

**2020 – 21 Departmental Assessment Plan**

<b>Department/Program/Unit:</b> ECTA	<b>Date:</b> 10/6/2020
<b>Related: University Goals/Outcomes:</b>	
<b>Members involved with development of Plan:</b> T Beck, L Ashby, G Haley, E Lamm, L ZumHofe, B Moore, P Koprince	
<b>Departmental/Program/Unit Student Outcome:</b> Students will assemble a portfolio and resume that demonstrate professional and educational skills relevant to their professional and/or graduate study career goals <b>State as follows:</b> Students should be able to [action verb] [something]. Students will be able to create a portfolio that clearly and fully demonstrates their professional and educational skills relevant to their professional and/or graduate study career goals	
<b>Background:</b> <i>What factors caused you to choose this particular assessment outcome? If you chose this outcome because of a perceived problem, please explain.</i> The department is interested in exploring the effectiveness of our placement seminar class overall. We want to know if the students are able to produce a professional and relevant portfolio for their career goals.	
<b>Question:</b> <i>What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)</i> How well are students able to produce a professional and relevant portfolio for their career goals?	
<b>Methodology:</b> 1. <b>OBJECT*</b> - <i>What data (i.e. artifact, exam score, detailed description of assignment) will be collected?</i> We use the portfolios produced in the CTA/Eng 300 class and score them with a standard rubric. a. <i>How does this data address the assessment question?</i> It rates the level of success in creating a professional and relevant portfolio. i. <i>Include/attach a description/example of assessment tool to be used.</i> (see below) 2. <i>How will data be collected?</i> Portfolios will be scored by the department using the rubric & averaging the scores.	
<b>Analysis of Artifacts:</b> <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>Discuss:</i> 1) <i>How the artifacts will be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):</i> The artifacts will be scored from 5 (high) to 1 (low). Here is the rubric with scores.  (5) Superior: Skillfully and fully communicates the student's skills in professional research, skill building, network/relational building, and experiences with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.  (4) Above average: Sufficiently communicates the student's skills in professional research, skill building, network/relational building, and experience with minor gaps and the language has few errors  (3) Average: Generally conveys the student's skills in professional research, skill building, network/relational building, and experiences although writing may include some gaps in content or language errors  (2) Developing: Mostly lists the student's skills in professional research, skill building, network/relational building, and experiences but includes vague descriptors or skips one of the areas entirely or has notable language errors  (1) Failing: Student provides a portfolio, but the descriptions of the student's skills are irrelevant, non-specific, or do not cover more than two of the skills in professional research, skill building, network/relational building, and experiences or the writing is primarily unclear and contains extensive language errors.  2) <i>How you will know if it is good (i.e. score required by % of students):</i> The department aims to have at least 70% of the portfolios receiving a score of 3 or higher.	
<b>Submitted by:</b> L Ashby & L ZumHofe <b>Date:</b> 10/6/2020 <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (Date):</b> 10/27	
<b>Department Chair notified of approval/or additional action needed:</b> Approved	

10-27-2020