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# 2015/16 Cycle: ALTERNATIVE DELIVERY

**Alternative Delivery – including but not limited to online, condensed time, dual credit.**

**Asses that**: 1. the rigor and credit hour requirements are equivalent to the traditional semester formats; 2. Student achievement in the alternative delivery course is equivalent to student achievement of the course in the traditional semester format.

**Fall -By 9/30/15 Instructor/dual credit liaison completes #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery Student**

**Spring - By 1/30/16 Outcomes and emails to the Assessment Committee Chair**

**May/SM – By 4/30/16**

 **By 10/15; 2/15; 5/15 Assessment Committee Chair reviews plans**

**Approved Not Approved**

 **Plan posted to Word Press Site Chair meets with**

 **Instructor/liaison**

 **Instructor/liaison collects artifacts Instructor/liaison revises &**

 **resubmits**

**Jan & May Seminars Instructors/liaisons share progress.**

**By 12/30(Fall); 6/15 (Spring); 7/30 (May/SM) Instructors/liaisons complete**

**#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery**

**and emails to Assessment Committee Department Chair**

**By 1/15; 7/30; 8/15 Assessment Committee Chair Reviews Executive Summaries**

 **Approved Not Approved**

 **Instructor Notified Chair meets with**

 **Instructor/Liaison**

 **Instructor/Liaison**

 **revises/resubmits**

**August Executive Summaries posted to Word Press Site**

**August Assessment Committee Chair/Dual Credit Coordinator**

 **Complete Summary of Executive Summaries**

 **September Assessment Committee Chair**

 **Posts to Word Press Site**

# Summary of Executive Summaries – Alternative Delivery

The 2015-2016 Assessment Cycle is the first cycle completed for courses delivered in alternative formats using the new university assessment processes developed in the 2014-2015 academic year. A course was classified as an Alternative Format course if it met the following criteria: 1) the same course was offered during a traditional 15-week semester; AND 2) was offered in a format different than the traditional face-to-face, 15-week format (including but not limited to online, condensed week, Dual Credit).

The purpose of the assessment of courses delivered in an alternative format was two-fold. First, the rigor of alternative format classes needed to be compared to courses taught in the traditional format to determine if the rigor in all formats was comparable. This was done by 1) comparing course guides; 2) comparing credit hour calculators (both were submitted with the *Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery – Student Outcome Form*). Next, student outcomes of the two course formats also needed to be measured and compared to determine if student learning in all formats was comparable. This was accomplished by collecting, analyzing, and comparing student outcome data from all course formats. *The Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery – Student Outcomes Form* and the *Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery Form* were used to complete the assessment process.

A review of the 2015 – 2016 Executive Summaries submitted by CUNE Dual Credit Liaisons (for dual credit courses) and departmental faculty supports that the goal of the assessment process is first and foremost the improvement of student learning and secondly that learning is consistent no matter what the format of the course. Each report continues to exemplify the involvement of entire departments in careful consideration of assessment outcomes and analysis and interpretation of results.

Information in the following tables supports that:

* **Dual Credit** (15 CUNE Courses offered as Dual Credit)
	+ Mean scores on the assessment were higher for Dual Credit courses than for CUNE courses – 12/15 (80%)
	+ Mean scores on the assessment were lower for Dual Credit courses than for CUNE courses – 3/15 (20%)
		- Math 184 – CUNE faculty worked with schools with low scores
		- PSY 101 – Difference in overall mean exam score was similar; differences occurred in specific subfields; CUNE faculty worked with schools to address subfield differences
		- SOC 101 – the CUNE faculty member addressed issues directly with the DC liaison
* **Online & 8 week formats** (7 Courses)
	+ Mean scores on the assessment were similar for alternative format and traditional classes – 4/7 (57%)
	+ Mean scores on the assessment were higher for the alternative format class – 2/7 (28%)
	+ Mean scores on the assessment were lower for alternative format class– 1/7 (14%%)
		- BIO 244 – the department determined that this course is best taught in a traditional 15- week, face-to-face format

Dual Credit

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Difference IS Statistically Significant |  |
|  |  Mean differences similar – OR – DC means higher than CUNE means | DC means significantly lower than CUNE means | ACTION | NOTES from Executive Summaries |
| Bio 111  | DC – m = 60CUNE – m = 57 |  |  |  given the number of students that scored below 70% on the assessment questions, a greater emphasis in experimental design needs to happen. |
| Chem 115 | DC – m= 42.8CUNE – m = 36.9 |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average.  |
| CTA 103  | DC – m = 18CUNE – m = 17 |  |  |  |
| ENG 102 | DC – m = 3.07CUNE – m = 2.88 |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average. |
| ENG 201 | DC – m = 3.5CUNE – m = 3.3 |  |  |  |
| HIST 115 | DC – m = 85%CUNE = 75% |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average. |
| Math 122 | 2DC – m = 88%CUNE – m = 84% | 1DC – m = 52% | 1DC instructor contacted and monitored. |  |
| Math 184 | DC – median = 10CUNE – median = 13 |  | Schools with low scores on the exam have been notified. All schools have been given a question-by-question summary of how their students performed on the exam and have been encouraged to give more attention to those topics on which their students performed poorly. |  |
| MU 111 | DC – m = 33CUNE – m = 28 |  |  | Low enrollment in DC classes. |
| Physics 110 | DC – m = 82.8%CUNE – m = 62% |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average. |
| PSYC 101 | DC – m = 35.7CUNE – m = 36.8 |  |  | Some differences in Subfields |
| REL 131 | DC – m = 5CUNE – m range = 2.9 – 3.9 |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average. |
| SOC 101 |   | DC lower thanCUNE | CUNE liaison will work with DC teacher |  |
| SPAN 101 | DC – m = 84 – 92%CUNE – m = 81% |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average. |
| SPAN 102 | DC – m = higherCUNE – m =71% |  |  | Dual credit average was higher than CUNE average. |

Alternative Format – OTHER (online/8 week)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Alternative Delivery means are similar to or higher than means of traditional class. | Alternative Format significantly lower than traditional course. | ACTION/NOTES |
| BIO 244 - Summer |  | Yes – alternative format significantly lower | Will not be taught again in alternative format. |
| Math 122 | Online – m = 84.2%Trad – m = 84% |  |  |
| PSY 324 | Online – m range= 91 – 94%Trad – m range = 91 – 96.6% |  |  |
| REL 121 | Online – m range = 2.7 - 4Trad – m range = 2.8 – 3.8 |  |  |
| REL 131 | Online – m range = 3.33 – 4.33Trad – m range = 2.9 – 3.9 |  | Online scores higher. |
| THEO 210 | Summer – m = 98%Trad – m = 94% |  | ALT DEL higher |
| THEO 251 | Summer – m = 84.9Trad – m = 81.2 |  |  |

# Biology

## BIO 111 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: BIO 111 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual Credit****Department: Natural Science Date: 9/16/2015** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Kyle Johnson, Robert Herman, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Fruend** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed?*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to communicate understanding of experimental design, the limits of experimentation, and the importance of variables and controls in experimental design as they apply to biology.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Can students design and critique experimental designs in biology, understand the limits of an experiment, identify and plan various variables and controls in an experiment, and communicate this effectively. |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* A series of questions on a final exam covering experimental interpretation and design.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Same as for the alternative delivery.
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Instructors will give, collect, and grade the exam, then send the results to the dual credit liason.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Same as for the alternative delivery.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Scores (means and distributions) will be analyzed.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Same as for the alternative delivery.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Scores (means and distributions) will be analyzed, compared with all other sections of the course (in currrent and previous years) and, if necessary, item analysis will be completed to see if some courses need strengthening in some areas. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Kyle B. Johnson Date: 9/16/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/6/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 10/6/15** |

## BIO 111 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Bio 111 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: Natural Sciences Date: 6/2/2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Kyle Johnson, Robert Hermann** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* The correct answers for each question pertaining to the understanding of experimental design was determined for the traditional and dual credit exam.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).The means and standard deviations for the items were calculated. An unpaired student's t-test was used to determine whether the means were statistically different. A p<0.05 was considered a statistically significant result.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students design and critique experimental designs in biology, understand the limits of an experiment, identify and plan various variables and controls in an experiment, and communicate this effectively?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* A total of 11 questions (multiple choice questions 1, 2, 4 - 7, 9 - 11, and true-false questions 12 and 20) were included in the analysis. The mean percentage ± SD of these questions that the dual credit students (from Calvary Lutheran) got correct was 60 ± 32%; for the CUNE students the mean percentage was 57 ± 20%. See figure 1 in the accompanying pdf.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  For both class structures, the results indicate that the students understood the topics better than random chance. However, less than a quarter of the students actually understood the topic well enough to score get a C or higher (>70%) on the questions asked, and less than 10% scored >80% on the material. Only two students (one from CUNE, one from Calvary) scored 100% on the questions. See figure 2 in the accompanying pdf.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) As the questions were multiple choice/true false, rater reliability was not a factor.5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The mean percentage ± SD of these questions that the dual credit students (from Calvary Lutheran) got correct was 60 ± 32%; for the CUNE students the mean percentage was 57 ± 20%. Using an unpaired student's t-test, it was determined that the differences in these were not statistically different (p<0.05).** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 6/6/2016 *How were the results shared?* Met as a department. *Who were results shared with?* Timothy Huntington, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Fruend, Connie Callahan, John Jurchen, Robert Hermann |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* Because the alternative format was not signficantly different from the standard format, no difference in how the alternatitive is delivered is necessary. However, given the number of students that scored below 70% on the assessment questions, a greater emphasis in experimental design needs to happen.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Students will have a greater understanding of experimental design. This can be assessed by using a similar or identical assessment to the one given this year.*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). No new budget requirements are necessary. |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Kyle Johnson Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/24/16 Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/24/16** |

