

2018– 19 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: ECTA Date: 5/21/19 Course(s): Eng 102 Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: All Eng 201 instructors for Seward and dual credit sections.
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> Students were given a common assignment and the papers were scored using a common rubric. The results were compiled via SurveyMonkey. 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> We filtered the results so that we could see the results for Seward campus versus dual credit locations and compared them.
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 circumstances of their paper/speech? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> In the dual credit sections, 69% of students scored 3.0 or higher on the rubric. In the Seward campus sections, 73% of the students scored 3.0 or higher on the rubric. (Please note that there was a typo on our assessment plan. We listed 3.5 as the goal, but 3.0 was intended. The 3.0 aligns with the score aimed for in our gen ed assessment as well.) 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results indicate that the majority of students are able to adequately or thoroughly consider and write/speak appropriately based on the audience, purpose, and circumstances of their paper/speech. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Last year, our results suggested that dual credit instructors were not using the full range of the rubric but instead were concentrating on the middle to upper range. We asked them to reconsider the range this year. It’s possible that the slightly lower score on the dual credit was due to this request. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Our dual credit score was just shy of the goal of having 70% of the students score 3.0 or higher on the rubric. Both scores were relatively close to one another, so we feel that they are comparable.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5/10/19 and 6/21/19 <i>How were the results shared? previewed at department and full info shared via email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> L ZumHofe, G Haley, L Ashby, B Moore, P Koprince, E Lamm, T Beck
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> We will continue to teach the assignment in a similar manner but will also request that instructors provide more instruction and feedback on drafts regarding adapting writing to the circumstances, purpose and audience. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We anticipate that scores will improve in the dual credit sections and more closely align with the Seward campus scores. 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: L ZumHofe, L Ashby **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/11/19

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed[™]

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate

Dean: na

This is the rubric that was used:

ANSWER CHOICES ▼

- ▼ (4) Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work.

- ▼ (3) Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context).

- ▼ (2) Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions).

- ▼ (1) Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).

- ▼ (0) Demonstrates no attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., expectation of instructor or self as audience).