

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

Course: Span 201    Alternative Format: Other    Explain "Other" if selected: dual credit

Department:    Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages    Date: 6 June 2019

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Jerrald Pfabe, Oscar Gonzalez, Jill Greff, Rob Seder, Norma Arambula

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 composition requirement. The rubric for the exam identified the following criteria: 1) basic compositional skills: a) thesis/theme, use of paragraph organization, use of basic Spanish grammar such as noun-adjective agreement; 2) correct use of at least three verb tenses in the indicative mood; 3) correct use of the subjunctive mood in at least two sentences and situations.

2). **COMPARABILITY** – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). We used an Excell worksheet. Student compositions were graded on the three rubrics listed above, with a scale from 4 to 0 for each rubric.

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

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students write a 400 word composition emphasizing the following criteria: 1) skill in basic compositional organization; 2) correct use of a minimum of three verb tenses in the indicative mood; 3) correct use of the subjunctive mood in at least two uses of the subjunctive mood?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The mean score based on Survey Monkey for CUNE students was 9.5 of 12 points. The dual credit schools had mean scores of 9.4, 9, 10.4, and 9.3.

3). **INTERPRETATION**\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). One of the dual credit school had a mean score higher than the Concordia mean. The other three had mean score which were only slightly below that of Concordia. I do not interpret this as a problem. The dual credit students did good work on this project.

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: 6 June 2019

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

Who were results shared with? (List names): Ben Stellwagen and Amy Royuk

#### 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? In the coming academic year, the assessment tool may be different because a different instructor will be teaching the course.

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

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: Jerrald Pfabe**

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/10/19**

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

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

**Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/10/19**