

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

Course: Span 102 Alternative Format: Other Explain "Other" if selected: dual credit

Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

Date: 06/15/2019

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). Students in the traditional format and in the dual credit classrooms were given the identical common exam on the uses of the preterite and imperfect tenses and the subjunctive mood in Spanish.

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). Each exam received a percentage grade on the exam. We calculated mean scores for the on-campus class and for each of the dual credit schools. We compared the results. See the related file.

Summary of **RESULTS***:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students correctly use the preterite and imperfect tenses? Can students correctly use the indicative and subjunctive moods in Spanish?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The mean score on the exam in the on-campus class was 52%. All of the dual credit schools exceeded the mean score of the on-campus class.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results indicated that the majority of students in the dual credit classrooms were able to use these verb tenses and moods at a level higher than the on-campus students.

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 the interpretation section, #3.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 06/14/2016

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) via email

Who were results shared with? (List names): 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? Overall it does not appear that changes are needed in the dual credit schools.

2. **IMPACT***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? We will be making adjustments in the 102 assessment tool for 2019-20. Our instructor for the course uses a solid methodology, but it is not very compatible with the common exam we have been using.

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).* Nothing.

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Jerry Pfabe

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/17/19

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/17/19