## BIO 244 – Plan – Summer

|  |
| --- |
|  **Course: Bio 244 Alternative Format:** **Department: Natural Sciences Date: May 31 - July 22, 2016**  |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Kyle Johnosn & Robert Hermann** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? The student will be able to compare the nutritional values of a variety of diets. This is a part of the "Analysis" objective of the general education.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to compare the nutritional values of different diets.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Can students determine the reliablility and strength of nutritional information? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Fad diet article
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Fad diet article
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Online via blackboard
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Online via blackboard
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  A scoring rubric will be utilized to grade the fad diet article.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  A scoreing rubric will be utilized to grade the fad diet article.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). The scores from the traditional course will be compared to scores from the online 8-week course. A score of 80% or more will be considered acceptable understanding of this concept. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Kyle B. Johnson Date: 4/28/16** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 4/29/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 4/29/16** |

## BIO 244 – Executive Summary - Summer

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: BIO244 Alt Format: Depar: Natural Sciences Date: 9-26-2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Kyle Johnson, Tim Huntington** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Rubric was used for grading (attached).*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).Compared average of an assignment for the same class.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students determine the reliablility and strength of nutritional information?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The mean and standard deviation for the assignment during the traditional fall course was 66.9± 25.9, while for the summer course it was 46.9 ± 33.0. A unpaired ttest assuming equal variance indicated that this difference was statistically significant (p<0.05). *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The assignment required students to take a position on different fad diets. Overall, the results demonstrated that students were not very successful in finding reliable information to base the decision of their diets on, as most students weighed nonscientific sources of information and other unreliable sources as high as they did reliable sources of information.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) During the summer course there was a high degree of attrition from the course (3/11 students failed to complete the assignment). Overall the numbers were notably lower in the summer course as well (11 summer students versus <60 traditional students).5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The alternative format scored significantly lower than the traditional format.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 10-05-2106*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* During the STEM strategic plan meeting.*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Connie Callahan, Brent Royuk, Robert Hermann, John Jurchen, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Fruend, Kent Einspahr, Kregg Einspahr, John Snow,  |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* I do not plan to teach the alternative format again.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Not applicable.*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). None |
| **Submitted Assessment Committee Chair by: 10/14/16** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 10/14/16****Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – : na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 10/14/16** |

# Chemistry

## CHEM 115 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Chem 115 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual Credit****Department: Natural Sciences Date: 9/9/15** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Kristy Jurchen, Robert Hermann, Kyle Johnson, Jennifer Fruend** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Student understanding and application of the general pronciples of chemistry.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to understand and apply the general principles of chemistry.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Are students able to understand and apply the general principles of chemistry? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* final exam
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).final exam
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Scores on a standardized American Chemical Society First Semester General Chemistry final exam will be collected from each Dual Credit instructor.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Scores on a standardized American Chemical Society First Semester General Chemistry final exam will be collected from the fall semester Chem 115 course.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Exam scores (means and distributions) will be analyzed.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Same as alternative delivery.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Scores (means and distributions) will be analyzed and compared with all other sections of the course (in current and previous years). |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Rob Hermann Date: 9/30/15** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/6/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 10/6/15** |

## CHEM 115 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CHEM 115 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual Credit Department: Natural Sciences Date: 10/5/16** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Kristy Jurchen, Robert Hermann**  |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* The scores on the multiple-choice American Chemical Society (ACS) First Semester General Chemistry final exam were gathered from all instructors and averaged separately for the on-campus and Dual Credit students.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).If the average scores are similar between the Dual Credit and on-campus students, or if the Dual Credit students outperform the on-campus students, the outcomes are considered to be comparable.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Are students able to understand and apply the general principles of chemistry?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The average final exam score for the on-campus students during the 2015-16 school year was 36.9 points out of 70 (52.7%). The average score for all Dual Credit students was 42.8 points out of 70 (61.1%). Broken down by school, the average scores were: Crean LHS, 55.5 points (79.3%); Lincoln LHS, 38.0 points (54.3%); Faith LHS, 32.8 points (46.8%); and Rockford LHS, 41.8 points (59.7%).*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  With the exception of Faith LHS, students at all of the Dual Credit sites outperformed the on-campus CUNE students on the final exam. Anecdotal evidence from Faith LHS suggests that theirs was a weaker and less motivated cohort of students than normal, and their average score was still well within the standard deviation (12.9 points) of the on-campus CUNE student scores. The national average score on this version of the ACS exam is 40.35 points, with a standard deviation of 12.26 points. The Dual Credit student scores, on average, exceed both the on-campus CUNE students and the national average. The Dual Credit students are able to understand and apply the general principles of chemistry as well as the average General Chemistry student in the nation.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) na5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The Dual Credit scores were higher than the on-campus scores, on average.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* October 5, 2016 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* In a department meeting.*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Robert Hermann, John Jurchen, Connie Callahan, Jennifer Fruend, Kent Einspahr, Kregg Einspahr, Brent Royuk, Tim Huntington, Kyle Johnson |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The Dual Credit instructors have been successful in teaching their students the general principles of chemistry. No adjustment will be imposed on the Dual Credit instructors. The Faith LHS scores will be monitored next year to determine if this was an isolated lower-performing cohort of students. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* We expect the outcome to be similar next year.*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). none |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Kristy Jurchen** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 10/13/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 10/13/16** |

# CTA

## CTA 103 – Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CTA 103 Alternative Format: dual credit Dept: ECTA Date: September 11, 2015** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: ECTA department (shared at meeting)** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Students will use appropriate source material to write and publicly present a research-based project that meets the standards of their discipline of study and effectively adapts to their audience.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to use appropriate source material and publicly present a research-based project.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Can students find appropriate sources? Can they present this research in a public format (speech)? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* persuasive speech
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).persuasive speech
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* rubric from speech
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).rubric from speech
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  rubric attached
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  same rubric

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Means of total scores will be compared. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Erica Lamm Date: September 11, 2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/15/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 9/15/15** |

## CTA 103 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CTA 103 Alternative Format:  Dual Credit    Dept.:   ECTA          Date:  May 31, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Pete Koprince** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*   We used the attached rubric and analyzed our data for the question, “Can students find appropriate sources? Can they present this research in a public format (speech)?*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).    Students in dual credit classes and on-campus classes had the same assignment (persuasive speech) and were assessed using the same rubric (attached). Instructors were informed about the use of the rubric.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*      Can students find appropriate sources? Can they present this research in a public format (speech)?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*  Dual credit students had an overall score of 18/20 on this question.Concordia students had an overall score 17/20 on this question.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*       Students answered the question 85-90% effectively, so we can affirm that they can find appropriate sources and present them in a speech. We don’t find the difference between scores of dual credit students and Concordia students to be significant. We are satisfied with the level of achievement for both student sample groups.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      There were 22 students in the on-campus class and 6 students in the dual credit class. We don’t have control over quantities of students, but noticed that there was a distinct difference in class size between groups. 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We felt that the outcomes were comparable and that the scores on the rubrics were similar.   |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:*  May 31, 2016  *How were the results shared?* Emailed to department members *Who were results shared with?* Bryan Moore, Erica Lamm, Tobin Beck, Pete Koprince, Lisa Ashby, Dan Thurber, Laurie Zum Hofe |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?*    The assessment reinforces that using a common assignment and common rubric is effective. However, the format of the rubric might be better designed to better specify the components of an effective persuasive speech. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*    We will consider and discuss revising the speech rubric for next year. *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).   None.  |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by:  : Laurie Zum Hofe****Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):      6/24/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed:   BUDGET IMPLICATIONS: Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na    Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |

## CTA 333 Plan – 8 week online

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CTA 333 Alternative Format: Department: ECTA Date: 8/27/15** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Erica Lamm, Laurie ZumHofe, Lisa Ashby** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? The student will be able to implement communication skills that will increase his/her effectiveness within target cultures.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students will be able to implement communication skills that will increase their effectiveness within target cultures.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)*  Are students able to create and present a researched project that demonstrates their understanding of the characteristics of a particular culture and the way in which communication skills apply to this culture and to themselves?  |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Final project
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Final project
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Traditional & online instructor will score the artifacts.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Traditional and online instructor will score all the artifacts..
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  See attached rubric.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  See attached rubric (the same rubric will be used for both delivery formats)

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). The rubrics will be the same, so the scores will be easily compared. We will compare the mean scores for each item on the rubric between the two delivery formats and see if there are any discrepencies between the two.  |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Lisa Ashby Date: 8/27/15** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/14/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: Clarification on analysis requested. Submitter notified of approval: 9/15/15** |

