

2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: ECTA Date: 06/13/2021 Course(s): English 102
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit Select Select
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Lisa Ashby, Laurie Zum Hofe, and 102 dual credit instructors
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
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. Rubric responses were as follows: (4) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. (3) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work. (2) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work. (1) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. (0) Does not use appropriate or relevant content to develop even the simplest of ideas in some parts of the work 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery 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 demonstrate correct content in a written paper? 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, 84% of students scored 3.0 or higher on the rubric for the content question. In the Seward campus sections, 92% of the students scored 3.0 or higher on the rubric for the content question. (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 content correctly and apply it to the argument in the written paper. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) n/a 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The results are comparable. Even though we met our goal, it's possible that because there were significantly more dual credit results submitted, that 84% is a more accurate picture of where students are working with the content of their papers.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 06/15/2021 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> emailed <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Lisa Ashby, Ben Stellwagen
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 as we are. 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 these scores will continue to consistent as we utilize the same assessed assignment across a number of academic years. 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: Laurie Zum Hofe Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/9/21
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na