

20xx– xx Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: ECTA Date: 6/11/19 Course(s): cta 103
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: Lamm, Zum Hofe
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> rubric for persuasive speech 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> compared average final scores of persuasive speech using t-test
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Are students able to consider and write/speak appropriately based on the audience, purpose, and circumstance. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Mean CUNE: 90.72 DC:94.93 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> P value and statistical significance: The two-tailed P value equals 0.1573 By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant. Confidence interval: The mean of Group One minus Group Two equals -4.21 95% confidence interval of this difference: From -10.13 to 1.72 Intermediate values used in calculations: t = 1.4506 df = 30 standard error of difference = 2.900 . 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) Very different numbers in the classes. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The difference was not statistically significant.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> May, 2019 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) department meeting</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Ashby, Moore, Koprince
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 dual credit course seems very comparable in grades on persuasive speeches; continued work with dual credit instructors. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> none 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: Lamm Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/11/19
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: na
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na