## CTA 333 – Executive Summary – 8 week online

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: CTA 333   Alternative Format:  Online    Department:   ECTA     Date:  May 26, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:  Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Pete Koprince** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*  We used the attached rubric and analyzed our data via the question:  Are students able to create and present a researched project that demonstrates their understanding of the characteristics of a particular culture and the way in which communication skills apply to this culture and to themselves? *2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). We compared the mean scores among 5 or 6 criteria for the assignment, rated on a 1-5 scale.   |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*  Are students able to create and present a researched project that demonstrates their understanding of the characteristics of a particular culture and the way in which communication skills apply to this culture and to themselves? *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*    Students in the f2f class had the following overall average in the assessed category of identifying cultural characteristics: 4. 5/5 Students in the online class had the following overall averages in the assessed category of identifying cultural characteristics: 4. 5/5*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*       A 3 score indicated that a “Student uses correctly three of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.” Students achieved a high level of success with identifying cultural characteristics. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) Students in the f2f cohort seemed more likely to ask for assistance than the online cohort. 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).Overall, the standard deviation between cohorts is less than 0.1. This is indicative of a consistent level of achievement between cohorts and that the assignment is delivered cohesively.  |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:*  May 31, 2016  *How were the results shared?*   Emailed to department members: Bryan Moore, Erica Lamm, Tobin Beck, Pete Koprince, Lisa Ashby, Dan Thurber, Laurie Zum Hofe |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?*   The assessment reinforces that students can identify cultural characteristics with great success. Because of this success, an action we can take is to specifically apply more theory of intercultural competency, revising the rubric to reflect this attention to deeper and richer cultural characteristics. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*   The anticipated impact is more student interaction and reflection with more challenging and meaningful concepts of intercultural competencies. *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).  None.  |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by:  Laurie Zum Hofe    Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):      6/24/16 Submitter notified/additional action needed:     na     BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:       na Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |

# English

### ENG 102 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: English 102 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: ECTA Date: 9/8/2015** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Lisa Ashby, Tobin Beck, Gabriel Haley, Peter Koprince, Erica Lamm, Andrew Moffitt, Bryan Moore, Laurie Zum Hofe** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? The student will be able to use scholarly sources to support written and oral claims.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. The student will be able to use scholarly sources to support written and oral claims.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Are ECTA students able to locate, apply, and cite scholarly/appropriate sources in support of written or oral claims |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Common Assignment -Research Paper
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Common Assignment -Research Paper
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Via SurveyMonkey Link with online assessment rubric
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Via SurveyMonkey Link with online assessment rubric
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*
	2. The artifacts will be analyzed looking at outcome #4 on the rubric.
	3. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  The artifacts will be analyzed looking at outcome #4 on the rubric.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). We will assess and compare mean scores of the assessments. |
| **Submitted by: Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe Date: 9/29/15 Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/29/15 Submitter notified/additional action: Analysis section needs to be completed. Submitter notified of approval: 10/20/15** |

### ENG 102 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Eng 102   Alternative Format:  Dual Credit    Explain Dept.:   ECTA          Date:  May 25, 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Lisa Ashby** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*   We used the attached rubric and analyzed our data via question #5, “**How well does the paper use source information legally, ethically, and meet the appropriate citation standards?”***2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). Students in dual credit classes and on-campus classes had the same assignment (research paper) and were assessed using the same rubric (attached). Instructors were informed about the use of the rubric.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*   Are ECTA students able to locate, apply, and cite scholarly/appropriate sources in support of written or oral claims?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*     Dual credit students had an overall score of 3.07/4 on this question.Concordia students had an overall score of 2.88/4 on this question.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*       A 3 score indicated that a “Student uses correctly three of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.”We don’t find the difference between scores of dual credit students and Concordia students to be significant. We are satisfied with the level of achievement for both student sample groups.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      We would like to continue to discuss the rating system, as this is our first use of this rubric. However, it’s interesting to note that the dual credit instructors rated their students at a higher score than the on-campus instructors. Is this because they are teaching this course to high school students and the rigor is higher in on-campus college students? Or is the score difference because on-campus students did less effective work? 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We felt that the outcomes were comparable and that the scores on the rubrics were similar.   |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:*  May 31, 2016 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)*   Emailed to Bryan Moore, Erica Lamm, Tobin Beck, Pete Koprince, Lisa Ashby, Dan Thurber, Laurie Zum Hofe |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?*  The assessment reinforces that using a common assignment and common rubric is effective. However, we would like to use it again next year in order to collect more data. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*     We will continue to use this rubric and common assignment next year. *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).   None.  |
| **Submitted via email by:  : Laurie Zum Hofe  eviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):      6/24/16 Submitter notified/additional action needed:   na   BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:     Approved & Posted to Assessment site:      6/24/16** |

## ENG 201 - Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: English 201 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: ECTA Date: 9/8/2015** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Lisa Ashby, Tobin Beck, Gabriel Haley, Peter Koprince, Erica Lamm, Andrew Moffitt, Bryan Moore, Laurie Zum Hofe** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? The student will be able to use scholarly sources to support written and oral claims.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. The student will be able to use scholarly sources to support written and oral claims.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Are ECTA students able to locate, apply, and cite scholarly/appropriate sources in support of written or oral claims |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Common Assignment -Literary Analysis Paper
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Common Assignment -Literary Analysis Paper
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Via SurveyMonkey Link with online assessment rubric
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Via SurveyMonkey Link with online assessment rubric
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*
	2. The artifacts will be analyzed looking at outcome #4 on the rubric.
	3. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  The artifacts will be analyzed looking at outcome #4 on the rubric.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). We will assess and compare mean scores of the assessments. |
| **Submitted by: Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe Date: 9/29/15 Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/1/15 Submitter notified/additional action: Analysis section clarified. Submitter notified of approval: 10/20/15** |

##

## ENG 201 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Eng 201 Alternative Format:  Dual Credit    Dept:   ECTA                        Date:  May 25, 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:  Dr. Laurie Zum Hofe, Dr. Lisa Ashby** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*    We used the attached rubric and analyzed our data via question #5, “**How well does the paper use source information legally, ethically, and meet the appropriate citation standards?”***2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).   Students in dual credit classes and on-campus classes had the same assignment (literary analysis) and were assessed using the same rubric (attached). Instructors were informed about the use of the rubric.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*   Are ECTA students able to locate, apply, and cite scholarly/appropriate sources in support of written or oral claims?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*     Dual credit students had an overall score of 3.5/4 on this question.Concordia students had an overall score of 3.3/4 on this question.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*       A 3 score indicated that a “Student uses correctly three of the information use strategies and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information.” We don’t find the difference between scores of dual credit students and Concordia students to be significant. We are satisfied with the level of achievement for both student sample groups.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)     We would like to continue to discuss the rating system, as this is our first use of this rubric. The Concordia University course sections were over-enrolled.  This impacted our ability to assign multiple drafts of the assignment and provide feedback.  We believe we could improve the ratings on the papers if students had more opportunity for drafts and feedback.  5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We felt that the outcomes were comparable and that the scores on the rubrics were similar.   |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:*  Tuesday, May 31, 2016    *How were the results shared?* Emailed to department members*):*   Bryan Moore, Erica Lamm, Tobin Beck, Pete Koprince, Lisa Ashby, Dan Thurber, Laurie Zum Hofe |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?*    The assessment reinforces that using a common assignment and common rubric is effective. However, we would like to use it again next year in order to collect more data. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*  We will continue to use this rubric and common assignment next year. *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).   The Concordia University course sections were over-enrolled.  This impacted our ability to assign multiple drafts of the assignment and provide feedback.  We believe we could improve the ratings on the papers if students had more opportunity for drafts and feedback.  Budget impact would be paying an instructor for more sections of the class to be offered.  |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Laurie Zum Hofe    Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):   6/24/16   Submitter notified/additional action needed:    na  BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:    emailed to Dean, College of Arts & Sciences 6/24/16   Approved & Posted to Assessment site:     6/24/16** |

# HISTORY

## History 115 - Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course:** **HIST 115 Alternative Format:**  **Explain “Other” if selected:** **Dual Credit****Department: His, Geo,CJ Date: 9/25** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: John Hink, Jamie Hink, Matt Phillips** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Students will be able to analyze Histogriaphical Material*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to read a historical monograph and anlyze its effectiveness.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Can students identify a thesis? Can students identify strengths and weaknesses of a historical work? Can students use evidence from the book to support their claims? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Book Review (Common Assignment)
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Book Review (Common Assignment)
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Papers will be scored according to a common rubric and submitted to the dual credit liason.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Papers will be scored according to a common rubric and submitted to the dual credit liason.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Rubric
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  rubric

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Comparison of commons scores |
|  |
| **Submitted by:** **John Hink Date: 9/25/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date):** **9/25/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: 9/25/15 Course guide for trad class requested. Submitter notified of approval: 9/28/15** |

