

2018– 19 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: HGISML Date: 6-30-2019 Course(s): CHNS 102
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit Select Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts:
Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan 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> student ability to participate in an interview with a native speaker of Mandarin Chinese and in a written exam with a sufficient level of accuracy and performance ability so as to show comprehension and to be comprehensible 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?</i> (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). When the number of students receiving grades of an "A" (90% and higher) on the final exam in the on-campus CHNS 102 class and the alternative CHNS 102 class are compared, the proportion of students attaining that level (90%+) for each alternative delivery class will equal or exceed the proportion for the on-campus class.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> re students able to use Mandarin Chinese in a sufficiently proficient manner in order to participate in an extemporaneous interview with a native speaker and to demonstrate comprehension in a written exam? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The Dual Credit CHNS 102 had a single student, whose final exam grade was 100% (N=1), while the on-campus class also had 6 out of 9 students who achieved a 90% or higher on their final exam (N=9), i.e., 67% of students. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The Dual Credit class achieved a sufficiently high percentage of students achieving an "A" on the final exam to exceed the percentage in the on-campus section of CHNS 102. With only a single student in the Dual Credit CHNS 102, it is difficult to extend these observations any further. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> The on-campus section of CHNS 102 uses a different textbook and a different method of teaching than the Dual Credit CHNS 102. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The student performance for the Dual Credit section seems higher than for the on-campus section of CHNS 102; however--as stated above--the fact that the Dual Credit course had only one student skews the results.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 7-7-2019 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Wilson Wu, ChengYu Chiu
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> The alternative format teaching will not change in the coming year, at least not due to these scores. (Through an agency, Concordia will be acquiring a new and less experienced Chinese teacher as a graduate assistant, so it may be that the overall comparison of scores will change as a result. It is important to consult to make sure that the classes are as similar in raising proficiency levels as possible, and particularly that the new graduate assistant is given the tools and mentoring he needs for success in teaching.) 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Students in both the on-campus CHNS 102 and Dual Credit CHNS 102 will achieve higher proficiency levels than this year. 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 by: Vicki Anderson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/16/19
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: approved
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

