

[Table of Contents](#)

[Collapse All](#)

About this Assessment Plan

[Settings](#)

Assessment Plan Owner: General Education

Current Assessment Planning Cycle

* Select Assessment Planning Form [2009-2010] Academic

* Status of Assessment Planning = Approved; Improvement = Approved Plan

* Public? Yes

Assessment Program Information

* Program Name: General Education

Contact Name: Sally Blomstrom

Contact Email: blomstrs@erau.edu

Contact Phone: 928-777-6684

Changes to Assessment Organization, Processes, Participants in Past Year (optional) Dr. Angela Beck was the General Education Coordinator for the past 7 years. This year Dr. Sally Blomstrom has taken on that role.

Ad Hoc Improvements in Past Year (optional)

Additional Information (optional)

Attach File(s) (optional)

Program Mission Statement

* Program Mission Statement Recognizing its general and special missions in education, Embry-Riddle embraces a general education program. This course of study ensures that students possess the attributes expected of all university graduates. Encouraging intellectual self-reliance and ability, the general education program enables students, regardless of their degree program, to understand the significance of acquiring a broad range of knowledge.

Throughout the general education program, students gain and enhance competence in written and oral communication. They practice reasoning and critical thinking skills and demonstrate computer proficiency. As students engage in this course of study, they familiarize themselves with and investigate ideas and methodologies from several disciplines. These include the arts and humanities, the social sciences, the natural sciences, and mathematics. The program also helps students recognize interrelationships among the disciplines.

Promoting the appreciation of varied perspectives, the general education program provides intellectual stimulation, ensuring that students are broadly educated. This course of study empowers students to make informed value judgments, to expand their knowledge and understanding of themselves, and to lead meaningful, responsible, and satisfying lives as individuals, professionals, and concerned members of their society and the world.

Alignment of Program Mission Statement to University Mission

Select checkboxes below for all of the appropriate elements below that indicate how your program aligns with the

...selected below. For all of the appropriate elements below that indicate how your program aligns with the University Mission Statement.

University Mission Statement:

Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University is an independent, nonsectarian, non-profit, coeducational university with a history dating back to the early days of aviation. The university serves culturally diverse students motivated toward careers in aviation and aerospace. Residential campuses in Daytona Beach, Florida, and Prescott, Arizona, provide education in a traditional setting, while an extensive network of learning centers throughout the United States and abroad serves civilian and military working adults through ERAU-Worldwide.

It is the purpose of Embry-Riddle to provide a comprehensive education to prepare graduates for productive careers and responsible citizenship with special emphasis on the needs of aviation, aerospace, engineering and related fields. To achieve this purpose, the university is dedicated to the following:

- Degree Programs Yes
- Academic Excellence No
- Responsible Graduates Yes
- Effective Educational Programs No
- Promote Ethical Behavior Yes
- Research No
- Student Personal Development Yes

System Information

Last Modified Date Friday, January 7, 2011 5:53:45 PM EST

Last User to Modify dickeya

Assessment Plan Outcomes

Name	Description	Status	Public
Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.			No
ERAU students are adequately prepared in information literacy skills.			No
ERAU students can adequately construct written documents for technical and non-technical audiences.			No
Students can adequately communicate ideas in non-written form.			No

[^ Back to top](#)

Assessment Plan Outcomes

[🔗 Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.](#)

Select Outcome from Master List of Outcomes

Instructions: Below, click the "BROWSE" button to:

1. (REQUIRED) Select an outcome to assess from Master List of Program Outcomes ("BROWSE" -> "Master List of Program Outcomes" -> "GO" button).
2. (OPTIONAL) Align outcome with any other applicable standards such as AABI, ABET, General Education Outcomes: ("BROWSE" -> "Standards" -> "GO" button).

Select Outcome to Assess from Master List of Outcomes and Align to any Applicable Standards AABI A An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics, science, and applied sciences to aviation-related disciplines
 PC_GENED_PO_01 Math Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.

Outcome Title

✦ Outcome Title Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success and Results

Assessment Outcome Title

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.

