

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Education Date: 5/19/2026 Course(s): EDUC 201 - Introduction to Education
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: Dr. Keith Kerschen and Dr. David Rindt
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> Data was analyzed using a scoring rubric. 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). A t-test was used to compare the outcomes of the traditional and alternative cohorts. The results of the t-test indicated there was no significant difference in the scores on the rubric between the traditional and alternative format students.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students articulate a clear vision of their personal beliefs related to teaching and learning? Are students able to make connections between core course topics related to teaching and student learning to their own philosophy of teaching? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The mean score from the traditional course delivery was 24.08 or 96% and the mean rubric score from the alternative delivery course was 23.25 or 93%. Students in both courses were able to articulate a unique teaching philosophy with connections to different areas of teaching. They included connections to content areas and pedagogical practices. For many students in the alternative delivery course, the points that were deducted came from the lack of specificity to a grade level or content area of interest in their philosophy. Based on the mean scores, both cohorts were successful in answering the assessment questions. Students in both cohorts could identify specific course assignments and topics that made the biggest impact on the development of their teaching philosophy. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results suggest that students can effectively articulate a vision of their personal beliefs about teaching and learning. Most students were able to reference specific topics/assignments from the course that influenced their own philosophy of teaching, indicating the course assignments and topics are beneficial in helping students craft their own teaching philosophy. In the results, it was mentioned that the alternative delivery students were not as successful as the traditional delivery students in making connections to their specific content area and grade level of interest. However, it should be noted that there was a small number of students in the alternative delivery course and several of those students indicated that they do not plan on continuing on the path to becoming a teacher. This could explain the lack of connections to the grade level and content area interests. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Both cohorts mentioned connections to the different educational philosophies and key philosophers covered in the course in their teaching philosophy. The EDUC 201 instructors can use this feedback to ensure the assignments that make the most impact on students remain as part of the course requirements. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The t-test revealed that there was no significant difference between the rubric scores of the traditional and alternative delivery students. Overall mean scores were very similar.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> August 2026 Education Department Retreat <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Results will be shared at the Education Department Retrea in August. <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Education Department Members: Lorinda Sankey, Shanna Opfer, Amanda Geidel, Keith Kerschen, Jerrita Staher, Amy Stradtman, Drew Gerdes, David Rindt, Vicki Anderson, Preston Sunderman.
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> Since there was not a 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 make connections to specific content areas and grade levels of interest, even if they are not choosing to continue in their preparation to be a teacher. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in</i>

the next academic year? Continuing to encourage students to write rough drafts and make revisions may help improve overall scores. 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):** 5/20/26

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 5/20/26

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na