

#4. 2017 – 18 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: ECTA	Date: 6/26/18	Course(s): CTA 103			
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:					
Dual Credit	Select	Select	Select	Select	Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: ECTA department					
See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>					
Analysis of artifacts:					
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)</i> . Students will show consideration of audience, purpose and circumstances in their written or oral communication.					
2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared)</i> . averaged final scores					
Summary of RESULTS*:					
1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to consider and write/speak appropriately based on the audience, purpose, and circumstances of their paper/speech?					
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The dual credit HS students averaged 86% on their persuasive speeches. The CUNE students averaged 92.95%.					
P value and statistical significance: The two-tailed P value equals 0.0457 By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be statistically significant.					
3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> A strict comparison would lead one to believe that CUNE students did better on their persuasive speeches than the dual credit class. But, see #4 for alternative interpretation.					
4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Kim Brandt of the HS seems to be a tougher grader than Erica Lamm--either that or the students didn't do as well.					
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Scores for CUNE students were higher on average.					
Sharing of Results:					
<i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 4/18/18					
<i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> met as department					
<i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Koprince, Ashby, Beck, Lamm, Zum Hofe, Moore, Haley					
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:					
1. ACTION *- <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> Kim Brandt should meet with Erica Lamm to discuss expetations and interrater reliability. The rubric might need to be revised.					
2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> If Brandt and Lamm work on reliability and expectations, the scores should be more comparable. HS students should show improvement in grades.					
3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). Money is needed to help Brandt pay for a trip to Seward to work with Lamm, or this could be done at the dual credit conference.					

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Erica Lamm

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/2/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/18