

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies, Modern Foreign Languages	Date: June 15, 2026
Course(s): SPAN 202	
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Select Select Select	
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Amy Royuk, Greta Gieseke, Rosalba Gonzalez Hill, Jill Greff Nick Ortega, Kristi Pishko, 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 the past subjunctive. 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-subjunctive 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 33 out of a possible 40 points. The mean scores of the submitted dual-credit schools were 33, 39, 34, 34, 23, 34, 36. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The assessment results demonstrate that students were able to accurately utilize the past subjunctive, based on the context clues provided in the sentence. The assessment also reflected their ability to distinguish between the two moods in Spanish - the indicative and the subjunctive. 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? Most of the class averages were satisfactory, with the mean scores of the dual-credit schools being equal to or greater than the mean of the CUNE students in the traditional format. Of the scores listed above, there was one school that reported a mean lower than that of CUNE.	
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> June 15, 2026 <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 using the past subjunctive. I do not foresee necessary changes in the alternative format teaching of this course. Regarding the 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/sge 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 on past subjunctive 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): 6/16/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:	6/16/26
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:	na