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

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: Math 122, Intro to Stats Alternative Format:**  **Explain “Other” if selected:**  **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** |