

## 2024 – 25 Departmental Executive Summary

<b>Department:</b> Natural Science	<b>Date:</b> 6/11/25
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Robert Hermann, Kristy Jurchen, Kyle Johnson, Connie Callahan, Raegan Skelton	
<b>See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:</b> <i>a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology</i>	
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students' performance scores as evaluated by their on-site supervisors using the standard Concordia Undergraduate Internship/Practicum Student Evaluation Form were compiled by the faculty instructors. The number of 4 or 5 (out of 5) and 3 or lower evaluation scores were tabulated. Areas which received a 3 or lower score were noted.	
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are internship/practicum students performing at a high level (at least a score of 4 on a scale of 1 - 5 on items 1 - 12 of Undergraduate Internship/Practicum Student Evaluation form)? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> The scores from 25 student internship evaluation forms were tabulated. Of these, 16 students (64%) received a rating of 4 or 5 on all 12 items on the evaluation form. Another student received all 4/5 scores, but the supervisor only ranked five out of the twelve areas. Three additional students received 4/5 scores in 11 out of the 12 areas. The remaining five received 4/5 scores in 9 or fewer out of the 12 areas. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> This was our first time using this evaluation as the basis of our program assessment. We probably were more optimistic than was warranted about the percentage of our students who would receive all-excellent ratings when working at a job/internship where they had no prior experience. Regardless, 64% (68% if the student with only five ratings is included) met our optimistic standard of receiving all 4/5/excellent ratings. 80% of our students received excellent ratings in at least 11 of the 12 areas. Further, no student received a score of lower than 3 (average/satisfactory) in any area. For students who are working in a lab or business for the first time, a satisfactory rating in an area such as the amount of supervision required or the level of initiative demonstrated is perfectly acceptable. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> One student completed his internship in Spain, where there is a different approach to evaluations like this. There, a rating of 3/average is considered a very good rating. For this student, who did receive some 4/5 ratings, their evaluation was exemplary in that context.	
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/10/25 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> via email and Teams documents <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Robert Hermann, Connie Callahan, Kyle Johnson, Raegan Skelton	
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> We will continue to teach our content areas so that students will be equipped with the scientific knowledge required to succeed in their future careers. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> No changes needed or expected for the internship course c. <i>Program:</i> We did not see any particular pattern in the areas where some students received less than exemplary ratings. Therefore, no areas stand out as particularly needing to be addressed. d. <i>Assessment:</i> We were overly optimistic and did not recognize how supervisors in the business or research environment would score entry-level workers. We should be more realistic and acknowledge that "satisfactory" is acceptable for a beginning worker. In the future, we will consider the goal to be met if 90% of our interns receive all "3" or higher ratings, and 80% of our interns receive at least 11 out of 12 "4" or "5" ratings. 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> Students are doing well in their internships as evidenced by the supervisor comments on their evaluation forms in addition to the number of "4" and "5" rankings. We expect this to continue. 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> None	

***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?*** We would like to continue the same assessment question, as this was our first time assessing "Preparation."

**Submitted by:** Kristy Jurchen

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):** 6/16/25

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

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