

2023– 24 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: ECTA Date: 05/24/2024 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: Laurie Zum Hofe, Lisa Ashby, Tobin Beck
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>
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 assignments were scored with a common rubric. 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 the Seward in-person campus assignments versus the dual credit location. We compared those results.
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, 88% of students scored 3. 5 or higher on the rubric. In the Seward campus sections, 96% of students scored 3. 5 or higher on the rubric. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results indicated that the majority of students are able to adequately demonstrate correct content in a written paper. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> We provided more resources to instructors this year which could have helped the higher percentages for student learning of content and knowledge. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Both scores were close to one another. We believe they are comparable.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 05/24/2024 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) via email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Lisa Ashby, Laurie Zum Hofe, Tobin Beck
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 in a similar manner. We offered more content development resources and will continue to update those resources for all instructors of the course. 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 scores will become more aligned and maintain higher rubric scores. 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: L. Zum Hofe Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/24/24
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: None