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

|  |
| --- |
| **Course: soc 101 Alternative Format:**  **Explain “Other” if selected: dual credit****Department:** **human and social sciences Date:** **09/12/16** |
| **Members** (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:** **bernie tonjes** |
| **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).* mean of students' test scores and then did a t test*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 the mean score of dual credit tests from the nontraditional format with traditional format mean scores  |
| **Summary of RESULTS\*:** *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* There should not be a statistically significant difference in the mean scores from tests given to both the nontraditional format and traditional format classes*2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The mean score for the nontraditional format was 16.57 and 19.62 for the traditional format so there was a statistically significant difference. *3).* ***INTERPRETATION****\* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*  The mean score for the nontraditional format was lower than the traditional format at a significant level. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) I compared the 20 test scores from the nontraditional students compared to a random sample of 50 scores from the 77 traditional students and did a t test. 5). ***How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare*?** (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).**The mean for test scores of the nontraditional format was significantly lower than mean score for the traditional format**  |
| **Sharing of Results:** *When were results shared? Date:* 9/2/16*How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* via email from Jane Heineke*Who were results shared with? (List names):* Nancy Elwell |
| **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 need to talk to and work with the classroom teacher in the nontraditional format and see what subject areas need addressed or strengthened in order to be comparable to the tradiitonal format class. *2.* **IMPACT\*-** *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION\*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Mean scores in the nontraditional format will be comparable with the traditional format and there will not be a difference in mean scores at a statistically significant level.*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:** **kathy miller** **Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):** **9/26/16** |
| **Submitter notified/additional action needed:** **na** **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** **na** **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:** **9/26/16** |