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

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CTA 103         Alternative Format:  Dual Credit    Explain “Other” if selected:****Department:   ECTA                        Date:  May 31, 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 for the question, “Can students find appropriate sources? Can they present this research in a public format (speech)?*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 (persuasive speech) 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):*      Can students find appropriate sources? Can they present this research in a public format (speech)?*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 18/20 on this question.Concordia students had an overall score 17/20 on this question.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*       Students answered the question 85-90% effectively, so we can affirm that they can find appropriate sources and present them in a speech. 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*)      There were 22 students in the on-campus class and 6 students in the dual credit class. We don’t have control over quantities of students, but noticed that there was a distinct difference in class size between groups. 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:*  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, the format of the rubric might be better designed to better specify the components of an effective persuasive speech. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*         We will consider and discuss revising the speech rubric for 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).            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:****BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |

**Grading Rubric: Persuasive Speech**

Speaker: Time:

Speech Topic: Date:

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Organization** Points\_\_\_\_\_ 5 x 4 (20) Comments:

Clear purpose

Intro. gained attention

Main points identifiable

Transitions used well

Points in appropriate order

Conclusion had necessary qualities

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Content** Points\_\_\_\_\_ 5 x 8 (40) Comments:

Speaker knows/is comfortable with topic

Focus included…

 Monroe’s Motivated Sequence Pattern

 Aristotle’s three proofs

 Avoidance of fallacies/faulty reasoning

Persuasive thesis is clear/concise

Length of presentation appropriate

Visual aids used effectively

Sources clearly cited

Content/approach to MLA outline appropriate

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Language** Points\_\_\_\_\_ 5 x 3 (15) Comments:

Speaker’s tone

Vocabulary precise

Terms/ideas/situations clearly defined

Emphasized key points

Pronunciation/grammar correct

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Delivery** Points\_\_\_\_\_ 5 x 4 (20) Comments:

Speaker maintained poise

Eye contact was apparent

Enthusiasm in attitude and face present

Non-verbals (gestures) appropriate

Pace and enunciation were used

Use of memory aids (notecards)

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Feedback** Points\_\_\_\_\_\_ 5 x 1 (5) Comments:

Monitored for audience reaction

Adjusted presentation if needed

Audience engaged

\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

**Total** Points\_\_\_\_\_/100 Additional Comments