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

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Eng 201          Alternative Format:  Dual Credit    Explain “Other” if selected:****Department:   ECTA                        Date:  May 25, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:  Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Lisa Ashby** |
| **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 question #5, “**How well does the paper use source information legally, ethically, and meet the appropriate citation standards?”***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).      Students in dual credit classes and on-campus classes had the same assignment (literary analysis) and were assessed using the same rubric (attached). Instructors were informed about the use of the rubric.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*      Are ECTA students able to locate, apply, and cite scholarly/appropriate sources in support of written or oral claims?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*      Dual credit students had an overall score of 3.5/4 on this question.Concordia students had an overall score of 3.3/4 on this question.*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.”We don’t find the difference between scores of dual credit students and Concordia students to be significant. We are satisfied with the level of achievement for both student sample groups.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      We would like to continue to discuss the rating system, as this is our first use of this rubric. The Concordia University course sections were over-enrolled.  This impacted our ability to assign multiple drafts of the assignment and provide feedback.  We believe we could improve the ratings on the papers if students had more opportunity for drafts and feedback.  5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We felt that the outcomes were comparable and that the scores on the rubrics were similar.   |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:*  Tuesday, 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 using a common assignment and common rubric is effective. However, we would like to use it again next year in order to collect more data. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*         We will continue to use this rubric and common assignment next year. *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).            The Concordia University course sections were over-enrolled.  This impacted our ability to assign multiple drafts of the assignment and provide feedback.  We believe we could improve the ratings on the papers if students had more opportunity for drafts and feedback.  Budget impact would be paying an instructor for more sections of the class to be offered.  |
| **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:    emailed to Dean, College of Arts & Sciences 6/24/16** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:     6/24/16** |

**Eng 102/201 Assessment Rubric**

**1. How well does the paper explore and develop its content?**

(4) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.

(3) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.

(2) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.

(1) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.

(0) Does not use appropriate or relevant content to develop even the simplest of ideas in some parts of the work.

**2. How well does the paper show consideration of audience, purpose & circumstances of writing?**

(4) Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.

(3) Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).

(2) Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).

(1) Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

(0) Demonstrates no attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

**3. How well does the paper reflect the conventions of the discipline and genre in which it is written?**

(4) Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices

(3) Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices

(2) Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation

(1) Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation.

(0) Does not attempt to use a consistent system for even the most basic organization and presentation.

**4. How well does the paper use sources & evidence to develop the writer's ideas in a text?**

(4) Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing

(3) Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing.

(2) Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing.

(1) Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.

(0) Does not demonstrate any attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing.

**5. How well does the paper use source information legally, ethically, and meet the appropriate citation standards? Evaluate these 4 items:**

* **use of citations and references**
* **choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting**
* **using information in ways that are true to original context**
* **distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution**

(4) Student uses correctly all four 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.

(3) 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.

(2) Student uses correctly two 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.

(1) Student uses correctly one 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.

(0) Student does not make correct use of any of the four information use strategies or does not have an understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.

**6. How well does the paper demonstrate control of syntax and mechanics?**

(4) Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free.

(3) Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language has few errors.

(2) Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors.

(1) Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage.

(0) Uses language that barely conveys any meaning due to extensive errors in usage.