

#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 201 Intro to Lit
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, L Ashby, 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 201 on campus and in all dual credit sections were give a common assignment to analyze literature. 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.

All of the rankings compared between on campus Eng 201s and dual credit Eng 201s within a few percentage points of each other in similarity. We don't see a significant difference between the scores of on campus versus dual credit. In addition, we determined that only about 10% of students are inadequately showing consideration of audience, purpose and circumstances of writing, while 90% are demonstrating this skill adequately or well.

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

The results demonstrate that 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)

None.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). The outcomes of on campus and dual credit were similar (see item 2 for details).

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?

This is the second year that we have assessed this learning outcome, and we feel that the teaching of audience, purpose, and circumstances of writing were more emphasized in this year's instruction. We asked instructors to include specific information about this in their assignments and in their discussion of the drafting process. We will continue to use these teaching approaches in the coming school year and will request them of instructors in both formats.

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 students will continue to demonstrate adequate to excellent consideration of audience, purpose, and circumstances in their literary analysis papers.

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: 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