Attachments

Measurement One

✳ Means of Assessment Other (please specify below)

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable) Final exam in MAT 241 Calculus I

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.) Student enrolled in one section of MA 241 participated during Fall 09 and all sections participated during Spring 10. Professors Hisa Tsutsui and Jason Jacobs were the faculty involved in data collection and analysis.

✳ Criterion for Success Aggregate scores will be examined. At least half the class will score at the 50th percentile or better.

Assessment Results / Data Collected In Fall 09 75% of the class earned a 50% or higher. 62% scored a 50% or higher during the spring term in one section and

Measurement Two

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results / Data Collected

Measurement Three

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results / Data Collected

Measurement Four

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Five and Up

For Outcomes with more than four measurements, indicate all means of assessment that will be used (select all that apply). Then list the details for measurements 5 and up in the areas that follow, numbering them appropriately in each text area, starting with number 5.

Capstone course / senior design project **No**

Exam in non-culminating course(s) **No**

Rubric-scored artifact in non-culminating course(s) **No**

End of course evaluations **No**

Focus group/structured interviews (students, faculty) **No**

ERAU Student Satisfaction Survey **No**

ERAU Graduating Student Survey **No**

ERAU Alumni Survey **No**

ERAU Employer Feedback Survey **No**

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) **No**

Incoming Freshmen Survey (CIRP) **No**

Other national survey **No**

External or internal peer review **No**

Retention / graduation rates **No**

Employment placement / continuing education rates **No**

Other (Please specify below) **No**

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion / Criteria for Success

test

Attach Supporting Documents

Improvements

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.

Use of Assessment Results

Have assessment results Yes (Select all that apply below, then describe) been used to make improvements?

Types of improvements

Curriculum modification(s) No

Pedagogy modification(s) No

Course sequence altered No

Technology-related changes No

Personnel-related changes were made No

Other Yes

Description of Improvements Improvements made are to the structure used for assessment. The same course will be assessed with the same final exam. In the future embedded questions will be identified and analyzed, which will provide the information needed to make informed, targeted curricular changes.

Attach File(s) (optional)

Planned Future Improvements

Indicate and describe any planned improvements. If new funds are required for planned improvements, you will also need to complete the next tab, "Mission Critical Budget Request".

Do assessment results indicate any critical improvements that must be made in the next fiscal year? Yes - planned improvements require NO NEW FUNDS

Description of Planned Improvements Changes will be made based on the results.

Mission-Critical Budget Request

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title Apply knowledge of college-level mathematics for defining and solving problems.

Mission-Critical Budget Request

Title of Budget Request

Details of Budget Request

Are capital funds required?

Total Amount of Operating Funds Requested

Salaries: \$

Duration:

Benefits: \$

Duration:

Professional Development: \$

Duration:

Computer Hardware: \$

Duration:

Computer Software: \$

Duration:

Other Operating Funds: \$

Duration:

[^ Back to top](#)

ERAU students are adequately prepared in information literacy skills.

Select Outcome from Master List of Outcomes

Instructions: Below, click the "BROWSE" button to:

1. (REQUIRED) Select an outcome to assess from Master List of Program Outcomes ("BROWSE" -> "Master List of Program Outcomes" -> "GO" button).
2. (OPTIONAL) Align outcome with any other applicable standards such as AABI, ABET, General Education Outcomes: ("BROWSE" -> "Standards" -> "GO" button).

Select Outcome to Assess from Master List of Outcomes and Align to any Applicable Standards

PC_Gen_Ed_Info_Literacy ERAU students are adequately prepared in critical thinking/information literacy Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University students demonstrate adequate information literacy skills through their ability to successfully frame and scope research questions, to use the available electronic resources at ERAU to efficiently and effectively find answers to these questions, to judge the merit of answers found (reliability, validity, authority), and to properly cite the pertinent electronic sources.

Outcome Title

✦ Outcome Title

ERAU students are adequately prepared in information literacy skills.

