

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: ECTA

Date: 6/17/2017 Course(s): CTA 103

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: Erica Lamm, Kim Brandt

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). persuasive speaking rubric

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). average of scores

Summary of **RESULTS***:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Students will show consideration of audience, purpose and circumstances in their written or oral communication.

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The average scores for the on-campus 103 was 92%. The average for dual credit was 91%. All students had issues primarily with quality sources and citation of sources. Outlines were overall high quality. Delivery was consistently average (B range) for both classes. Consideration of audience was shown in both sections.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Scores show that students averaged about 4/5 on the audience feedback section. While there is room for improvement, overall it appears that students are picking topics appropriate for their audience and using audience feedback to make changes. More focus on real-time changes based on feedback is needed. Students tend to stick to their rehearsed outline regardless of audience reactions. However, their purpose was appropriate for the audience.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) There were far fewer in the dual credit class with which to compare.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Students were very similar, average scores were comparable. Similar issues with sources and adapting to audience feedback were apparent.**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: may 12, 2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) department

Who were results shared with? (List names): Laurie Zum Hofe, Lisa Ashby, Erica Lamm

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? All teachers need to focus more on information literacy and how to cite sources in an oral format.

2. **IMPACT***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Section of the rubric for citing sources should increase by 2%. Work on adapting to audience feedback should be incorporated in lessons.

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). Use of the library will be necessary; ensuring adequate staff in the research area would be

ideal.

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Erica Lamm

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/22/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/22/17