

## 2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Education <b>Date:</b> May 25, 2023 <b>Course(s):</b> EDUC 224
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Online <b>Select</b> <b>Select</b>
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Amanda Geidel (Program Director), Jill Choate (Instructor)
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students earned 3 pts/IEP element correctly located within the paperwork for a total of 30 possible points. 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – <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> Average score on the assignment in the face-to-face course was compared to the average score on the assignment in the online course.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can pre-service teachers locate the nine legally required elements within an IEP document. 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Students who complete this assignment in the traditional face-to-face offering of EDUC 224 score on average 27/30 points on this assignment. The students who completed the course online this spring also scored on average 27/30 points. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results indicate that pre-service teachers can locate the IEP elements and successfully complete this assignment equally well no matter the format for course delivery. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) NA 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> They were the same.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 5/25/23 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) via email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Nancy Elwell, Jill Choate, Amanda Geidel
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> The assignment and instructions will not be altered. 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> No change 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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> NA
<b>Submitted by:</b> Amanda Geidel <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 5/30/23
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved 5/30/23
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> NA