Course Assessment in a Box

Course Assessment in a Box is a practical tool for you to conduct assessment of course Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs). By following these simple steps, using assessment tools you already use to evaluate student work, you can easily produce a course assessment of SLOs.

These steps align with the course SLO assessment page in the CurricUNET Program Review Module. Once the steps are completed, it should be easy to transfer your work to, or simply attach it to, the Program Review.

1. Number and name of the course being assessed:

BSM 101 – Fundamentals of Supervision

2. Course SLOs from the Course Outline of Record (simply cut and paste from the COR):

1. Acquire and evaluate skill sets needed for being a successful leader, manager or supervisor in the 21st century.
2. Identify effective communication techniques and develop a process for performance feedback to employees.
3. Compare and evaluate various techniques for motivating, leading, and managing personnel.

3. If you have had any dialogue about the Course SLOs amongst faculty who teach this course, please describe it here (leave blank if there has been no specific dialogue):

4. List the SLO(s) you are assessing in this particular instance:

SLO #2: Identify effective communication techniques and develop a process for performance feedback to employees.

5. Describe the assessment strategy or tool that addresses the SLO(s):

Assessment of this SLO occurs in two separate learning units in the course. In both parts of the assessment the student is required to submit a written assignment. Together the assignments requires students to 1) define communication and performance feedback for employees; 2) identify, describe and give examples of formal and informal communications in the work place in general and in performance feedback specifically; and 3) identify potential problems, advantages and disadvantages of using specific types of communications in the workplace and give examples of effective uses of each type. (e.g. written, verbal face/face or telephone, etc.)

Copies of the assignments Unit #4 Written Assignment and Unit #5 Written Assignment are included herewith.

NOTE: Try to use assessment strategies you are already using to evaluate student work as part of your grading system. Examples: Rubrics for Evaluating Projects or Assignments, Portfolio Evaluation, Culminating Projects, Final Exams, Writing Assignments, Performance Assessment, Department Testing, Pre and Post Tests, Vendor or Industry Certification Examinations, Indirect Assessments (Student Surveys, Focus Group Discussions, Interviews), or others....
6. Describe how the criteria or standards in this assessment tool link to the SLO(s) being assessed:

Criteria for the successful completion of this assignment are outlined in the **Written Assignment Rubric** available to students at the onset of the assignment, and included herewith.

7. By looking holistically at the results from all students, describe your findings:

Students who are still enrolled in the course at the time of assessment of this SLO are generally able to demonstrate their competence of this SLO and complete the assignment successfully. The majority of the students receive high scores equating to As and Bs. However, like all performance distribution patterns there are one or two students who received average or below average scores for their submissions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit #4 Written Assignment assessment required students to <strong>Identify effective communication techniques.</strong> The outcome was as follows:</th>
<th>Unit #5 Written Assignment assessment required students to <strong>develop a process for performance feedback to employees.</strong> The outcome was as follows:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall 2011</strong> = 18 students submitted the assignment worth 40 points.</td>
<td><strong>Fall 2011</strong> = 15 Students submitted the assignment designed in two parts each worth 20 points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Scores:  
7 = 40/40  
7 = 38/40  
2 = 37/40  
1 = 34/40  
1 = 33/40 | Scores:  
12 = 40/40  
3 = 20/40* |
| *See notes on revisions to assessment in item #9 below. |
| **Spring 2012** = 12 students submitted the assignment worth 40 points. | **Spring 2012** = 9 Students submitted the assignment worth 40 points. |
| Scores:  
10 = 40/40  
1 = 37/40  
1 = 35/40 | Scores:  
5 = 40/40  
2 = 38/40  
2 = 35/40 |
| **Fall 2012** = 13 students submitted the assignment worth 20 points. | **Fall 2012** = 12 Students submitted the assignment worth 40 points. |
| 8 = 20/20  
3 = 18/20  
1 = 13.70/20  
1 = 12/20 | Scores:  
10 = 40/40  
2 = 36/40 |
8. Describe faculty dialogue (if any) involved in the assessment process:

9. Based on an analysis of your findings and dialogue, describe revisions (if any) in curriculum or teaching strategies implemented to promote student success:

In Fall 2011 Semester the **Unit #5 Written Assignment** was completed in two parts and separately submitted. Three (3) out of 15 students submitted only one part of the assignment resulting in their receiving up to only one-half of the credit, and preventing a complete review of the student performance on the SLO. In subsequent semesters the assignment was revised to be one larger assignment that eliminated the problem.

10. After the improvements are implemented, describe the results:

When comparing the data from Fall 2011 and Spring 2012, it could be read to show there was a general improvement in the students' scores after revising the assessment. The average score on this assessment in Fall 2011 was 36/40, while the average score in Spring 2012 was 38.44/40.