

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

**Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages**

**Date: 6-15-2017**

**Course(s): SPAN 102**

**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:**

**See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** a) *Course requirement evaluation*; b) *Student Outcome*; c) *Question(s)*; e) *Methodology*

**Analysis of artifacts:**

1). Student Outcome: **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA\*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We administered a common exam in the traditional setting and the dual credit high school settings. This exam measured whether students use verbs with native-like competence in the preterite and imperfect tenses, and whether they distinguish correctly between the Spanish indicative versus subjunctive mood. The mean score from each dual credit class was collected for comparison with the mean score from the traditional setting.

2). **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).* If the mean scores of the dual credit classes equalled or surpassed the mean score of the traditional class, then outcomes were considered to be comparable.

**Summary of RESULTS\*:**

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students correctly use preterite and imperfect verb tenses in Spanish? Can students correctly distinguish between the subjunctive and indicative moods in Spanish?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* We compared mean scores from the traditional setting and the dual credit high school settings and determined that the scores from the dual credit settings are indeed higher than that from the traditional setting. The mean score for the traditional setting was 67%; the mean scores for the dual credit schools ranged from 68.4% to 88.5%, with one outlier at 60.5%.

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The results indicated that, for the specific items examined, the outcomes for the students in the dual credit high schools exceeded the outcomes for the traditional setting students, with the exception of the one outlier class indicated above.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* It is uncertain why the outcomes are lower for the particular outlier school. The mean score is not lower than the traditional setting mean score in a statistically significant way, but it raises questions about why this might be.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** The results indicated that, for the specific items examined, the outcomes for the students in the dual credit high schools exceeded the outcomes for the traditional setting students, with the exception of the one outlier class indicated above.

**Sharing of Results:**

*When were results shared? Date:* 6-30-2017

*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* in an e-mail to members of the department

*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Vicki Anderson, Julie Johnston, Jerry Pfabe, John Mehl, Matt Myers, Amy Royuk, Melissa Mann, Peggy Williams, Kim Davis, Ben Sparks, Margie Propp, PeiLan Kao

**Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:**

1. **ACTION\***- *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of*

*this course starting the next academic year?* It indicates that the current practices of the dual credit setting instructors is effective, so no changes are needed.

2. **IMPACT\***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* n.a.

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).* none

**Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Vicki Anderson**

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/21/17**

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

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

**Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/21/17**