

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Education **Date: 8-31-2017** **Course(s): EDUC 425A**

Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:

Online **Select** **Select** **Select** **Select** **Select**

Members (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Vicki Anderson (the only faculty member in the undergraduate ESL program)**

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).* In both the traditional face-to-face class and the online class, students are required to complete the same assignments, projects, and exams, with modifications made to inherently in-class assignments when necessary, to match the online format of the online delivery course. In order to determine whether or not students in the two versions of the course are achieving the same outcomes, scores were collected for the course's key assessment assignment (a sheltered instruction lesson plan geared towards a mainstream classroom setting with the anticipation of English language learners making up part of the class, the lesson plan submitted and given feedback then submitted again).

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 score for the online Summer 2017 course key assessment did not differ in a statistically significant way from the mean score for the key assessment of the traditional Spring 2017 course, the courses will be considered comparable.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Are students in the online version of the course able to achieve scores on the course's key assessment that are comparable to those achieved in a face-to-face section of the course?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Mean scores for the submitted course key assessment for the online and face-to-face courses were compiled and compared. The mean score for the face-to-face version of the course in Spring 2017 was 97%; the mean score for the online version of the course in Summer 2017 was 98%.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The mean scores for the key assessments of the two versions of the course did not differ in a statistically significant way. This shows that students in the online version of the course are indeed able to achieve the same outcomes as students in the face-to-face version of the course.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* Because the two versions of the course were identical in terms of course materials, assignments, projects, and exams, it is not surprising that the student outcomes for the two versions of the course were comparable. The fact that the key assessments produced scores showed similar outcomes helps us recognize the

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The results for the two versions of the course were comparable.**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 9-1-2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) in an e-mail to Lorinda Sankey, who will then determine whether to announce the result in an upcoming Education faculty meeting

Who were results shared with? (List names): Vicki Anderson, Lorinda Sankey (and, if Dr. Sankey deems it desirable to share the results with the rest of the Education Department, Shana Opfer, Bernie

Tonjes, Amanda Geidel, Annette Oliver, Dylan Teut, and Kristen Nugent)

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?* EDUC 425A was offered for the last time in Summer 2017 and is being replaced by EDUC 225, a significantly modified version of the course. New online delivery course materials will need to be provided to ensure that the online version of EDUC 225 [if there is demand for one] match those in the face-to-face version of EDUC 225. However, the key assessment (the sheltered instruction lesson plan) will remain the same.

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): 9/4/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/4/17