## History 115 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Hist 115 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual Credit****Department: Hist, Geo, CJ Date: 12/1/2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: John Hink, Matt Phillips, Jamie Hink** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Data was analyzed using a common rubric. *2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).NA  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students identify a thesis? Can students identify strengths and weaknesses of a historical work? Can students use evidence from a book to support their claims?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Four out of five dual-credit sections met the goal of 80% of students scoring at least an 8 out of 12 on the rubric. The one dual-credit section that fell short only had six dual credit students, two of whom did not meet the benchmark. In the on campus section 75% of students (18 of 24) met the objective, falling just short. Overall, 82.4% of all students assessed met the objective. Class Total Students Students with 80% or Better Objective MetBassett 21 17 80.9%Loveless 3 3 100%Rebecca 6 4 66%Senechal 37 33 89%Hink 24 18 75%Total Dual 67 57 82.4%*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  These results suggest that most students are capable to writing a college-level book review that identifies an author's thesis and of assessing the relative strengths and weaknesses of the work while supporting themselves with evidence. However, since the assessment ultimately looked to measure three areas, measuring students with an overall score should be complemented with an analysis of their performance in specific categories. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) The rubric used needs to be revised for clarity and precision in order to illuminate exactly what areas deficient students need remediation. 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The results were comparable.**  |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 12/1*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Shared electronically and discussed individually*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Jamie Hink, Matt Phillips |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* In the future, in addition to assessing the artifact with an overall score, the sections will submit more detailed rubric results that will reveal how students performed in particular categories of the rubric. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* In light of the relative success of most students, efforts going forward will focus on why some students fell below the identified goal and how the teacher's of respective sections can remediate their deficiencies in specific areas. *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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: John Hink** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 12/8/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 12/8/16** |

# Math

## Math 122 - Plan - Online

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 122, Intro to Stats, May term Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected:** **Department: Math Date: Summer, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Brian Albright, Ed Reinke** |
| **Course Requirements:** *1. Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes* 1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]

*2. Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?* * 1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed?* *knowledge of statistical concepts*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to demonstrate understanding of basical statistical concepts covered on tests.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Do students grasp the basic statistical concepts taught in the course? |
| **Methodology** **1. Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\** * 1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Average test scores.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Average test scores.

*2. Collecting data:** 1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Test scores from the 4 online tests given will be collected and averaged.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Test scores from the 4 online tests given will be collected and averaged.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Average test scores will be collected.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Average test scores will be collected.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Simply compare the average test scores. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Brian Albright Date: 8/19/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 8/24/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 8/24/15** |

## Math 122 – Executive Summary - Online

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 122, Intro to Stats Alternative Format: Department: Math Date: Summer, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Brian Albright, Ed Reinke** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We compared average test scores of the online students to average scores from college students in our traditional face-to-face classes.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We compared average scores.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Do students demonstrate understanding of basical statistical concepts covered on tests*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Online students take the same 4 tests as students in Brian Albright's face-to-face classes. The average scores from the online summer class and the Fall 2015 class are shown below: Online - 84.2% Face-to-face - 84%The average scores are virtually identical. This indicates that online students understand the concepts as well as face-to-face students.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The tests indicate that online students perform as well as traditional on-campus face-to-face classes.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) (see the summary)5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **Nearly identical** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 9/6/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Met as a team*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, and John Snow |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* Minor refinements and improvements will be made.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Scores will continue to be similar to face-to-face classes.*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: 9/6/16** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/6/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/6/16** |

## Math 122 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 122, Intro to Stats Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual Credit****Department: Math Date: Fall 2015-Spring 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Brian Albright, Ed Reinke** |
| **Course Requirements:** *1. Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes* 1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]

*2. Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?* * 1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed?*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to demonstrate understanding of basical statistical concepts covered on tests.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Do students grasp the basic statistical concepts taught in the course? |
| **Methodology** **1. Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\** * 1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Common final exam
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Average test scores.

*2. Collecting data:** 1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Scores from the common final exam.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Test scores from the 4 tests given will be collected and averaged.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** **1) Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\**** * 1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Scores from the common final exam will be collected.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Average test scores will be collected.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Simply compare the average test scores. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Brian Albright Date: 9/8/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/8/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: 9/8/15 Submitter notified of approval: 9/8/15** |

## Math 122 – Executive Summary - Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 122, Intro to Stats Alternative Format: Dual Credit Dept:** **Math Date: Fall 2015-Spring 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Brian Albright, Ed Reinke** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We compared average final exam scores from the dual credit students to average scores from college students in our traditional face-to-face classes.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We compared average scores.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Do students grasp the basic statistical concepts taught in the course?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Each dual credit class was given a common final exam. The teachers graded these exams and return them to us. We looked over the exams for any evidence that important topics were not being taught in the classes. None was found. The scores were recorded and averaged. The results are as follows: Lincoln Lutheran - 52% Calvary High - 88%The average test scores in our Fall 2015 face-to-face classes was 84%. The Calvary High scores are very comparable to this average. The Lincoln Lutheran scores were much lower. Brian addressed this issue with the teacher via email. The cause was attributed to uncomtrolable sampling error. The small class size of only 6 students leads credence to this attribution. This teacher will be closely monitored in the future.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The exams show that the key topics are being taught in the dual credit classes and that students can perform as well in the dual credit classes as traditional on-campus face-to-face classes.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) (see the summary)5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **na** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 4/21/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Met as a team: Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, and John Snow |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The teacher at Lincoln Lutheran will be closely monitored.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Scores at Lincoln Lutheran will improve.*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: 4/21/16** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 4/21/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed:** **na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 4/21/16** |

## Math 184 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 184, Calculus I Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: Math Date: 9/28/2015** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Ed Reinke, Brian Albright, John Snow** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [ ]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?* Yes
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [ ]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. [x]
 |
| **Student Outcome:** *What student outcome from the departmental matrix will be assessed? (It is suggested that you cut and paste directly from the matrix. Clarify if the student outcome has a more specific focus than the broader outcome. Outcomes should represent the absolute priorities for learning- students must be able to do [this] when they finish this course).* **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Demonstrate competence of basic Calculus I topics. |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Can students demonstrate competence of basic Calculus I topics. |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Dual Credit courses will be administered a multiple choice final exam online.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Traditional students will take a similar written exam.
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Dual Credit courses will be administered a multiple choice final exam online
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Traditional students will take a similar written exam
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Problems on multiple choice tests will be graded on a correct or incorrect basis.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Problems on multiple choice tests will be graded on a partial credit basis.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Dual Credit multiple choice scores will be compared to traditional written scores. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: John Snow Date: 9/28/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/29/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 9/29/15** |

## Math 184 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 184, Calculus I Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: Math Date: June 1** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Ed Reinke, Brian Albright, and John Snow** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We compared the performance of dual credit students on a multiple choice comprehensive final exam to the performance of on campus students on a non-multiple-choice version of the same exam.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).We compared five number summaries.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students demonstrate competence of basic Calculs I topics?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The five number summary for the dual credit students taking the multiple choice exam is: Minimum 2, First Quartile 7, Median 10, Third Quartile 13, Maximum 20. The five number summary for the on-campus students is: Minimum 3, First Quartile 10, Median 13, Third Quartile 15, Maximum 20.The dual credit scores are a little below the on-campus scores. However, this difference can probably be attributed to the difference between partial credit grading and all-or-none grading. *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  It appears that most of the dual credit students can demonstrate a level of competence with basic Calculus I topics.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) see summary5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **na** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* June 1 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Met as a team Ed Reinke, Brian Albright, and John Snow |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* Schools with low scores on the exam have been notified. All schools have been given a question-by-question summary of how their students performed on the exam and have been encouraged to give more attention to those topics on which their students performed poorly.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Overall scores on the common exam will improve.*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). none |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: John Snow** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/24/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site:** **6/24/16** |

# MUSIC

## Music 111 - Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Mu 111, Music Appreciation Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual Credit Department: Music Date: August 31, 2015** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Elizabeth Grimpo, Jerrode Marsh, Joseph Herl, Kurt von Kampen**  |
| **Course Requirements:** *1. Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes* 1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) Yes

*2. Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?* Yes* 1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) X
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Retention and comprehension of the material.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to identify specific traits, historical events, and general themes of classical music and its composers from 400-1950.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Can students understand and identify the broad themes and supporting details within the history of classical music? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* 40 question multiple choice cummulative exam.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).40 question multiple choice cummulative exam.
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* For each student, the instructor will report the number of correct answers on the multiple choice exam; the average score will be calculated.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).For each student, the instructor will report the number of correct answers on the multiple choice exam; the average score will be calculated.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  number of correct answers out of the 40 possible
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  number of correct answers out of the 40 possible

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). The average exam scores from the dual credit course and the traditional course will be compared. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Elizabeth Grimpo Date: August 31, 2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/3/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 9/3/15** |