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success and Results

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title

ERAU students are adequately prepared in information literacy skills.

Attachments

Measurement One

✦ Means of Assessment Other national survey

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Project SAILS, the Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills (SAILS) from Kent State University.

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

The Hazy Library Instruction Librarians administered to 475 students during the Fall, 2009 semester in 29 class sessions. We tested a sufficient number of students to have a valid sampling.

✧ Criterion for Success Comparison with benchmark institutions.

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Students at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Prescott performed better than the institution-type benchmark on the following SAILS Skill Sets:

- &vβσπ; Selecting Finding Tools
- &vβσπ; Searching
- &vβσπ; Using Finding Tool Features
- &vβσπ; Retrieving Sources
- &vβσπ; Documenting Sources
- &vβσπ; Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues

Students at Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Prescott performed about the same as the institution-type benchmark on the following SAILS Skill Sets:

- &vβσπ; Developing a Research Strategy
- &vβσπ; Evaluating Sources

To identify which skill sets were easier and which were more difficult for Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Prescott students, the skill sets below are ordered by performance, from best to worst. The ordering reflects the magnitude of difference between the ERAU mean and the institution-type benchmark mean.

Best:

- &vβσπ; Developing a Research Strategy
- &vβσπ; Evaluating Sources
- &vβσπ; Retrieving Sources
- &vβσπ; Searching
- &vβσπ; Selecting Finding Tools
- &vβσπ; Documenting Sources
- &vβσπ; Using Finding Tool Features

Worst:

- &vβσπ; Understanding Economic, Legal, and Social Issues

Overall scores across all SAILS skills sets are shown in the following table:

	Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University	Institution Type: Masters	All Institutions
SAILS Skill Sets			
Developing a Research Strategy	564	555	554
Selecting Finding Tools	564	545	544
Searching	548	535	533
Using Finding Tool Features	585	556	554
Retrieving Sources	582	559	558
Evaluating Sources	578	571	566
Documenting Sources	585	561	562
Understanding Economic, Legal and Social Issues	563	534	531

Detailed performance of Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University Prescott students on the individual SAILS skill sets are reported, beginning on page 8 of the complete Project SAILS Report dated December 2009, which is probably submitted under the library's assessment

report dated December, 2007, which is probably submitted under the history's assessment page. We are happy to provide it for you if you are interested.

Measurement Two

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other'
Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment
Measurement (Timeframe
of Data Collection,
Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Three

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other'
Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment
Measurement (Timeframe
of Data Collection,
Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Four

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other'
Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment
Measurement (Timeframe
of Data Collection,
Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Five and Up

For Outcomes with more than four measurements, indicate all means of assessment that will be used (select all that apply). Then list the details for measurements 5 and up in the areas that follow, numbering them appropriately in each text area, starting with number 5.

Capstone course / senior **No**
design project

Exam in non-culminating **No**
course(s)

Rubric-scored artifact in **No**
non-culminating
course(s)

End of course evaluations **No**

Focus group/structured interviews (students, faculty) **No**

ERAU Student Satisfaction Survey **No**

ERAU Graduating Student Survey **No**

ERAU Alumni Survey **No**

ERAU Employer Feedback Survey **No**

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) **No**

Incoming Freshmen Survey (CIRP) **No**

Other national survey **No**

External or internal peer review **No**

Retention / graduation rates **No**

Employment placement / continuing education rates **No**

Other (Please specify below) **No**

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion / Criteria for Success

Assessment Results / Data Collected

test

Attach Supporting Documents

Improvements

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title ERAU students are adequately prepared in information literacy skills.

Use of Assessment Results

Have assessment results been used to make improvements? **Yes (Select all that apply below, then describe)**

Types of improvements

Curriculum modification(s) Yes

Pedagogy modification(s) Yes

Course sequence altered No

Technology-related changes No

Personnel-related changes were made No

Other No

Description of Improvements
The Instruction Librarians, Evelyn Harris, Suzie Roth, and Patricia Watkins, have reviewed these results. They will revise the instruction modules for all COM122 classes to emphasize the skills that were most difficult for our students and will continue to follow ACRL best practices for information literacy instruction.

