the material". Therefore, based on the summary of the assessment results, it is concluded that the student outcome of being able to recognize, understand, interpret and critically evaluate the components of a "fad diet" was met.<br>4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> After the analysis utilizing the initial rubric, it was observed that the rubric may not adequately discriminate between levels and quality of analysis. With only three categories/levels of scores, only two criteria, and no range of scores within each category/level concerns were raised that the rubric and therefore the analysis lacked the desired level of detail and discrimination.                  |
| <b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 4/26/19 and 5/9/19<br><i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Initial results were discussed at the department meeting with the Executive Summary shared via email.<br><i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Nolan Harms, Jen Janousek, Chris Luther, Angie Boldt   |
| <b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b><br>1. <b>ACTION</b> *- <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i><br>a. <i>Teaching:</i> Click or tap here to enter text.<br>b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Assignment will continue with more detailed instructions and expectations provided to the students, including the revised rubric.<br>c. <i>Program:</i> Click or tap here to enter text.<br>d. <i>Assessment:</i> Rubric for this assignment will be revised. Categories for levels of performance will be expanded to a minimum of 4 such categories. In addition, rubric will be expanded to include more specific and separate criteria/elements as opposed to one overall "score" for the two major sections. Finally, the rubric will provide the opportunity to assess using a range of scores within each level of performance.<br>2. <b>IMPACT</b> *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> This action should provided better discrimination of the quality of analysis and work among students. Furthermore, it should provide assessment results that are more reflective and discerning of the analysis outcome. It is possible with the revised rubric that student performance may in fact decrease; however, we believe that this will benefit both our students and department going forward.<br>3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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> Click or tap here to enter text. |
| <b><i>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</i></b>  |
| <b><i>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</i></b> The current questions will once again be assessed utilizing the revised rubric in HHP 285 – Topics in Nutrition.   |

**Submitted by:** Vicki Boye **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 5/10/19

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

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** na