## Music 111 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Mu 111 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Depart: Music Date: June 1, 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis : Elizabeth Grimpo, Jerrode Marsh, Joseph Herl, Kurt von Kampen** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* The 40 question multiple choice cumulative exam, taken by every student, was graded according to the attached answer key. A summary of scores, according to each course, is also attached.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).The mean and median exam scores of each class were calculated.   |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students understand and identify the broad themes and supporting details within the history of classical music?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The Music Appreciation course taught at St. Paul Lutheran High School in Concordia, MO, had an enrollment of three students each semester. In the fall semester, the mean of the multiple choice cumulative exam was 34 and the median was 33. In the spring semester, the mean of the multiple choice cumulative exam was 31 and the median was 31.The Music Appreciation course taught at Concordia University, Nebraska, had an enrollment of 35 students. The mean of the multiple choice cumulative exam was 28 and the median was 29. *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The median scores of the multiple choice cumulative exam in the dual credit and traditional courses are 70% (C) or better. This demonstrates that the students are indeed understanding and remembering the broad themes and supporting details within the history of classical music. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) Since each class size varied, the median exam scores also varied. This was to be expected. The smaller (dual credit) courses had fairly high (B to C+) exam averages. The larger (traditional general education) course had a more moderate exam average (mid to low C) as the score distribution followed a typical bell curve. 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The assessment results were similar, indicating that the average student in the dual credit and traditional format are learning and understanding the same material.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* June 15, 2016*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* met as a department von Kampen, Blersch, Grimpo, Herl, Jacobs, Schultz  |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The high school students in the dual credit Music Appreciation course are, on average, performing slightly better than the college students in the traditional general education Music Appreciation course. Therefore, no change to the dual credit instruction is needed at this time.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* N/A*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). N/A |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: June 15, 2016 Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/24/16 Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/24/16** |
| PhysicsPHYS 110 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Phys 110 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Dual credit - traditional format (36 weeks face-to-face) Department: Natural Science Date: 8/31/15** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Rob Hermann, Kyle Johnson, Kristy Jurchen, Jen Fruend** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? "communicate understanding and information about the world in verbal, graphical, and analytical languages" and "analyze a natural situation to determine how the world behaves in that experience", from the course syllabus*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to analyze natural situations and communicate understanding and information about the world in verbal, graphical, and analytical languages.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Are students able to analyze natural situations and communicate understanding and information about the world in verbal, graphical, and analytical languages. |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* 40-question multiple choice exam, taken from the course bank for the standard textbook and given in association with the final exam for the course.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).40-question multiple choice exam, taken from the course bank for the standard textbook and given in association with the final exam for the course. (Same as for alternative delivery.)
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Instructors will give, collect, and grade the exam, then send the results to the dual credit liason.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Same as for alternative delivery.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Scores (means and distributions) will be analyzed.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Same as for alternative delivery.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Scores (means and distributions) will be analyzed, compared with all other sections of the course (in current and previous years) and, if necessary, item analysis will be completed to see if some courses need strengthening in some areas. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Robert Hermann Date: 9/16/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/6/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 10/6/15** |

PHYS 110 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Phys 110 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: Natural & Computer Science Date: 9/9/16** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Kyle Johnson, John Jurchen, Kristy Jurchen, Tim Huntigton, Connie Callahan, Jen Fruend** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Scores (means and distributions from a 40 question multiple choice final exam) were analyzed.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).Scores from the various dual credit sites were compared with each other and with scores from when the course was last taught on the Seward campus.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Are students able to analyze natural situations and communicate understanding and information about the world in verbal, graphical, and analytical languages.*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The averages for the three schools teaching Phys 110 were: Martin Luther (Greendale WI) 88.4%, St. Paul LHS (Concordia, MO) 76%, Lincoln Lutheran LHS (Lincoln, NE) 84%. These results are very similar to each other, and to past years. They compare favorably to the last round of scores from when Phys 110 was taught on the Seward campus, when the average was 62%. (The format of this document will not allow pasting a chart into the text area provided.)*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The assessment instrument consists of 40 multiple choice questions from the test bank for the standard textbook for the course. The questions require students to analyze physical situations and answer questions about them from a physics perspective. Several of the questions involve analyzing graphs of motion or other types of graphs, and many involve using equations and calculations. The fact that students average over an 80% on this exam is solid evidence that students are indeed able to analyze natural situations and to communicate their understanding.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) The averages for most of the schools and the aggregate average have been increasing over the years. This may be due to teachers knowing what is expected and doing a better job of teaching the objectives. Alternatively it could mean teaching to the test. Not every school has improved every year, so there is enough variablility that the scores are still believable, but it might be good in the future to vary the exam questions somewhat.5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).See #3. The scores from the dual credit sites are similar to and in fact better than those scored by the students in the course offered on Seward's campus in the spring of 2014.  |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* June 6, 2016*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Met as a department: Rob Hermann, Brent Royuk, John Jurchen, Kristy Jurchen, Tim Huntington, Kyle Johnson, Connie Callahan, Jen Fruend |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* Since the dual credit students are demonstrating admirable mastery of the concepts, we will try not to do too much to change this.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Hopefully it will not deter from the learning that students are demonstrating.*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Rob Hermann Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/16/16****Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS –na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/16/16** |

PsychologyPSY 101 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: PSY 101 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: Human & Social Science Date: 10-19-15** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Nancy Elwell, Thad Warren, Kathy Miller** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? “The student will be able to gain a broad understanding of key concepts in the psycholology field?” Content Knowledge in 12 topic areas of psychology will be assessed in the dual credit and on-campus PSY 101 Introduction to Psychology classes. This is the second year for assessing this outcome. The outcome was chosen again to establish a clear baseline of knowledge retained over a two year period.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. The student will demonstrate an understading of key concepts from 12 topic areas of psychology.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* 1. Do students in Dual Credit PSY 101 classes retain knowledge of the field of psychology presented to them throughout the course, as measured through an assessment at the end of the educational experience? 3. Do students in Dual Credit compared to on-campus PSY 101 classes retain comparable knowledge in the field of Psychology on the same measure? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* An exam consisting of 50 multiple choice questions in 12 spacific psychology topic areas.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).The same exam that consisting of 50 multiple choice questions in 12 spacific psychology topic areas.
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* The 50 question multiple choice exam and answer sheets will be emailed to instructors to administer. The completed exams will be sent to the chair of the Human & Social Science department to be scored.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).The 50 question multiple choice exam and answer sheets will be emailed to instructors to administer. The completed exams will be sent to the chair of the Human & Social Science department to be scored.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  1. scores will be computed by topic and by overall exam.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  1. scores will be computed by topic and by overall exam.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Statistical comparison (t-test) will be computed for CUNE vs. Dual credit by topic and overall score.It is anticipated that the following will be accomplished:1. 80% of CUNE students will receive a score of 80% or higher on each topic area.2. 80% of CUNE students will receive a score of 80% or higher on the overal exam.3. 80% of Dual Credit students will receive a score of 80% or higher on each topic area.4. 80% of Dual Credit students will receive a score of 80% or higher on the overall exam. |
| **Submitted by: Thad Warren Date: 10-19-15 Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/20/15****Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 10/20/15** |

PSY 101 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Department: Social Science Date:** **10/6/16** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts:** **Warren - grading of a 50 question multiple choice exam** |
| **See Undergraduate Program Outcome Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes – Gen Eds for:** a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1****). PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*  1. Exams were scored. 2. Total # of questions correct were recorded for each student score.3. Total # of questions correct per sub-topic were recorded as the sub-topic score.4. Range, median, mode, % corret total, % correct per sub-topic - computed by class and by CUNE or Dual Credit |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1. Do students in on-campus PSY 101 classes retain a broad range of knowledge in the field of psychology?2. Do students in Dual Credit PSY 101 classes retain a broad range of knowledge in the field of psychology?3. Do students in Dual Credit compared to on-campus PSY 101 classes retain comparable knowledge in the field of psyhcology?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional*. RESULTS used to address assessment questions 1, 2, and 3. 1. 80% of CUNE students scored 80% or higher on each topic area.  RESULTS: This criteria was not met. The mean % correct in topic area: 80% or higher - Subfields, Neuroscience, Development, States of Consciousness 70 - 79% - Memory, Sensation/perception, Disorders, Social Psych. 60 - 69% - Learning, Motivation, Personality, Health  2. 80% of CUNE students will receive a score of 80% or higher on the overal exam.  RESULTS: This criteria was not met.  41% scored 80% or higher. 60%scored 70% or higher. 82% scored 60% or higher. 93% scored 50% or higher.3. 80% of Dual Credit students will receive a score of 80% or higher on each topic area.  RESULTS: This criteria was not met. The mean % correct in topic area: 80% or higher - Subfields, Neuroscience  70 - 79% - States of Consciousness, Sensation/Perception, Memory, Development, Personality, Disorders, Social Psych 60 - 69% - Learning, Motivation, Health4. 80% of Dual Credit students will receive a score of 80% or higher on the overall exam. RESULTS: This criteria was not met.  28% scored 80% or higher. 57% scored 70% or higher. 85% scored 60% or higher. 96% scored 50% or higher. Calculated using mean% correct  CUNE Dual CreditN 137 130mean 36.8 35.7SD 7.89 6.3t test p=0.239  See attachment for additional data. *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* 1. Do students in on-campus PSY 101 classes retain a broad range of knowledge in the field of psychology? The bench mark of 80% across all topics is probably too aggressive for a general education course that is taken by many first year college students many of whom are not psychology majors. While the last assessment cycle chosed topics of noted concern were those that fell in the 50 - 59% range - Motivation, Personality, Health and Social Psychology. This cycle has shown marked improvement with no topic receiving lower then a 65% mean score.2. Do students in Dual Credit PSY 101 classes retain a broad range of knowledge in the field of psychology? Once again, the bench mark of 80% across all topics may have been too aggressive as data was not separated out for classes that contained both Dual Credit and non-dual credit students. The topic of noted concern last cycel of assessment was Health, which fell in the 40 - 49% range. Like CUne studetns the Dual credit studetns showed marked improvement. with no topic falling below 64 % mean score3. Do students in Dual Credit compared to on-campus PSY 101 classes retain comparable knowledge in the field of psyhcology? The t test result (p=.239) which idnicates there is little to no statistical difference between CUNE and Dual Credit students at the .05 level as a collective. This can be due to the use of a similer test for two consecutive years. Instructors have become familier with the assessment and may be adjusting teaching to better acomidate students with spacific informaiton about key subject matter. This is also ilusstrative in the overall improvement in scores with both CUNE and Dual Credit Students. 4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) none |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date*: Oct. 2016*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Departemnt meeting and individual meetings with Adjuncts and Dual Credit instructors*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Warren, Elwell, Miller |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*  The department of Human and Social Sciences will complete a program review and curriculum map for all psychology courses (including PSY 101) during the 2015-16 school year and the assessment used for Dual Credit will be evaluated at this time. General data on topics will be shared with both CUNE and Dual Credit istructors seeking feed back about commn text books and shared material *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*  Evaluating the curriculum for PSY 101 will result in a prioritization of topic coverage for both CUNE and DC courses resulting in adequate coverage of all topics. It is anticipated that knowledge retention will improve especially in areas of low achievement.*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). none |
| ***If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.*** |
| ***What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?***  **We will utilize a similer assessment tool for the 16-17 learning cycle in order to affirm the findings and to check conintual improvement.**  |
|  |
| **Submitted by:** **Thad Warren Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):** **12/1/16** |
| **Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** **na****Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 12/1/16** |

