

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

<b>Course: Span 102 Alternative Format: Other Explain "Other" if selected: dual credit</b> <b>Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages Date: 06/14/2018</b>
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts: Jerrald Pfabe, Lindsey Morris, Jill Greff, Paul Kollmorgen, Rob Seder, Jan Riofrio, Norma Arambula, Oscar Gonzalez</b>
<b>See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:</b> <i>a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students in the traditional format and in the dual credit classrooms were given the identical common exam which the uses of the preterite and imperfect tenses and the subjunctive mood in Spanish.  2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – <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> Each exam received a percentage grade on the exam. We calculated mean scores for the on-campus class and for each of the dual credit schools. We compared the results. See the related file.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students correctly use the preterite and imperfect tenses? Can students correctly us the indicative and subjunctive moods in Spanish?  2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The mean score on the exam in the on-campus class was 58%. All of the dual credit schools, with one exception, exceeded the mean score of the on-campus class. The exception was only one point lower.  3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results indicated that the majority of students in the dual credit classrooms were able to use these verb tenses and moods at a level higher than the on-campus students.  4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i>  5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). <b>See the interpretation section, #3.</b>
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 06/14/2016 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) via email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Vicki Anderson and Bernie Tonjes
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> Overall it does not appear that changes are needed in most of the dual credit schools. I am not concerned about the one school which was below the CUNE average. The teacher uses a different approach to instruction. He's excellent and his students do well.  2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> I hope the results can be higher both on campus and in the one dual credit school.  3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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). Nothing.

**Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Jerry Pfabe**

**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**