

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Business & Math Management	Date: 6/19/17	Course(s): BUS 343 Operations		
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:				
Condensed (3 credits fewer than 15 weeks)	Select	Select	Select	Select
Select				

Members (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:**
Langewisch, Beck, Heidorn

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 Learning Management System recorded the percentages correct for each student for each chapter over 18 chapters, keeping separate scores for quantitative and conceptual problems. The students' scores were averaged over the 18 chapters.

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).* Comparing the results over time, we can assess visually if the results are trending and if they meet the 80% correct target or not.

Summary of RESULTS*:
1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can the students average an 80% success rate or higher with quantitative and conceptual problems?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The averages for the various terms are in the table below, and have been charted in the attachment.

Term	OM Concepts, F2F	OM Concepts Online	OM Quant., F2F	OM Quant., Online
201130		78		85
201210	85		94	
201230		82		94
201310	88		90	
201410		88		94
201410	89		88	
201430		80		68
201530		90		76
201610	90		91	
201630		94		89

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* Since 2011, the face-to-face students have consistently averaged 80% or higher for both quantitative and conceptual measures. The online students performed less well in the 201130, 201430, and 201530 terms, more often with the quantitative problems; but comparably with the conceptual questions.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* The online classes have some smaller sample sizes of 9, 4, 6, 3, 8, and 5. The face-to-face classes were of size 19, 30, 33, and 25. Thus besides some random noise there are some sample size issues.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Results for a few of the terms suggest the online students were not doing as well with quantitative problems. Recent results, however, show that they are doing as just as well or even better.**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 6/19/17

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email

Who were results shared with? (List names): Beck, Heidorn, Langewisch

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 lower scores in quantitative problems were noted some time ago, and the professor added additional screencast and email support to the course to help the students get access to the proper tools to solve these problems. These actions appear to have worked.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* We expect comparable results into the future.

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: Langewisch

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/21/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/21/17