We have revised the library instruction program for the Fall 2010 semester, placing more emphasis on the skills where our students need reinforcement, and are using examples from the SAILS test to illustrate information literacy skills concepts.

Skills that will be emphasized in the COM122 instruction as well as in the upper division lectures:

- &vβσπ:Developing a research Strategy
- &vβσπ:Evaluating Sources
- &vβσπ:Understanding economic, legal and social issues
- &vβσπ:Documenting Sources

Attach File(s) (optional)

Planned Future Improvements

Indicate and describe any planned improvements. If new funds are required for planned improvements, you will also need to complete the next tab, "Mission Critical Budget Request".

Do assessment results indicate any critical improvements that must be made in the next fiscal year? Yes - planned improvements require NO NEW FUNDS

Description of Planned Improvements

Mission-Critical Budget Request

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title ERAU students are adequately prepared in information literacy skills.

Mission-Critical Budget Request

Title of Budget Request

Details of Budget Request

Are capital funds required?

Total Amount of Operating Funds Requested

Salaries: \$

Duration:

Benefits: \$

Duration:

Professional
Development: \$

Duration:

Computer Hardware: \$

Duration:

Computer Software: \$

Duration:

Other Operating Funds: \$

Duration:

[^ Back to top](#)

ERAU students can adequately construct wrtitten documents for technical and non-technical audiences.

Select Outcome from Master List of Outcomes

Instructions: Below , click the "BROWSE" button to:

1. (REQUIRED) Select an outcome to assess from Master List of Program Outcomes ("BROWSE" -> "Master List of Program Outcomes" -> "GO" button).
2. (OPTIONAL) Align outcome with any other applicable standards such as AABI, ABET , General Education Outcomes: ("BROWSE" -> "Standards" -> "GO" button).

Select Outcome to Assess from Master List of Outcomes and Align to any Applicable Standards PC_GENED_PO_02 Writing Construct effective written documents for technical and non-technical audiences.

Outcome Title

* Outcome Title ERAU students can adequately construct wrtitten documents for technical and non-technical audiences.

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success and Results

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title ERAU students can adequately construct wrtitten documents for technical and non-technical audiences.

Attachments

Measurement One

* Means of Assessment Other (please specify below)

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable) Pre- and post-course writing samples from 8 sections of COM 221 and 10 sections of engineering design capstone courses.

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.) Fall 2009 and Spring 2010
Students from 8 sections of COM 221 sand 10 sections of engineering design capstone courses will participate, along with the faculty teaching those courses.

* Criterion for Success On the post-tesst students will score an aggreate mean of 70%, furthermore students will show a significant improvement from pre to post measures of at least 10% of the mean aggregate score.

Assessment Results / Data Collected On the post-test, student scored an aggregate mean of 76%, exceeding the 70% threshold.
Students showed sianificant improvement from pre to post measures of 17% of the mean

...aggregate score, exceeding the 10% threshold.

Measurement Two

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other'
Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment
Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Three

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other'
Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment
Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Four

Means of Assessment

Description of 'Other'
Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment
Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion for Success

Assessment Results /
Data Collected

Measurement Five and Up

For Outcomes with more than four measurements, indicate all means of assessment that will be used (select all that apply). Then list the details for measurements 5 and up in the areas that follow, numbering them appropriately in each text area, starting with number 5.

Capstone course / senior **No**
design project

Exam in non-culminating **No**
course(s)

Rubric-scored artifact in **No**
non-culminating
course(s)

End of course evaluations **No**

Focus group/structured interviews (students, faculty) **No**

ERAU Student Satisfaction Survey **No**

ERAU Graduating Student Survey **No**

ERAU Alumni Survey **No**

ERAU Employer Feedback Survey **No**

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) **No**

Incoming Freshmen Survey (CIRP) **No**

Other national survey **No**

External or internal peer review **No**

Retention / graduation rates **No**

Employment placement / continuing education rates **No**

Other (Please specify below) **No**

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion / Criteria for Success

Assessment Results / Data Collected

test

Attach Supporting Documents

[^ Back to top](#)

