

## 2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

**Department:** ECTA **Date:** 6/15/2023 **Course(s):** Eng 201 Introduction to Literature  
**Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:** Dual Credit

**Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:** All English profs on campus and all 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\*** - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).

The artifacts were scored using the following rubric (4 is high; 0 is low) and examined whether the paper demonstrated the writer's correct comprehension of the literary content.

(4) Thoroughly describes plot, characters, structure or other literary content with no errors.

(3) Adequately describes plot, characters, structure, or other literary content with few errors.

(2) Generally describes plot, characters, structure, or other literary content with several errors or inaccuracies.

(1) Some attempt is made to describe plot, characters, structure, or other literary content but the paper contains many inaccuracies or errors.

(0) The paper shows little to no correct information about the plot, characters, structure, or literary content or makes no attempt to describe these elements at all.

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 compared the rankings between CUNE on campus and dual credit. We wanted to see if both results had at least a 3.5 average among 70% of the students in both formats.

**Summary of RESULTS\*:**

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Are students able to demonstrate correct comprehension of the literary content of a piece of literature in a written paper?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

A 3.5 score or higher was achieved by 83% of the dual credit students; a 3.5 or higher was achieved by 90% of the CUNE on-campus students. Both met our minimum aim of at least 70% of students achieving a 3.5 score or higher.

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

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? Both of the delivery methods met the minimum aim of at least 70% of students achieving a 3.5 score or higher.**

**Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 6/15/2021 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Results were emailed *Who were results shared with? (List names):* ECTA Dept and all Eng 201 instructors.

**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 will continue to emphasize the importance of correct reading comprehension in the course.
2. **IMPACT\***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* The anticipated impact is that emphasizing correct comprehension will result in richer and fuller analysis of the literature and solid literary analysis papers.
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.

**Submitted by:** Lisa Ashby      **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/27/23

**Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:** Approved 6/27/23

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