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

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CTA 333        Alternative Format:  Online    Explain “Other” if selected:**  **Department:   ECTA                        Date:  May 26, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:  Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Pete Koprince** |
| **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 used the attached rubric and analyzed our data via the question:  Are students able to create and present a researched project that demonstrates their understanding of the characteristics of a particular culture and the way in which communication skills apply to this culture and to themselves?  *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).  We compared the mean scores among 5 or 6 criteria for the assignment, rated on a 1-5 scale. |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:**  *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*        Are students able to create and present a researched project that demonstrates their understanding of the characteristics of a particular culture and the way in which communication skills apply to this culture and to themselves?  *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*  Students in the f2f class had the following overall average in the assessed category of identifying cultural characteristics: 4. 5/5  Students in the online class had the following overall averages in the assessed category of identifying cultural characteristics: 4. 5/5    *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*        A 3 score indicated that a “Student uses correctly three of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.”  Students achieved a high level of success with identifying cultural characteristics.  *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)  Students in the f2f cohort seemed more likely to ask for assistance than the online cohort.  5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).  Overall, the standard deviation between cohorts is less than 0.1. This is indicative of a consistent level of achievement between cohorts and that the assignment is delivered cohesively. |
| **Sharing of Results:**  *When were results shared? Date:*  May 31, 2016      *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)*   Emailed to department members involved     *Who were results shared with? (List names):*       Bryan Moore, Erica Lamm, Tobin Beck, Pete Koprince, Lisa Ashby, Dan Thurber, Laurie Zum Hofe |
| **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?*          The assessment reinforces that students can identify cultural characteristics with great success. Because of this success, an action we can take is to specifically apply more theory of intercultural competency, revising the rubric to reflect this attention to deeper and richer cultural characteristics.  *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*           The anticipated impact is more student interaction and reflection with more challenging and meaningful concepts of intercultural competencies.  *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:  Laurie Zum Hofe**  **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):      6/24/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed:     na**  **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:       na**  **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |