

#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: ECTA	Date: 5/16/17	Course(s): Eng 102 Experiences in Writing			
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:					
Dual Credit	Select	Select	Select	Select	Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: L. ZumHofe, L. Ashby, G. Haley, P. Koprince, E. Lamm, B. Moore					
See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation;</i> b) <i>Student Outcome;</i> c) <i>Question(s);</i> e) <i>Methodology</i>					
Analysis of artifacts:					
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Course instructors scored their section's artifacts using the standard rubrics. The information was compiled onto a spreadsheet for analysis of the scoring results. The means for each ranking in dual credit were compared to the means for on campus.					
2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).</i> The means for each ranking in dual credit were compared to the means for on campus. We compared the difference in percentages receiving 3 or higher between the two delivery modes. We checked for differences in statistical significance between the two groups.					
Summary of RESULTS*:					
1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to consider and write/speak appropriately based on the audience, purpose, and circumstances of their paper/speech?					
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> 78.5% of the on campus students and 78% of the dual credit students scored 3 or higher on the rubric. We had approximately 20% of students who showed an awareness of audience, purpose and circumstances of writing. These students were below adequate but not minimal in their considerations of these rhetorical elements. Only about 2% showed minimal or no consideration of these rhetorical elements.					
3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> More than 3/4 of our students were adequate or thorough in demonstrating consideration of audience, purpose and circumstances of their writing. This indicates that most students are able to employ the rhetorical elements expected of them. Very few students are completely ignoring these rhetorical elements.					
4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i>					
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? There was no statistically significant difference between the 3 or higher ranking percentages of on campus versus dual credit.					
Sharing of Results:					
<i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5/12/17					
<i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> met as a department; the results will be shared via email with all the dual credit instructors					
<i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> B. Moore, E. Lamm, P. Koprince, L. ZumHofe, G. Haley, L. Ashby					
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:					
1. ACTION *- <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> We will ask the dual credit instructors to highlight in their course guides how audience, purpose, and circumstances are included in instruction. We will ask that they include specific, applied activities that address this element in the class both in the planning and revision stages of the writing process.					

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* We expect to see fewer scores of 2 or lower on the scoring rubric, which will tell us that all students have received this instruction and are able to apply it to their writing.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION*** (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* no

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Lisa Ashby

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 5/17/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assess. Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/17/17