

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: CTA Date: 8-31-17 Course(s): CTA 333 Intercultural Communication

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:

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). Papers were collected for both online and traditional courses and graded according to provided 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). By using the attached rubric, we can see if scores of both courses were comparable.

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 a particular culture and the way in which communication skills apply to this culture and themselves?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. On the 5 point rubric provided, students (n = 52) in the traditional section averaged a 3.8. Students in the online model (n =5) averaged a 3.5.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). It is honestly difficult to interpret because the online section was comprised of 5 students who completed the final paper, and therefore making any statistical conclusions from this would be relying too heavily on a sample that could be skewed with quite a bit of variance. We simply need a greater sample size of online students in order to do a true comparison.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) N/A

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Nothing stands out as an immediate concern; however, the sample size of online students makes it difficult to draw large conclusions until a greater sample is gained.**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: August 2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Discussed as part of department meeting

Who were results shared with? (List names): Zum Hofe, Ashby, Lamm, Haley, Moore

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? We will stay the course until we have a reason to deviate based on a difference in results by a larger sample. It is possible that the average scores, if over a larger sample, that are different to a small scale could still be significant, but we don't have enough of a sample size now to conclude that.

2. **IMPACT***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? No change

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). N/A

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Peter Koprince
Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/1/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/1/17