

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: ECTA Date: 6/18/18 Course(s): Eng 102 Exp in Writing
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: G
Haley, L ZumHofe, dual credit instructors

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).

Students in Eng 102 on campus and in all dual credit sections were give a common writing assignment. These papers were scored using a standardized rubric available to all scorers via SurveyMonkey.

2). **COMPARABILITY** – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).

We examined the percentage of papers ranked at each level (1-4) for on campus versus dual credit. We sought similar percentages for all rankings in both delivery modes.

Summary of **RESULTS***:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):

Are students able to show consideration of audience, purpose & circumstances of writing?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.

For on campus classes, 77% of students scored at the 3/4 adequate/excellent level. For dual credit classes, 92% scored at the 3/4 adequate/excellent level. About 21% of on campus students scored at inadequate/minimal (2/1) levels, while around 7% scored as inadequate (2) and 0% as minimal level (1).

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).

The results demonstrate that at least 75% of students are showing adequate or excellent consideration of audience, purpose and circumstances of writing.

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

Please see item 5 for discussion of observations.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).

The outcomes were not as similar as we would like to see. 46% of dual credit students scored a 4, while 11% of on campus students scored a 4. 66% of on campus students scored at 3, while 46% of dual credit students scored 3. We do not feel that there is very good inter-rater reliability between our dual credit scorers and the on campus scorers. We also feel that our dual credit instructors may have very different expectations of what constitutes a 4 ranking versus what our on campus instructors expect.

We discussed that it may be helpful to provide all instructors sample papers at each of the levels for rubric training. We suggested that all instructors continue to build further discussion into the drafting process to make student’s more aware of circumstance, purpose, and audience. We know that many dual credit schools do not use or follow our CUNE standardized course goals, so it makes sense that the assessment results will differ too. We believe that if we get greater consistency in our course guides and assignments, then we will have more consistent results.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 4/18/18

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Met as a department

Who were results shared with? (List names): G Haley, E Lamm, P Koprince, T Beck, B Moore, L ZumHofe, L Ashby. We also send a summary of our results to our dual credit instructors.

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 discussed that it may be helpful to provide all instructors sample papers at each of the levels for rubric training. We suggested that all instructors continue to build further discussion into the drafting process to make student's more aware of circumstance, purpose, and audience. We know that many dual credit schools do not use or follow our CUNE standardized course goals, so it makes sense that the assessment results will differ too. We believe that if we get greater consistency in our course guides and assignments, then we will have more consistent results.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

We anticipate that the majority of students will continue to demonstrate adequate to excellent consideration of audience, purpose, and circumstances in their literary analysis papers. However, we also anticipate that our scores between on campus and dual credit will align more closely.

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).* We would ask that the new dual credit director spend more time assisting the dual credit liaisons to get greater consistency in the course guides, learning outcomes, and assignments from our dual credit instructors.

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Lisa Ashby

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/14/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:

na **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:** 7/1/18