

#4. 2017 – 18 Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: History, Geography and Criminal Justice American Government	Date: 6-19-18	Course(s):
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: Tobin Beck, Steve Vaughan, Nathan Bassett		
See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>		
Analysis of artifacts:		
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). See attached rubric.</i>		
2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). The outcomes were compared using a rubric to assess how well students applied principles of government in a 1,000-word essay. Thirty representative essays were compared, including 10 each from students in DC-1 from the fall of 2017, DC-2 from the spring of 2018, and CUNE American Government class PS111 from the spring of 2018.</i>		
Summary of RESULTS*:		
1). <i>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?</i>		
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The results show that students in the DC-1 and DC-2 classes as well as students in CUNE PS111 learned how the institutions of American government function and interact, and learned how to apply that theoretical knowledge to an examination and analysis of contemporary issues.</i>		
When 10 representative essays from DC-1 were scored according to the seven categories of the rubric, the 10 essays had an overall mean of 3.4 out of 4. The overall mean was a composite average of mean results in these seven categories: 3.6 for integration of knowledge, 3.6 for topic focus, 3.7 for depth of discussion and analysis, 3.7 for cohesiveness, 3.4 for conventions of grammar, 3.5 for sources and 2.7 for citations.		
When 10 representative essays from DC-2 were scored according to the seven categories of the rubric, the results showed an overall mean of 3.3 out of 4. The overall mean was a composite of mean results in these seven categories: 3.2 for integration of knowledge, 3.4 for topic focus, 3.1 for depth of discussion and analysis, 3.3 for cohesiveness, 3.1 for conventions of grammar, 3.7 for sources, and 3.4 for citations.		
When 10 representative essays from CUNE PS111 were evaluated, the overall mean for the class was 3.5. That was an average for mean results of 3.6 for integration of knowledge, 3.6 for topic focus, 3.6 for depth of discussion and analysis, 3.6 for cohesiveness, 3.5 for conventions of grammar, 3.5 for sources and 3.3 for citations.		
3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results show that students were able to demonstrate an understanding of theoretical knowledge about the institutions of the executive, judicial and legislative branches of American Government and apply that knowledge to an analysis of real-life issues. The results also showed that the two DC classes were similar in their outcomes to those of the CUNE PS111 class.</i>		

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?** The overall average scores of dual credit students were comparable to those of CUNE students. Among the seven categories of the rubric, results were similar in all categories except category 7, citations, where DC-1's mean score of 2.7 was 18 percent below that of CUNE's mean of 3.3 and 21 percent below DC-2's mean of 3.4.

	Overall	Knowledge	Focus	Depth	Cohesion	Grammar	Sources	Citation
DC1	3.4	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.4	3.5	2.7
DC2	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.1	3.3	3.1	3.7	3.4
DC mean	3.35	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.25	3.6	3.0
CUNE	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.3

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 6-19-18

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

Who were results shared with? (List names): Tobin Beck, Nathan Bassett, Steve Vaughan, Jane Heinicke.

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?* Before the start of the fall semester, I plan to discuss with the instructors of DC-1 and DC-2 the pros and cons of the essay assessment, as well as their observations and insights on the teaching of the class. Both instructors are experienced educators whose input has been very valuable in shaping the course. We also will discuss and share techniques and lesson plans that work well in engaging and motivating students. I also will discuss with the instructor of DC-1 additional strategies for improving student 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 able to integrate 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 theory, but that the course equips them with the tools to be informed and active citizens who participate in government.

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: Tobin Beck on 6-19-18

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/26/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18