

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

**Course:** PS111 American Government    **Alternative Format:** Other    **Explain "Other" if selected:**  
**Dual Credit American Government**  
**Department:**    **History, Geography and Criminal Justice**                      **Date:** 6-20-17

**Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:** Tobin Beck, Steve Vaughan, Nathan Bassett

**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 the attached 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). An option was provided to instructors to use a 1,000-word essay or a group project essay as the analysis tool. Steve Vaughan of Lutheran Jr. and Sr. High School in Rockford, Ill., chose the 1,000-word essay and Nathan Bassett of Lincoln Lutheran High School in Lincoln, Neb., chose the group project essay. The results were compared with those of the CUNE PS111 class from the spring 2017 semester.*

**Summary of RESULTS\*:**

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students explain the roles of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches of American government, particularly as applied to major contemporary societal issues?*

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The results showed that students in the two classes learned how the institutions of American government function and interact, and how to apply that theoretical knowledge to an examination and analysis of contemporary issues.

DC Class 1 provided a representative two essays. When scored according to the seven categories of the rubric, the two essays had an overall mean of 3.29 out of 4. The overall mean was a composite of results in these seven categories: 3 for integration of knowledge, 3 for topic focus, 3.5 for depth of discussion and analysis, 3.5 for cohesiveness, 4 for conventions of grammar, 2 for sources and 2 for citations.

DC Class 2 provided a representative five essays, two from his first semester class and three from his second semester class. The results showed an overall mean of 3.40 out of 4. The overall mean was a composite of results in these seven categories: integration of knowledge 3.4, topic focus 3.6, depth of discussion and analysis 3.4, cohesiveness 3.6, conventions of grammar 3.2, sources 4, and citations 3.6.

CUNE PS211 - second semester class - representative 10 essays were evaluated (out of a class of 12 students). The overall mean for the class was 3.08. That was a composite of 2.8 for integration of knowledge, 2.9 for topic focus, 3.2 for depth of discussion and analysis, 3.1 for cohesiveness, 3.2 for conventions of grammar, 3.3 for sources, and 3.1 for citations.

3). **INTERPRETATION\*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The results showed that students were able to demonstrate an understanding of theoretical knowledge about the institutions of the executive, legislative and judicial branches of American government and apply that knowledge to real-life issues.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the*

scoring tool was low) na

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).

The average scores of dual credit students were higher than those for CUNE students in all categories except sources and citations.

	Overall	Integ	Focus	Depth	Disc/Ana	Cohes	Gramm	Sourc	Citation
DC 1	3.29	3	3	3.5	3.5	3.5	4	2	2
DC 2	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.2	4	3.6
DC - Average	3.35	3.2	3.3	3.45	3.45	3.55	3.6	3	2.8
CUNE	3.08	2.8	2.9	3.2	3.1	3.2	3.2	3.3	3.1

### Sharing of Results:

*When were results shared? Date:* Bassett's were received and shared 12-13-16 and 6-1-17 by email, and Vaughan's were received 5-30-17 by email and 5-31-17 by mail and shared 6-5-17 by email.

*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* The results were shared interdepartmentally via email.

*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Tobin Beck, Jane Heinicke and Bernard 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?* I will discuss with the instructors the pros and cons of the assessment tools and listen to their insights on how the essay format is working. We also will discuss and share techniques and lesson plans that work particularly well in engaging and motivating students. I also will standardize the record-keeping among the various parties to ensure that full results are being collected and evaluated beyond representative samples. Additional support will be provided to the instructor of DC1 in the areas of sources and citations.

2. **IMPACT\***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION\* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* The results are encouraging in showing that students are engaging in the process of integrating theory with practical application. The anticipated impact is that we will continue to show students that American Government is more than just an exercise in memorization, and that the course equips them with tools for how to be informed and involved as citizens.

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: 6/20/17**

**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**