

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: ART Date: 6.30.26 Course(s): ART 271
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: Professor Groth, Kate Doss
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> Students should be able to write a compelling essay about the unified characteristics of an artwork as a foundational task, which demonstrates student observation skills as it pertains to art artifacts and ability to coherently form an essay receiving an 80% or higher. 2). COMPARABILITY – <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> Results were compared to traditional in person class.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> How well do students write essays? How well do students create a hierarchy of aesthetic qualities of an artwork that they then unify together? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Students were reported as doing well. The results are not statistically significant as there were only three students taking the ART 271. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The students were able to perform well on the essay and pass the course 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> A common test may be more desirable to create commensurate results. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? They were not statistically relevant as the sample sizes were small, but they were favorable as students passed.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6.30.26 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> 6.30.26 <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Professor Groth
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> The current results do not impact the teaching of the essay in class. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> Students will continue to observe artworks and be able to describe them as a foundational skill in art history. 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> none
Submitted by: Justin Groth Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/6/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 7/6/26 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na