

## 2024-2025 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> ECTA	<b>Date:</b> 6/15/2025	<b>Course(s):</b> Eng 102
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> <b>Dual Credit</b>		
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> All Eng 102 instructors for Seward and dual credit sections; ENG 102 liaison (H. Kroonblawd)		
<b>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 were given a common assignment and the papers were scored using a common rubric.  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> We filtered the results so that we could see the results for Seward campus versus dual credit locations and compared them.		
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 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, 76% of students scored 3.5 or higher on the rubric. In the Seward campus sections, 80% of the students scored 3.5 or higher on the rubric.  3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results indicate that the majority of students are able to adequately demonstrate correct content, through both exploration and development, 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 had a low/delayed response rate for on-campus sections; in the future, we'll encourage instructors to provide a holistic sample of student papers for assessment.  5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> Both scores were relatively close to one another, so we feel that they are comparable. There were slight decreases in percentages compared to last year, but the assessment responses were in close alignment in comparison of the two sections. One potential reason for this decrease may be student use of AI (see ACTION section below).		
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/15/25 <i>How were the results shared?</i> Results will be shared with on-campus department instructors as well as with dual-credit instructors. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> L Ashby, G. Haley, B Moore, P Koprince, H. Kroonblawd, T Beck and adjunct and dual-credit Eng 102 instructors		
<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> With AI use increasing both inside and outside of the classroom, it will be important to provide instructional/policy support for ENG 102 instructors both on campus and in dual credit classrooms. While general instructional practice may remain similar, writing process and development will need to address appropriate use of technology as well as authentic engagement with course content.  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> Providing support for writing instructors will allow student writing to remain the focal point of the ENG 102 course. We may see a continued fluctuation in scores depending upon the kind of work that students submit and what part of the writing process is being assessed.		

3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION*</i> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). None	
<b>Submitted by:</b> H Kroonblawd, L Ashby	<b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/23/25
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> approved	
<b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na	

This is the rubric that was used:

**How well does the paper explore and develop its content?**

- (4) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work.
- (3) Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work.
- (2) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work.
- (1) Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work.
- (0) Does not use appropriate or relevant content to develop even the simplest of ideas in some parts of the work.