PSY 324 – Plan – Summer

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: PSY 324 Alternative Format: Online Department: EDUC Date: 4/21/16** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Geidel and Deterding** |
| **Course Requirements:**1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* 136
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor)
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?* Yes - course guides are comparable
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor)

**b.** Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one: attached OR course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:**1. *What student outcome will be assessed? 6. Identify and locate the ingredients required in writing an IEP (Individualized Education Plan) for exceptional students.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students will be able to identify the 9 required ingredients in all IEPs and locate them within the document.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Are students able to independently locate official IEP paperwork online? Are students able to identify the nine required ingredients of the paperwork by reading their course required text? Are students able to locate these nine ingredients within the paperwork? |
| **Methodology**1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* IEP paperwork with 9 ingredients identified.

b. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note“na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Same1. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Collection of the actual IEP paperwork via Schoology.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Same
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:**1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):* Student performance will be measured in number of ingredients located in correct place within IEP paperwork. 3 pts will be earned for each of the 9 ingredients correctly identified. 3 pts for finding a complete set of IEP paperwork online.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:* Same
2. ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). Comparability will be determined by comparing the average of the overall scores on the assignment.
 |
| **Submitted: Geidel Date: 4/19/16 Reviewed : 4/21/16 Approved: 4/21/16** |

PSY 324 – Executive Summary – Summer

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: PSY 324 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected:****Department: EDUC Date: 9/30/16** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Amanda Geidel and Amanda Deterding** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Student performance will be measured in number of IEP ingredients located in correct place within IEP paperwork. 3 points will be earned for each of the 9 ingredients correctly identified. 3 points will be loacting a complete set of IEP paperwork online.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).By averaging and comparing the course scores on this assignment.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Are students able to independently locate official IEP paperwork online? Are students able to identify the 9 required ingredients of the paperwork by reading their course text? Are students able to locate these 9 ingredients within the paperwork?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* There were 4 sections of the course taught during the summer and fall terms. The average scores on the assignment ranged from 91-96% or 27/30-29/30. The instructor for one of the fall classes was an adjunct, and her students scored the highest average at 96.6%, or 29/30. The other 3 classes were taught by a full-time faculty member. Two of these classes were taught to undergraduate student, one online and one face to face. Each of these two classes scored a 91% or 27/30 average. The thrid class taught by the full-time faculty member was online and to non-traditional students, who averaged a 94% or 28/30 on the assignment.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  No matter the class, the success rate of the students was high. There was some variance where a different instructor taught the class or where nontraditional students were involved. In any either delivery format, students were able to independently locate IEP paperwork, and then identify the 9 required ingredients within it.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) Different faculty teaching the same course may yield different student scores based on grading practice. It would be too soon to determine that with this data as it is just one set.5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **When it involved the same instructor and the same type of students the traditional and alternative format had identical outcomes using this artifact. When a different instructor and non-tradtional students were involved the outcome was still acceptable for this outcome.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 9/30/2016 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* via executive summary *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Amanda Geidel, Amanda Deterding, Nancy Elwell |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The alternative format for the class will not be altered next summer.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Students will continue to be successful in this course assignment no matter what format they take the course.*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). none |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Amanda Geidel** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/30/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/30/16** |

ReligionREL 121 – Plan – Summer

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Rel-121 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected:****Department: Theology Date: April 30, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, and Mark Meehl** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Knowledge*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to gain a broad understanding of the concept of Christology in the Old Testament.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* 1. Can the student appropriately define and explain the term messiah within a Biblical framework? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Final exam essay question
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Final exam essay question
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Exam will be completed and submitted via email to the instructor.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Students submit the essay at the time of the Final.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  See attached document regarding scoring rubric.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  same

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). The range and mean scores on the exam question for the alternative delivery will be compared to those of the traditional class. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Mark Meehl Date: April 30, 2016** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 5/6/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 5/6/16** |

REL 121 – Executive Summary – Summer

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Rel 121 Alt Format: 8 week online Depart: Theology Date: Sept. 9, 2016** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Blanco, Groth, Holtorf, and Meehl** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Members of the department scored each artifact using the rubrics attached*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).The mean scores of a random selection of students in the traditional format courses (n = 15) were compared to the mean score of the students in the online course (n = 3) on each of the 5 components. |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* **1. Can the student appropriately define and explain the term messiah within a Biblical framework?***2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* **Submitted artifacts were assessed using the attached rubric, then compared with past assessments of the same assessment question from traditional format classes. Results:**1. **Mean Traditional Delivery: 3.6 Mean Alternative Delivery: 3.7**
2. **Mean Traditional Delivery: 3.8 Mean Alternative Delivery: 3.3**
3. **Mean Traditional Delivery: 3.2 Mean Alternative Delivery: 4**
4. **Mean Traditional Delivery: 2.8 Mean Alternative Delivery: 2.7**
5. **Mean Traditional Delivery: 3.6 Mean Alternative Delivery: 3.3**

*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  **The results indicate that the students were able to define and explain the term messiah within a Biblical framework satisfactorily.***4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) none5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **A test of significance between the two groups could not be completed due to the low number of students in the alternative group (n=3) but the means of all V components were similar.**  |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* **9/20/2016***How were the results shared? (* **By email with department.***Who were results shared with?*  **Charles Blanco, David Coe, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, and Mark Meehl** |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* **The alternative format obtained similar results as the traditional format. The emphasis on this knowledge goal will continue.***2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* **The anticipated impact will be to enhance the student achievement of this knowledge outcome through additional emphasis on this component of knowledge during instruction.***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). none |
| **Submitted by: Mark Meehl Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/21/16****Submitter notified/additional action needed: additional specific data for comparison was requested.** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – none Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/30/16** |

REL 131 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: REL 131 Hist & Lit NT Alt Format: Dual Credit Department: Theology Date: September 16, 2015** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl and Dirk Reek** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [ ]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [ ]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Knowledge*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to gain a broad understanding of the concept of Christology in the New Testament.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* 1. Can a student demonstrate the centrality of the mission and work of Jesus in a study and/or an application of a Biblical text?2. Does the student employ the appropriate terminology regarding the person and work of Jesus Christ? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Written assignment
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Written assignment
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Upon completion of the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters, the assignments will be sent to the department for assessment after the Spring 2016 semester.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Upon completion of the Fall 2015 and Spring 2016 semesters, the assignments will be sent to the department for assessment after the Spring 2016 semester.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  See attached document regarding scoring rubric.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  See attached document regarding scoring rubric.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). If the scoring rubric for both the alternative and the traditional written assignments score an average of 3, then the department will be satisfied that the alternative delivery reflects the same content quality related to the concept of Christology as the traditional method. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Date: September 28, 2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 10/6/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 10/6/15** |

