

2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies, Modern Foreign Languages Course(s): SPAN 102 Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Select Select Select	Date: June 16, 2025
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Amy Royuk, Renee Brenner, Shanna Cavarrubias, Carolina Espinoza, Greta Gieseke, Jill Greff, TJ Heupel, Paul Kollmorgen, Emily Meier, Mireya Moreno, Megan Obermueller, Chris Oerman, Nick Ortega, Kali Ott, Rob Seder, Juliana Theodorakis	
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> The students in the traditional format, as well as in the dual-credit classrooms, were given an assessment centered upon the use of past-tense verbs. The assessments were 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 – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable?</i> (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). I compared the mean scores of the dual-credit classes with the mean score earned by my students in the traditional format.	
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students effectively use past-tense verbs to communicate about a variety of topics? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The mean score for CUNE students was 21 out of a possible 30 points. The mean scores of the submitted dual-credit schools were: 22, 24.5, 26.5, 26, 26.4, 25.4, 25, 17.5, 20.4, 22.3, 22.8, 24.8, 21, 24.9, 24.5 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The assessment results demonstrate that the students were able to accurately use a variety of verbs in the past tense, based on the context clues provided in the sentence. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? With the exception of one school, the mean scores of the dual-credit schools were equal to or greater than the mean of the CUNE students in the traditional format.	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: June 16, 2025 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Via email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Nancy Elwell, Beth Pester	
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> This assessment reflects the importance of the central focus of communicating in the present tense. I do not foresee necessary changes in the alternative format teaching of this course. Regarding the one school that reported a mean lower than that of CUNE, I plan to reach out to that teacher directly to see if there is any further assistance that he/she would like from me as he/she works with the students. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Maintaining the conceptual focus past tense verbs will continue to benefit students as they strive for proficiency in their communicative skills. 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> n/a	
Submitted by: Amy Royuk Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/17/25	
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: approved BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na	