

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: EDUC	Date: 9/4/2018	Course(s): EDUC 224 - 01&02			
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:					
Condensed and online	Select	Select	Select	Select	Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts:					
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> Data (Student scores) from the face to face courses was averaged and then compared to the same data from the online courses.					
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> Outcomes were determined comparable because class performance averages on this assignment were similar.					
Summary of RESULTS*:					
1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to independently locate official IEP paperwork online? Are students able to identify the nine required ingredients of the paperwork by reading their course required text? Are students able to locate these nine ingredients within the paperwork?					
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Student data in the face to face courses shows the average student score on this assignment was 25.28/30 points. Student data in the online courses shows the average student score on this assignment was 24.75/30 points.					
3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results for both formats of the course indicate that students are able to independently locate IEP paperwork online, identify the nine required ingredients in the textbook, and locate these ingredients within the paperwork.					
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). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? If the course average on this assignment was rounded to the nearest point, both the face to face and online data reveal student scores as 25/30 points.					
Sharing of Results:					
<i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 9/4/2018					
<i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) via email</i>					
<i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Nancy Elwell, Dean					
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> No changes will be made to this assignment/assessment in the alternative format of the course.					
2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> na					
3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> none					
Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: 9/4/18					
Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/5/18					
Submitter notified/additional action needed: na					

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/5/18