REL 131 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Rel 131 Alternative Format: Dual Credit Department: Theology Date: 9-8-16** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Charles Blanco, Mark Meehl, Paul Holtorf** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Scoring rubric*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).The score for the Alternative Delivery assignment was within the average of 3 and in keeping with the traditional mode regarding the same assignment. Therefore, the department is satisfied that the Alternative Delivery re: Rel 131 is the same in content and quality as the traditional mode of delivery re: the concept of Christology.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1. Can a student demonstrate the centrality of the mission and work of Jesus in a study and/or an application of a Biblical text?2. Does the student employ the appropriate terminology regarding the person and work of Jesus Christ?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* One artifact was assessed using the five items (see attached scoring rubric) on a Likert scale of 1 (fails to meet outcome), 3 (meets outcome), and 5 (exceeds outcome). The score for all five items was a 5, signifying that the assignment exceeded the outcome.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  Related to the student outcome and the comparability of delivery modes--alternative and traditional--the content related to the outcome is the same in both delivery modes.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) None5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).**I: Traditional-3.6/Alternative-5****II: Traditional-3.9/Alternative-5****III: Traditional-3.2/Alternative-5****IV: Traditional-2.9/Alternative-5****V: Traditional-3.7/Alternative-5** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 9-7-16*How were the results shared?* Met as a department*Who were results shared with?* Charles Blanco, Mark Meehl, Terence Groth, Russ Sommerfeld, David Coe, Paul Holtorf |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The department was pleased with the assessment outcome based on the artifacts collected. The results will be shared with the Dual Credit Instructor, affirming the instructor re: Rel 131.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* None*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Paul Holtorf Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/9/16Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/9/19** |

REL 131 – Plan – Summer Online

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Rel 131 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected:****Department: Theology Date: April 28, 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, and Mark Meehl** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Knowledge*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to gain a broad understanding of the concept of Christology in the New Testament.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)*      1. Can a student demonstrate the centrality of the mission and work of Jesus in a study and/or an application of a Biblical text?2. Does the student employ the appropriate terminology regarding the person and work of Jesus Christ? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Written assignment
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Written assignment
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Within Blackboard, students will submit their written assignments either as a pdf or a Word document.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Since I teach the same course with the same assignment, I will be able to access to the data from the traditional semester.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  The analysis of the assignment will follow the requirements of the assignment as explained in the course guide.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  See 1.a.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). A mean score from the written assignment from the alternative delivery format will be compared with the mean score from the written assignment from the traditional delivery format.If the mean scores are within 10-15% points between the alternative and traditional delivery formats, then the outcomes are comparable. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Date: April 28, 2016** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 5/10/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: revisions made to analysis of artifacts Submitter notified of approval: 5/10/16** |

REL 131 – Executive Summary – Summer Online

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Rel 131 Alternative Format: Summer TermDepartment: Theology Date: 7/20/16** |
| **Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* See attached scoring rubric.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).If the scores from the writing assignment in the Alternative Delivery are within a range of a 3-4 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, falling in the range between 3-4 in the traditional delivery method, then the analysis will have revealed comparability of the two methods.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*1. Can a student demonstrate the centrality of the mission and work of Jesus in a study and/or an application of a Biblical text?2. Does the student employ the appropriate terminology regarding the person and work of Jesus Christ?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Six artifacts were collected from the Alternative Delivery course. The following results are listed (Alt. Deliv./Trad. Deliv.):Item 1: 3.33/3.6Item 2: 4/3.9Item 3: 3.33/3.2Item 4: 4.33/2.9Item 5: 4.33/3.7*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The scores from the writing assignment in the Alternative Delivery were within the range of 3-4. These results are interpreted to mean that the methods employed in the Alternative Delivery Summer Term is similar to and as effective as in the Traditional Delivery semester. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) na5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The outcomes indicate that the Alternative Delivery semester is very comparable with the Traditional Delivery semester. There is no loss of course effectiveness or student outcome.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 7/20/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Theology department members considered the results.Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The results of the Alternative Delivery assessment indicate that no changes need to be made in the Alternative Delivery semester for Rel 131 in future Summer Terms.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* On the basis of the assessment it is anticipated that students will continue to benefit from taking Rel 131 in the Alternative Delivery semester of Summer Term, and that advisors can encourage students to regard this Alternative Delivery course a viable option in meeting this criterion for appropriate program and major fields of study.*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Paul Holtorf Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/29/16 Submitter notified/additional action needed: 7/29/16 BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/29/16** |

SociologySOC 101 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
|  **Course: Soc 101 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: dual credit****Department: Human and social sciences Date: 9/29/15** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Kathy Miller, Bernie Tonjes** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? communicate subject related knowledge*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. communicate subject related knowledge
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* Do students understand the main theories and concepts in sociology? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* test
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).test
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* test scores will be submitted
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).test scores will be collected
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Scores will be averaged
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Scores will be averaged

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). compare the average scores between the traditional and alternative delivery classes |
|  |
| **Submitted by: kathy miller Date: 9/29/15** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/30/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 9/30/15** |

SOC 101 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: soc 101 Alternative Format: dual credit Dept.:HSS Date: 09/12/16** |
| **Members**) **involved with analysis of artifacts: bernie tonjes** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* mean of students' test scores and then did a t test*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).compared the mean score of dual credit tests from the nontraditional format with traditional format mean scores  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* There should not be a statistically significant difference in the mean scores from tests given to both the nontraditional format and traditional format classes*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The mean score for the nontraditional format was 16.57 and 19.62 for the traditional format so there was a statistically significant difference. *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The mean score for the nontraditional format was lower than the traditional format at a significant level. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) I compared the 20 test scores from the nontraditional students compared to a random sample of 50 scores from the 77 traditional students and did a t test. 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The mean for test scores of the nontraditional format was significantly lower than mean score for the traditional format**  |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 9/2/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* via email from Jane Heineke*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Nancy Elwell |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* I will need to talk to and work with the classroom teacher in the nontraditional format and see what subject areas need addressed or strengthened in order to be comparable to the tradiitonal format class. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Mean scores in the nontraditional format will be comparable with the traditional format and there will not be a difference in mean scores at a statistically significant level.*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). na |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: kathy miller** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/26/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/26/16** |

SpanishSpanish 101 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
|  **Course: Span 101 Alt Format: dual credit Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages Date: 15 Sept. 2015** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Jerrald Pfabe, Lindsey Morris, Jill Greff, Paul Kollmorgen, Rob Seder, Jan Riofrio, Katie Lane, Kim Lavado, Kristin Freeman, Emily Meier** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Uses of verbs in the present and preterite tenses; uses of "ser" and "estar"; uses of "por" and "para." From departmental assessment matrix #8. Skills for communication .*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. 1. Conjugate correctly verbs in the present and preterite tenses. 2. Use "ser" and "estar" in the correct contexts. 3. Use "por" and "para" appropriately.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* 1. Can student correctly use the present and preterite tenses in Spanish? 2. Can the student correctly use the verbs "ser" and "estar"? 3. Can the student correctly use the prepositions "por" and "para." |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* A short exam on the two verb tenses, on ser and estar, and on por and para.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).These students will take the identical exam..
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* By the dual credit teacher who will send the materials to Concordia.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).By the on-campus instructor.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Each item in the exam will be marked correct or incorrect and a percentage grade given.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Each item in the exam will be marked correct or incorrect and a percentage grade given.
	3. 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). The %s of As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs will be compared betwee the traditioanl (CUNE) classes and dual credit classes.
 |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Jerrald K. Pfabe Date: 9/14/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/14/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: Clarification of analysis requested - 9/14/14 Submitter notified of approval: 9/15/15** |

Spanish 101 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Span 101 Alt. Format: dual credit Depart: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages Date: 7 Sept. 2016** |
| **Members**) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Jerrald Pfabe, Lilndsey Morris, Mill Greff, Paul Kollmorgen, Rob Seder, Jan Riofrio, Katie Lane, Kim Lavado, Kristie Freeman, Emily Meier** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* We administered a common examination in the traditional setting and in the dual credit high schools. The exam included: use of verbs in the present and preterite tenses; uses of "ser" and "estar"; uses of "por" and "para"*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).The exams in the traditional setting and in the dual credit high schools were graded and given a percentage grade.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1) Can the student conjugate correctly verbs in the present and preterite tenses. 2) Can the student correctlyu use the verbs "ser" and "estar"? 3) Can the correctly use the prepositions "por" and "para"?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* We compared "mean" exam results of Concordia U. students with "mean" results from the dual credit high schools. The mean grade for Concordia U. students was 81%. In every case, the mean scores for the dual credit school was high.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Concordia U**. Traditional setting- 81 |  |  |
| **Dual Credit High Schools**: 1–85 2–85 3–85 4-92 5–84 6-92 |  |  |

*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The results indicate that on the specific items examined, the students in the dual credit high schools were exceeding the outcomes of Concordia U. students. We can conclude that the quality of instruction and student responses more than meet the requirement of comparability.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) na5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **See #3 above.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:*Summer 2016 *How were the results shared?)* through computer files*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Vicki Anderson and Bernie Tonjes. |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* It would appear that no specific changes are necessary.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* n.a.*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). None is necessary. |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: 9/7/16** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/9/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/9/16** |

 |  |  |  |  |
| Spanish 102 Plan – Dual Credit

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Span 102 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: dual credit****Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages Date: 11 Sept. 2015** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Jerrald Pfabe, Lindsey Morris, Jill Greff, Paul Kollmorgan, Rob Seder, Jan Riofrio, Chris Oerman, Katie Lane, Kim Lavado, Kristin Freeman, Emily Meier** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Use of preterite and imperfect tenses and indicative and subjunctive moods. Departmental Assessment Matrix #8: Skills for communication.*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. distinguish between the correct uses of the preterite and imperfect tenses and the uses of the indicative and subjunctive moods.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* 1. Can student correctly use the preterirte and imperfect tenses in Spanish? 2. Can the student correctly use the indicative and subjunctive moods in Spanish |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* A short exam on verb tenses in the past and on the indicative and subjunctive moods.
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).These students will take the identical exam..
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* By the dual credit teacher who will send the materials to Concordia.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).By the on-campus instructor.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Each item in the exam will be marked correct or incorrect and a percentage grade given.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Each item in the exam will be marked correct or incorrect and a percentage grade given.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). The % of As, Bs, Cs, Ds, and Fs will be compared between traditional (CUNE) and Dual Credit classes. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Jerrald K. Pfabe Date: 9/11/2015** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 9/14/15** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: Clarification of comparability requested.** **Submitter notified of approval: 9/15/15** |

