

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Business & Math Date: 7/27/16 Course(s): ECON 101/102
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: Andy Langewisch, Tim 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). Correct answers on questions addressing economic efficiency from select exams were computed for CUNE and Dual Credit classes. Average % correct was then computed.

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). Average % of correct answers were compared between CUNE and Dual Credit classes. %s were also compared to a baseline of 80% correct.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Do students understand the difference between economic efficiency and what people often perceive as social equity, or fairness?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.

The major assessment goal for economics students at Concordia Seward for the 2016-17 academic year was understanding what economic efficiency is. Students in both traditional and alternative delivery modes failed to meet that standards laid out.

Assessment Criteria

In order to be considered a success, students must perform better than average on the six exam questions. The overall average exam score of students in the traditional delivery course of Microeconomics (ECON 102) in the 2016-17 school year was 74.7%. Students must score a minimum of 80% on each of the six questions in order to be considered better than average.

Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment Microeconomics (ECON 102) 2016-17 Concordia University Nebraska – Traditional Delivery (n=92)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
3	I	61%	80%	-19%
3	II	58%	80%	-22%
10 & 11	III	91%	80%	+9%
12 & 13	IV	76%	80%	-4%
13 Web	V	61%	80%	-19%
14 & 15	VI	88%	80%	+8%

In the traditional delivery course, taught with a lecture format at Concordia University Nebraska, students did not meet the minimum requirements on questions I, II, IV and V. The 92 students in this population did not meet the criteria for understanding economic efficiency. The students in this population struggled in understanding the difference between allocative efficiency and productive efficiency. In addition, they did not meet the minimum standard for understanding why monopolies are inefficient and how technology increases efficiency.

Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment AP Macroeconomics (Blended) 2016-17 DUAL CREDIT High School – Alternative Delivery (n=13)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
3	I	62%	80%	-18%
3	II	69%	80%	-11%
10 & 11	III	92%	80%	+12%
12 & 13	IV	85%	80%	+5%
13 Web	V	62%	80%	-18%
14 & 15	VI	100%	80%	+20%

In the alternative delivery DUAL CREDIT course, students did not meet the minimum requirements on questions I, II, and V. The 13 students in this population did not meet the criteria for understanding economic efficiency. The students in this population struggled in understanding the difference between allocative efficiency and productive efficiency. In addition, they did not meet the minimum standard for understanding how technology increases efficiency.

Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment Comparison Of Traditional versus Alternative Delivery – DUAL CREDIT 2016-17				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT		DIFFERENCE
		CUNE (n=92)	DC (n=13)	
3	I	61%	62%	1%
3	II	58%	69%	12%
10 & 11	III	91%	92%	1%
12 & 13	IV	76%	85%	9%
13 Web	V	61%	62%	1%
14 & 15	VI	88%	100%	12%

CUNE is the abbreviation for Concordia University; Seward Nebraska
DC is the abbreviation for the DUAL CREDIT high school

Despite the wide difference in population sizes between the traditional delivery (n=92) and the alternative delivery (n=13) populations, neither population met the assessment standards. In addition, both populations struggle with the concepts of productive and allocative efficiency as well as the reasons why technological advance improves economic efficiency. **When there was a performance difference, the students at the DUAL CREDIT school performed better than the students at Concordia University Nebraska (CUNE).** This is likely a subjective difference in the two populations. An AP high school class is likely to be more selective than a university Gen-Ed class.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

Students enter an economics class with notions that results that they perceive to be “good”, “wins”, or “fair” must be efficient because the word efficiency has positive connotations. In fact, an important lesson for students is that results that are perceived as “bad”, “losses”, or “unfair” are often the more efficient results in the economic perspective¹. This message is not getting through to students in our classes at this time. For the 2017-18 school year, we will emphasize the concept of economic efficiency more in lecture sessions and with supplemental reading material. Planning for the 2017-18 improvements has been ongoing and shared with the instructors of the alternative delivery DUALCREDIT classes.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* The traditional and alternative delivery results were similar, but the statistics are impacted by large differences in population sizes and subjective qualities.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?**

Substantially similar. When there was a performance difference, the students at the DUAL CREDIT school performed better than the students at Concordia University Nebraska (CUNE).

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 7/25/17

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Presented to department chair.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Andy Langewisch, Steve Vaughan, Glen Worthington

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?* Improvements in classroom delivery of this idea and additional written material.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Students will meet criteria.

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: Tim Heidorn

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 7/27/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/27/17