

2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies, Modern Foreign Languages **Date:** June 14, 2023

Course(s): SPAN 101

Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: **Select** **Select** **Select**

Members (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:** Amy Royuk, Norma Arambula, Carolina Espinoza, Lola Cateli, TJ Heupel, Jill Greff, Rob Seder, Megan Obermueller, Rachel Andersen, Emily Meier, Diana Ballard, Paul Kollmorgan, Kali Ott

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 students in the traditional format, as well as in the dual credit classrooms, were given an assessment centered upon the use of present tense verbs. The assessment was scored on the basis of grammatical accuracy of the necessary verb forms. For each question, the students were asked to provide the appropriate form of the verb, based on context.

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).* I compared the mean scores of the dual credit classes with the mean scores earned by my students in the traditional format

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students effectively use present-tense verbs to communicate about a variety of topics?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The mean score for CUNE students was 23 out of a possible 30 points. The mean scores of the submitted dual credit schools were: 28.3, 25, 28.3, 21, 25.4, 24, 27.1, 24.5, 27.1, 14.1, 24.1 and 24.3

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The assessment results demonstrate that students were able to accurately use a variety of verbs in the present tense, based on the context clues provided in the sentence.

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?** Nearly all of the class averages were satisfactory, with the mean scores of the dual credit scores being similar to (or higher than) the mean of the CUNE students in the traditional format. It is worth mentioning that one of the DC schools reported a mean score of 14.1 (out of 30 possible points). Both Dr. Pester and I have spoken with this instructor to better understand the circumstances that lead to this class average, and we are optimistic that the scores will improve in the future.

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date:* June 15, 2023 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Via email *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Beth Pester

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?* This assessment reflects the importance of the central focus of communicating effectively in the present tense. I do not foresee necessary changes in the alternative format teaching of this course.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Maintaining the conceptual focus on present tense verbs will continue to benefit students as they strive for proficiency in their communicative skills.

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).* n/a

Submitted by: Amy Royuk **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