

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

Course: Span 201: Intermediate Spanish 1    Alternative Format: Other    Explain "Other" if selected: dual credit

Department:    ICS/ML    Date: 06/14/2018

**Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Jerrald Pfabe, Jill Greff, Oscar Gonzalez, Rob Seder, Norma Arambula**

**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 wrote a composition of about 400 words. The composition was evaluated on three criteria: 1) basic compositional skills; 2) use of at least three verb tenses in the indicative mood; 3) use of the subjunctive mood. Each criterion was graded on a 5-point scale.

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 results of the evaluation of the three criteria based on total points (out of 12) for each student and the composite average for each school.

#### **Summary of RESULTS\*:**

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1) The student demonstrates the skills of writing a good composition: clear statement of theme, development of theme, sound paragraph organization; 2) the student uses appropriately at least three verb tenses in the indicative mood; 3) the student uses the subjunctive mood in more than one application and in correct verb forms.

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The CUNE class had a composite average score of 9.25 of 12. The dual credit classes had average scores of: 8; 10; 9; 7.4.

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* TIn general the results seem reasonably reliable. We need to examine how compositions from other schools are evaluated, and also keep in mind that there is a certain amount of subjectivity in assessing compositions, especially in terms of the first criterion. The school with the score of 10, I believe, had that high of a score because of highly questionable grading. All but one of the students had identical scores on the three criteria tested. I've read samples of student compositions from that school and they seemed similar to the quality of CUNE students. It's just the instructor's grading that is suspect. I also think that a couple of the teachers were overly strict in the grades they assigned.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* In the future we probably should examine the wording of a couple of the criteria. This is our first attempt in working with Span 201, and some refinement might be in place.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). **See above comments in the Results and Interpretation sections. The is the first year this course has been dual credit. I need to refine the criteria on Survey Monkey and also work with teachers, a couple of which may have been overly strict in their evaluations, and one of which was overly generous and did not do the evaluation properly.**

#### **Sharing of Results:**

*When were results shared? Date:* 6/14/2018

*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* By forwarding this document to relevant members of the faculty.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Vicki Anderson, Bernie Tonjes, Nancy Elwell.

**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?* So far I don't think there needs to be significant change, but we will still need to look at the full picture when other schools submit their compositions.

2. **IMPACT\***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Possibly becoming a bit more explicit on the criteria.

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 of which I'm aware.

**Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Jerrald Pfabe, 12/20/2017**

**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: 6-14-18**