

#### #4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Course: Span 101    Alternative Format: Other    Explain "Other" if selected: dual credit

Department:    Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

Date: 12 June 2019

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Jerrald Pfabe, Lindsey Morris, Jill Greff, Paul Kollmorgen, Rob Seder, , Oscar Gonzalez, Amy Royuk, Carri Halstead, Emily Meier, Mireya Moreno-Sanchez, Shanna Covarrubias

See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology

#### Analysis of artifacts:

1). Student Outcome: **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA**\* - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We administered a common examination in the traditional setting and in the dual credit high schools. The exam included: use of verbs in the present and preterite tenses; uses of "ser" and "estar"; uses of "por" and "para"

2). **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared).* The exams in the traditional setting and in the dual credit high schools were graded and given a percentage grade.

#### Summary of **RESULTS**\*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1) Can the student conjugate correctly verbs in the present and preterite tenses. 2) Can the student correctly use the verbs "ser" and "estar"? 3) Can the correctly use the prepositions "por" and "para"?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* We compared "mean" exam results of Concordia U. students with "mean" results from the dual credit high schools. The mean grade for Concordia U. students was 75%. In every case, the mean scores for the dual credit school was higher, with one exception.

3). **INTERPRETATION**\* - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The results indicate that on the specific items examined, the students in the dual credit high schools were exceeding the outcomes of Concordia U. students. We can conclude that the quality of instruction and student responses more than meets the requirement of comparability.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)*

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). **See #3 above.**

#### Sharing of Results:

*When were results shared? Date:* 06/14/2018

*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) through computer files*

*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Nancy Elwell, Amy Royuk, Ben Stellwagen

#### Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION**\*- *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* We need to reassess the common exam or the form of evaluation now that we have a different instructor for the course who uses a different method of language acquisition..

2. **IMPACT**\*- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* .

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the **ACTION**\* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). None is necessary.*

**Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Pfabe**

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/12/19**

**Submitter notified/additional action needed: na**

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**

**Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/12/19**