 [Students can adequately communicate ideas in non-written form.](#)

Select Outcome from Master List of Outcomes

Instructions: Below, click the "BROWSE" button to:

1. (REQUIRED) Select an outcome to assess from Master List of Program Outcomes ("BROWSE" -> "Master List of Program Outcomes" -> "GO" button).
2. (OPTIONAL) Align outcome with any other applicable standards such as AABI, ABET, General Education Outcomes: ("BROWSE" -> "Standards" -> "GO" button).

Select Outcome to Assess from Master List of Outcomes and Align to any Applicable Standards

PC_GENED_PO_03 Speech Communicate ideas in non-written form, such as through oral presentations and visual media.

Outcome Title

✳ Outcome Title Students can adequately communicate ideas in non-written form.

Assessment Measures, Criteria for Success and Results

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title Students can adequately communicate ideas in non-written form.

Attachments

Measurement One

✳ Means of Assessment Other (please specify below)

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable) Other: student skill survey developed for COM 219 students based on expectations drawn from Speaking and Listening Competencies for College Students (http://www.natcom.org/uploadedFiles/Content/Education/Virtual_Faculty_Lounge/College%20Competencies.pdf) and supplemented with items from the Commission on Public Relations Education 2006 Report, "The Professional Bond" <http://www.commpred.org/theprofessionalbond/> and additional items drawn from research currently being conducted at the University of Minnesota Crookston on teams. That research is funded by a Bush grant. The survey was administered at the start and the end of the term for both the fall and spring terms with 3 sections included from fall and 3 from spring. All sections were taught by the same instructor. The survey has been administered during the 07-08 year, 08-09 year with all faculty participating, and the 09-10 year. Results from the student skill survey were compared with faculty evaluations of students' persuasive speeches and with course evaluations. Data were also gathered from the senior capstone courses in engineering. The student skill survey and instructor evaluations for persuasive speeches provide a measure of intermediate skill level in oral communication. The data gathered from students' oral presentations for their capstone projects to a panel of industry representatives provide evidence of advanced oral communication skill level.

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.) The first data set included student responses to this student skill survey. On the student skill survey students rated their skills on 57 items using a 5-point scale with 1 representing poor and 5 representing excellent. The items distinguished between content (11), organization (7), delivery (7), team skills (17) and personal skills (15). Students in the basic course completed the survey during the spring of 2008, the 2008-2009 and 2009-2010 academic years. The student skill survey was administered at the start and the end of the term for each class included in this report.

✳ Criterion for Success Criterion for Success: changes in students' self perceptions were analyzed using MANOVA and paired t-tests. Significance from time1 to time2 was the criterion for success.

Assessment Results / Data Collected Student skill surveys resulted in significant differences between time1 and time2 for each factor (content, organization, delivery skills, personal skills, and team skills.)

Measurement Two

Means of Assessment Other (please specify below)

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable) The second data set includes instructor evaluations of persuasive speeches.

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.) The persuasive speeches are either the second or third presentations of the terms and all of the persuasive speeches were evaluated by the instructor.

Criterion for Success How closely the students' self report measure matched the teacher's evaluation of the students' performance on corresponding items with the persuasive speech evaluation form.

The analysis of the instructor evaluation forms involved changes attributable to different teaching techniques, which required multiple semesters. The time period for this analysis covered 1½ years from fall 2008 through fall 2009 and included ten sections. The ten sections were taught by one faculty member and incorporated service-learning. Each of the sections followed the same basic course structure with some variation in the order of assignments. Items from the evaluation forms were selected based on how closely the items matched items on the students' self report surveys completed at the end of the terms. A comparison was made between the means of selected items from the instructor evaluations and the means of the corresponding responses to the student skill survey (Table 3). The overall mean difference between the mean of students' self report level and the mean of the instructor's evaluation was less than 0.10, which indicated reasonable correspondence. Students' self evaluations were not consistently higher, which some literature suggested. The discrepancies provide insights into which areas need better shared understanding.