Spanish 102 – Executive Summary – Dual Credit |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Span 102 Alternative Format: dual credit Department: Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages Date: 7 Sept. 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Jerrald Pfabe, Lindsey Morris, Jill Greff, Paul Kollmorgen, Rob Seder, Jan Riofrio, Katie Lane, Kim Lavado, Kristin Freeman, Emily Meier** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Students in the traditional format and in the dual credit classrooms were given the identical common exam which the uses of the preterite and imperfect tenses and the subjunctive mood in Spanish.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).Each exam received a percentage grade on the exam. We calculated mean scores for the on-campus class and for each of the dual credit schools. We compared the results. See the related file.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students correctly use the preterite and imperfect tenses? Can students correctly us the indicative and subjunctive moods in Spanish?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The mean score on the exam in the on-campus class was 71%. All of the dual credit schools, with two exceptions, exceeded the mean score of the on-campus class.*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The results indicated that the majority of students in the dual credit classrooms were able to use these verb tenses and moods at a level higher than the on-campus students.*4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) na5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **See the interpretation section, #3.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 9/6/16 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* via email *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Vicki Anderson and Bernie Tonjes |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* Overall it does not appear that changes are needed in most of the dual credit schools. We probably need to contact two schools where the mean was below that of the traditional class.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* I hope the results can be higher both on campus and in the two dual credit schools.*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). Nothing. |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: 9/9/16** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 9/9/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 9/9/16** |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| THEOLOGYTHEO 210 – Plan – Summer

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Theo 210 Alt Format: Hybrid: 2 weeks face to face; 1 week online****Department: Theology Date: April 28, 2016** |
| **Members involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Charles Blanco, Terence Groth, Paul Holtorf, and Mark Meehl** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Knowledge*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to articulate a Biblical understanding of the term vocation
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)*      1. Can a student demonstrate a Biblical definition of the term vocation?2. Does the student employ the appropriate terms when providing examples within the understanding of vocation? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Written assignment
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Written assignment
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Within Blackboard, students will submit their written assignments either as a pdf or a Word document.
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).In consultation with a departmental colleague who teaches the same course.
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Written assignment will be scored based on the requirements in the course guide.
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Written assignment will be scored based on the requirements in the course guide.

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). A mean score from the written assignment from the alternative delivery format will be compared with the mean score from the written assignment from the traditional delivery format.If the mean scores are within 10-15% points between the alternative and traditional delivery formats, then the outcomes are comparable. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Paul Holtorf Date: April 28, 2016** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 5/2/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 5/2/16** |

THEO 210 – Executive Summary – Summer  |  |  |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Theo 210 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: Summer Term****Department: Theology Date: 7/20/16** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* The assignment identified was the vocational interview conducted during the traditional delivery method and during the alternative method. The mean score of the interview from both the traditional and alternative methods will be analyzed.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).If the mean scores are within 10-15% points between the alternative and traditional delivery formats, then the outcomes were comparable.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1. Can a student demonstrate a Biblical definition of the term vocation?2. Does the student employ the appropriate terms when providing examples within the understandings of vocation?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* Fourteen artifacts were collected from the Alternative Delivery course. The following results are listed (Alt. Deliv./Trad. Deliv.):Mean score: 98% / 94%*3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The mean scores from the assignment in the Alternative Delivery were within the range of 10-15% points. These results are interpreted to mean that the methods employed in the Alternative Delivery Summer Term is similar to and as effective as in the Traditional Delivery semester. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The outcomes indicate that the Alternative Delivery semester is very comparable with the Traditional Delivery semester. There is no loss of course effectiveness or student outcome.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 7/20/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Theology department members considered the results.*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The results of the Alternative Delivery assessment indicate that no changes need to be made in the Alternative Delivery semester for Theo 210 in future Summer Terms.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* On the basis of the assessment it is anticipated that students will continue to benefit from taking Theo 210 in the Alternative Delivery semester of Summer Term, and that advisors can encourage students to regard this Alternative Delivery course a viable option in meeting this criterion for appropriate program and major fields of study.*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Paul Holtorf** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/29/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: 7/29/16** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/29/16** |

 |  |  |  |  |
| THEO 251 – Plan – Summer

|  |
| --- |
|  **Course: Theo 251 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: May Term****Department: Thelology Date: May 2016** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with the development of this Assessment Plan: Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld** |
| **Course Requirements:** 1. *Does the alternative delivery course meet credit hour requirements? (135 clock hours).* Yes
	1. A credit hour audit is attached. (Dual credit – must attach one for each instructor) [x]
2. *Are the alternative course requirements comparable to the requirements of the course offered in the traditional format?*
	1. Course guide is attached for the alternative format. (Dual credit – must attach on for each instructor) [x]
	2. Course guide is attached for the traditional format. Check one:

 [x]  attached OR [ ]  course not available in traditional format |
| **Student Outcome:** 1. *What student outcome will be assessed? Knowledge*
2. **State as follows: Students should be able to [action verb] [something**]. Students should be able to explore a Pauline biblical text using the methods and hermeneutical principles demonstrated throughout the course.
 |
| **Question**: *What specific question(s) are you attempting to answer through assessing this student outcome? (What are you trying to find out? There may be more than one question, but no more than three.)* What is involved in exploring a biblical text to develop an accurate interpretation of its meaning and to apply it to a contemporary setting? |
| **Methodology** 1. **Student Outcome** - *OBJECT\**
	1. *What student artifact from the alternative course will be used to assess the outcome?* Exegetical
	2. *What student artifact from the traditional course will be used to assess the outcome*? (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Exegetical
2. *Collecting data:*
	1. *How will data be collected from the alternative format course?* Scores from the Exegetical
	2. *How will data be collected from the traditional format course?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format).Scores from the Exegetical
 |
| **Analysis of Artifacts:** 1. **Student Outcome:** *PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\****
	1. **Alternative delivery-** *How will the artifacts be analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used):*  Rubrics attached
	2. **Student Outcome – Traditional delivery -** *How will the artifacts will analyzed (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used)* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format)*:*  Rubrics attached

 2) ***COMPARABILITY*** - *How you will determine if the outcomes of the two are comparable?* (note “na” if the course is not available in a traditional format). If the scores from the Exegetical project in the Alternative Delivery are within a range of 10-15% of Traditional Delivery, then the analysis will have revealed comparability of the two methods. |
|  |
| **Submitted by: Charles Blanco Date: 5/6/16** |
| **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (Date): 5/10/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action: na Submitter notified of approval: 5/10/16** |

THEO 251 – Executive Summary – Summer |  |  |  |  |
|

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Theo 251 Alternative Format: Explain “Other” if selected: May Term****Department: Theology Date: 5/27/16** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld** |
| **See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for:** *a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology*  |
| **Analysis of artifacts:** *1).* Student Outcome*:* ***PERFORMANCE CRITERIA****\* - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* See attached Exegetical Study Steps with point values assigned to each step.*2).* **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable?* (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).If the scores from the Exegetical project in the Alternative Delivery are within a range of 10-15% of Traditional Delivery, then the analysis will have revealed comparability of the two methods.  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* What is involved in exploring a biblical text to develop an accurate interpretation of its meaning and to apply it to a contemporary setting?*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The average score on the Exegetical project for Theo 251-01 & 251-02 during the Fall Semester of 2015 (total number of students = 46) was 81.2 out of 100 points possible. The average score on the Exegetical project for Theo 251 during the Alternative Deliver May Term semester of 2016 (total number of students = 7) was 84.9 our of 100 points possible. *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The scores from the Exegetical project in the Alternative Delivery were within a range of 10-15% of Traditional Delivery (4.6%). These results are interpreted to mean that the methods employed in the Alternative Delivery semester are similarly as effective as in the Traditional Delievery semester. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*)      5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). **The outcomes indicate that the Alternative Delivery semester is very comparable with the Traditional Delivery semester. There is no loss of course effectiveness or student outcome.** |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 5/27/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Theology department members considered the results.*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Paul Holtorf, Mark Meehl, Terry Groth, Russ Summerfeld |
| **Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:** *1.* **ACTION\*-** *How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?* The results of the Alternative Delivery assessment indicate that no changes need to be made in the Alternative Delivery semester for Theo 251 in future May Term semesters.*2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* On the basis of the assessment it is anticipated that students will continue to benefit from taking Theo 251 in the Alternative Delivery semester of May Term, and that advisors can encourage students to regard this Alternative Delivery course a viable option in meeting this criterion for appropriate program and major fields of study.*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). None |
| **Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Charles Blanco** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/24/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed: na BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/24/16** |

 |  |  |  |  |