2024–25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Members (must include m		tructor only) involve	d with analysis	of artifacts: Dr. Keith	
Kerchen and Dr. David Rir					
See Alternative Delivery					
a) Course requirement eva	luation; b) Student	Outcome; c) Questic	on(s); e) Methodo	ology	
Analysis of artifacts:					
1). Student Outcome: PEF			ata analyzed? (at	tach rubrics/scoring tools	if
used). Data was analyzed					
2). COMPARABILITY – H					
were comparable? (note "i	-	-		•	
of the traditional and alterr				s no significant difference	e in
the scores on the rubric be	tween the traditiona	al and alternative for	mat students.		
Summary of RESULTS*:					
1). Restate the assessmen					
personal beliefs related to					se
topics related to teaching a					
2). Summarize the assess		-	-	•	
encouraged but optional.					an
rubric score from the altern	2				
articulate how their teachir			2		tent
areas and pedagogical pra					
spelling/grammar aspect o				•	
questions. Students in bot		•	assignments and	topics that made the bigg	jest
impact on the developmer				· · · · · · · · ·	
3) INTERPRETATION* -					
students are able to effect					ubric
for this assessment analyz					
interest and how their und	•	•		•	
level on the rubric in these	•	-			
nighlighting approaches sp					
eference specific topics/a					ating
the course assignments a					
4). Observations made the					
was low) Both cohorts me					
on their teaching philosopl					
this feedback to ensure the	assignments that i	make the most impa	ci on siudenis re	main as part of the course	3
requirements.	o of the traditional	and alternative for	mat analysis	mnara? The t test reveal	~d
5). How did the outcome					ed
that there was no significa students. Overall mean sc					
sumenis uverali mean sc	Jies were verv simi	iar. with trammaf/SD	enniu pennu trie a	area where the most point	5

Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: August 2025 Education Department Retreat *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Results will be shared at the Education Department Retrea in August. *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Education Department Members: Lorinda Sankey, Shanna Opfer, Amanda Geidel, Keith Kerschen, Jerrita Staher, Amy Stradtmann, Drew Gerdes, David Rindt, Vicki Anderson.

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? Since there was no statistically significant difference between the traditional and alternative format scores on the assessment, no major changes will be needed that impact the alternative format teaching of this course. Alternative format instructors will be encouraged to have their students write rough drafts prior to their final submission to help improve scores related to grammar/spelling. This is not directly related to the assessment question but would help increase the overall scores on the assessment. 2. IMPACT*- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in

the next academic year? Encouraging rough drafts and revisions would hopefully help improve the rubric scores in the areas of spelling/grammar. Since a teaching philosophy paper is a professional document, our goal is for students to model this professionalism in their writing, as they may be asked to submit a teaching philosophy statement in future job applications. While this doesn't directly relate to the original assessment question, improving in the area of professional writing will help the argument in the philosophy statements overall. 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). There are no budget implications for the action described above.

Submitted by: Keith Kerschen Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/16/25

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: n