The categories (content, organization, delivery, personal skills, and team skills) were composed of individual items. For this analysis similar items were chosen from the student survey and from the evaluation form. A closer examination of aggregate responses to individual items on the evaluation form revealed that students scored better on gaining attention and interest than on establishing personal credibility. To shed light on the results the design blueprint for the class was employed. Previously students worked in teams to write introductions and conclusions for a given set of topics, which addressed the first student learning outcome for the course. While the exercise seemed to help students think of ways to gain attention and relate the topic to the audience, the students did not display evidence of understanding how to build credibility. During the Fall 2009 term students were asked to go around the room and state why they were credible on their persuasive speech topics. It appears as though personal credibility statements gained at the expense of statements relating the topic to the audience suggesting that an additional learning experience may be useful.

Measurement Three

Means of Assessment Other (please specify below)

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable) The third set includes quiz scores.

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.) Students took an online quiz for each chapter in the text. The quizzes were taken from The Challenge of Effective Speaking 14th Edition, written by Rudolph Verderber, Kathleen Verderber and Deanna Sellnow. The course grade included 15 of the 16 chapter

KARLEEN VERDEGEE, and DEBRA BROWN. THE COURSE GRADE INCLUDED 15 OF THE 16 CHAPTER quizzes. The students could opt to take 15 quizzes or the lowest score of the 16 would be excluded in the calculation of the final grade. The quizzes consisted of multiple choice and true/false questions from a pool. Students could use their text and notes for the quizzes.

Criterion for Success Average quiz scores.

Assessment Results / Data Collected

The quiz scores from the same ten sections of the course were used in this analysis. The analysis looked at which chapters had the highest quiz scores and, more to the point, which chapters had the lowest quiz scores. The average quiz scores were compared across sections for Fall 08, Spring 09, and Fall 09. Chapters 2 and 9 were tied in terms of the frequency each occurred with the highest average score per class. The highest quiz scores varied between chapters for different classes. The lowest average scores, however, did not vary beyond two chapters. The chapter which appeared the most often with the lowest score was Chapter 14. Scores for the Chapter 11 quiz were also low, but occurred less often than Chapter 14.

Measurement Four

Means of Assessment End of course evaluations

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.) Course evaluations were completed at the end of each course. Two items were selected from the course evaluations. First was an item asking the extent to which "My instructor's methods and materials help me learn." The second asked the extent to which "My instructor distributed and followed a clear, well-organized course syllabus. Course evaluations from three semesters were included in this analysis (Fall 08, Spring 09, and Fall 09).

Criterion for Success Evaluations above neutral.

Assessment Results / Data Collected

Overall the evaluations were positive. Quantitative responses and comments were both reviewed to better understand results. On most items student responses were above neutral, however for the item on instructor methods, neutral responses were reported.

Students reported liking the class and they gave favorable responses to the instructor. Moreover, in reflective comments written during the course students wrote and said very positive comments about service-learning. The responses to this course evaluation item seemed inconsistent with the other evidence. The comments section of the course evaluations was read to see if additional information was offered for clarification. Although few students offered suggestions for how the course could be improved, three students over the three semesters commented they didn't like group work in class. This was a speech class students experience less speech anxiety when they were acquainted with people in the audience. Group tasks give

students the opportunity to get to know others in the class. The combined course evaluations for all ten sections revealed a few comments stating students didn't like group work in class. Each of the comments made on the course evaluations had been read, but each had been a single comment made in one of four classes from a semester so it had not received much attention. In the context of looking at ten sections, the three comments provided an indication of why some students chose a neutral response to the item of how well the instructor's methods helped them learn.

