

2018 – 2019/2019 – 2020 General Education Executive Summary

Department: Health & Human Performance Date: 6/18/20
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Angie Boldt, Vicki Boye
See General Education Assessment Plan for: a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology
Analysis of artifacts: 1). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Data was analyzed using final scores on a written "fat diet" analysis (rubric).
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 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? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 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 100%(13/13) of the students scored better than the 80% threshold both for the analysis criteria and the for the overall assessment. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> A grade of a B or better (80%+) according to the 2019-2020 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. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> A revised rubric was developed that addressed the perceived lack of discrimination and level of detail available from the 2018-2019 rubric. The new rubric incorporates 3 criteria, four categories/levels of scores as well as a range of scores within each category. The revised rubric provided better discrimination of the quality of the analysis and work among students, as well as assessment results that were more reflective and discerning of the analysis outcome.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 2020 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Results & Executive Summary Shared with department via email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Nolan Harms, Jen Janousek, Chris Luther, Angie Boldt
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> Assignment will continue with detailed instructions and expectations provided to the students, including the revised rubric. c. <i>Program:</i> Click or tap here to enter text. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Click or tap here to enter text. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Click or tap here to enter text. 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> Click or tap here to enter text.
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: Vicki Boye Assessment Committee Reviewed: 7/14/2020
Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed: 7/14/2020
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

