

## 2018– 19 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> ECTA	<b>Date:</b> 5/21/19	<b>Course(s):</b> Eng 201 Intro to Lit
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b>		<b>Dual Credit</b>
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b>		All Eng 201 instructors, including G. Haley, L. ZumHofe, L. Ashby & dual credit instructors
<b>Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) <i>Course requirement evaluation;</i> b) <i>Student Outcome;</i> c) <i>Question(s);</i> e) <i>Methodology</i>		
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Instructors of the course scored a common paper from all sections using a rubric.  2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – <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 compared the scores overall for Seward campus versus the scores for dual credit locations on question 4 of our SurveyMonkey rubric.		
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 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> The results for Seward showed that 77% of the students scored 3.0 or higher. The results for dual credit locations showed that 82.5% of students scored 3.0 or higher. It was our aim that a minimum of 70% of students would score 3.0 or higher, and this was achieved. (Please note that 3.5 was the score on our original plan, but the 3.5 was an error--it was supposed to be 3.0. This matches with the Eng 201 scoring that we planned for our gen ed assesement also.) 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> We determined that the majority of students were able to demonstrate adequate to thorough consideration of audience, purposes and circumstances of writing/speaking. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> None  5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> The scores met our aimed for goal in both the traditional and alternative formats. They were within a few percentage points of each other.		
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5/11/19 and 6/20/19		<i>How were the results shared? Met as a department and final results were also emailed</i>
<i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> L ZumHofe, G. Haley, T Beck, B Moore, E Lamm, P Koprince, L Ashby		
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> We anticipate the teaching will remain similar next year.  2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <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 we will have similar or better results next year. This year we asked instructors to emphasize consideration of circumstances, purpose and audience of writing a literary analysis more specifically in their sections of the course. Our results aligned better, so we feel that the change made in the past school year will also help next year’s achievement.  3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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		
<b>Submitted by:</b> L Ashby and L ZumHofe		<b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/11/19
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> na		
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na		

Here is the rubric used:

- ▼ (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).