During the previous semester the same student learning outcome would have included listening as it related to a second service-learning presentation. Students needed to revise their presentations and deliver them to a different audience. They received feedback from the community partner, their instructor and peers, and were asked to incorporate that feedback when revising their presentations for the new audience. At the beginning of the term one service-learning presentation was in the schedule, and part way into the semester an opportunity presented itself for a second service-learning presentation to take place near the end of the semester. The second service-learning assignment was added, which replaced an originally planned assignment. The change was made so that students could benefit from revising their initial presentations and delivering those presentations to a different audience in a different setting. Students respond very positively to the service-learning projects. The reflective comments from students indicated that they valued the second presentation, because they perceived the revisions and second presentations improved their speaking skills. They listened to the feedback and incorporated suggestions.

On the course evaluations the overall percentage of students who "strongly agreed" or "agreed" that the instructor "distributed and followed a clear, well-organized course syllabus" remained about 97% for both semesters. A change was observed, however, in the number of students who "strongly agreed" (46% during the term when students engaged in two service-learning presentations) and (70% when students did the capstone presentation analysis.) Since the organization of the rest of the syllabus had not changed, the conclusion was that making the addition of the second service-learning presentation negatively impacted students' perceptions of a well-organized syllabus.

Measurement Five and Up

For Outcomes with more than four measurements, indicate all means of assessment that will be used (select all that apply). Then list the details for measurements 5 and up in the areas that follow, numbering them appropriately in each text area, starting with number 5.

Capstone course / senior design project **No**

Exam in non-culminating course(s) **No**

Rubric-scored artifact in non-culminating course(s) **No**

End of course evaluations **No**

Focus group/structured interviews (students, faculty) **No**

ERAU Student Satisfaction Survey **No**

ERAU Graduating Student Survey **No**

ERAU Alumni Survey **No**

ERAU Employer Feedback Survey **No**

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) **No**

Incoming Freshmen Survey (CIRP) **No**

Other national survey **No**

External or internal peer review **No**

Retention / graduation rates **No**

Employment placement / continuing education rates **No**

Other (Please specify below) **No**

Description of 'Other' Means of Assessment (if applicable)

Details of Assessment Measurement (Timeframe of Data Collection, Participants/Roles, etc.)

Criterion / Criteria for Success

Assessment Results / Data Collected

test

Attach Supporting Documents

Improvements

Assessment Outcome Title

Outcome Title: Students can adequately communicate ideas in non-written form

Use of Assessment Results

Have assessment results been used to make improvements? **Yes** (Select all that apply below, then describe)

Types of improvements

Curriculum modification(s) **No**

Pedagogy modification(s) **Yes**

Course sequence altered **Yes**

Technology-related changes **Yes**

Personnel-related changes were made **No**

Other **No**

Description of Improvements

Instructor evaluations for persuasive speeches were compared with skill survey responses at the end of the course. Results suggested that the perceptions of the instructor and the students were fairly consistent. Differences between students' perceptions of their skills and instructor evaluation of those skills indicated where improvements were needed and created an opportunity to address the discrepancy by modifying or changing a learning experience. One way to increase the mutual understanding of expectation was to create a better designed learning experience for the observation, analysis, and evaluation of sample speeches. Also, students hear all of the team presentations. More discussion is included at the conclusion of each persuasive speech to help the speakers and the listeners.

The quiz scores indicated that items needed to be changed for the Chapter 14 quiz. This chapter was covered near the end of the term, and students may have been less likely to complete the quiz due to competing demands. To see if that was the case a comparison was made with scores for Chapter 15, which was covered later in the semester. The scores for Chapter 15 were higher, so it appeared the issue with Chapter 14 was specific to the items and/or the content. Revisions were made to how the content was covered.

Course evaluation results caused sequencing to change and caused changes to the syllabus.

Attach File(s) (optional)

Planned Future Improvements

Indicate and describe any planned improvements. If new funds are required for planned improvements, you will also need to complete the next tab, "Mission Critical Budget Request".

Do assessment results indicate any critical improvements that must be made in the next fiscal year? **Yes - planned improvements require NO NEW FUNDS**

Description of Planned Improvements **Students in the sections of speech taught by Dr. Blomstrom will develop and deliver webinars in addition to the current service-learning projects.**

