

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: BUS Date: 7/27/17 Course(s): BUS121
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:
Dual Credit Select Select Select Select Select

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Todd Johnson, Andy Langewisch, Tony Smith

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). Comprehensive final exam results comparisons. (See 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 comprehensive final exam results.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students create the basic financial statements? Can students apply the framework and the concepts of the accounting process necessary to create the basic financial statements? Can students make decisions using financial information common to business?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The Dual Credit class had a total of four students. The goal for the comprehensive final exam is that at least 70% of the students score at least 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam. In the Dual Credit class, 100% of the students scored 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam. For the Concordia University students, only 65% of the students scored 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam.

Class	Total Students	Students scoring 70% or above	Objective Met
DC1	4	4	100%
CUNE	48	31	65%
Totals	52	35	67%

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results suggest that the Dual Credit students were able to meet the objective of preparing the basic financial statements while understanding and applying the accounting concepts necessary to create and analyze the financial statements. The CUNE students did not meet the objective. Only 65% of the students were able to meet the goal of 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam. The results show that more detail is needed in the assessment criteria to help determine what areas are lacking in the education process. This is the first time we have used this comprehensive final exam for both the CUNE students and the 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) The comprehensive final exam was a multiple choice exam that included all topics covered throughout the semester. The format and length of the exam can be difficult for some students due to interpretation of the information provided in each question.

5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The dual credit course met the objective with 100% of the students scoring 70% or higher on the comprehensive final. The CUNE students did not meet the objective.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: June 28, 2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Electronic and met with Andy Langewisch

Who were results shared with? (List names): Andy Langewisch, Tim Heidorn, Curtis Beck, Andy Monnich

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?* We plan to categorize the comprehensive final exam so we can track specific areas within the accounting course that need improvement. This categorization will assist both the traditional course and the dual credit course in determining what areas require additional educational resources.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Categorizing the comprehensive final exam will allow us to focus on individual categories within the accounting course as compared to focusing on the overall score.

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 additional resources would be needed

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Todd Johnson

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 8/15/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 8/15/17