#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery
Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Business Administration   **Date: 14 June 2018   Course(s): ECON 101 & 102**   **Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit**
Members (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Tim Heidorn, Lowell Miller & Glen Worthington**
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 attached report   *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). This is an assessment of whether ttraditional and alternative met the minumum standards of 80% of students or more with correct answers to the questions.
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 percieve as social equity, or fairness?   *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* The student populations in the traditional delivery did not meet the criteria, but students in alternative delivery did meet the assessment criteria (see attached report for details)   *3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The main problem with the traditional delivery assessment was on the first exam which typically has very low scores.   *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) Experience with the subject of economics appears to be a prerequisite for assessment.   *5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare**? **Alternative delivery was superior to traditional delivery**|
Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date:* 6/14/18   *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* Presented to department chair.   *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Andy Langewisch, Lowell Miller, 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?*   IAssessthe traditional delivery students starting with Exam 2. Avoid assessment on Exam 1.   *2.* **IMPACT****- What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*   New criteria will be assessed.   *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): 6/14/18**
Submitter notified/additional action needed: na   **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na**   **Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18**

Assessment Summary
Macro & Microconomics
2016 – 2017

The major assessment goal for economics students at Concordia Seward for the 2017-18 academic year was understanding what economic efficiency is. Students in the traditional delivery mode failed to meet standard, but students in the alternative delivery modes met and exceeded the standard (with one minor exception).

Assessment Criteria
In order to be considered a success, students must perform better than average on the six questions listed on the last page of this summary. The overall average exam score of students in the traditional delivery course of Microeconomics (ECON 102) in the 2017-18 school year was 75.6%. 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 Macroeconomics (ECON 101) 2017-18 Concordia University Nebraska – Traditional Delivery (n=99)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
3	I	46%	80%	-34%
3	II	48%	80%	-32%
10 & 11	III	79%	80%	-1%
12 & 13	IV	91%	80%	+11%
15	V	91%	80%	+11%
16 & 17	VI	93%	80%	+13%

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 and III. The 99 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. It is notable that the biggest failure happened on the first exam of the semester. For many students this is the first exam of their college career as well as the first exam in Economics. Grades are generally very low (68%, D average) and these two questions are among the most difficult on the exam. The last three questions, which are on the third exam of the semester produced acceptable results. This can be interpreted as success with experience.

Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment AP Macroeconomics (Blended) 2016-17 High School 1 – Alternative Delivery (n=5)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
3	I	100%	80%	+20%
3	II	100%	80%	+20%
10 & 11	III	100%	80%	+20%
12 & 13	IV	100%	80%	+20%
15	V	80%	80%	0%
16 & 17	VI	100%	80%	+20%

Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment AP Macroeconomics (Blended) 2016-17 High School 2 – Alternative Delivery (n=20)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
3	I	85%	80%	+5%
3	II	75%	80%	-5%
10 & 11	III	80%	80%	0%
12 & 13	IV	100%	80%	+20%
15	V	80%	80%	0%
16 & 17	VI	95%	80%	+15%

The alternative delivery courses, taught face-to-face at two separate Lutheran High Schools, the students met or exceeded the criteria on all but question II (if the two samples are combined [n=25] the standard was met or exceeded on all six questions) This was an improvement over a similar assessment from the 2016 – 17 school year. The students in Alternative Delivery demonstrated that they understand the concept of economic efficiency.

		% CORRECT			Difference	
CHAPTER	QUESTION	CUNE (n=99)	H.S. 1 (n=5)	H.S. 2 (n=20)	H.S. 1	H.S. 2
3	I	46%	100%	85%	+54%	+39%
3	II	48%	100%	75%	+52%	+27%
10 & 11	III	79%	100%	80%	+21%	+1%
12 & 13	IV	91%	100%	100%	+9%	+9%
15	V	91%	80%	80%	-9%	-9%
16 & 17	VI	93%	100%	95%	+7%	+2%

(Table title: Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment — Comparison Of Traditional versus Alternative Delivery — 2017-18)

CUNE is the abbreviation for Concordia University; Seward Nebraska

Difference H.S. 1 = H.S 1% minus CUNE %

Difference H.S. 2 = H.S 2% minus CUNE %

Students in alternative delivery classes performed better on the assessment than the Concordia college students on every question except question V. 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. The difference on question 5 is likely a different emphasis by the three separate instructors, although the alternative delivery students still performed to the standard on this question.

Conclusion & Recommendations

Economics instructors in both traditional and alternative delivery modes will continue to emphasize the concept of efficiency, but we will move on to new assessment criteria in the 2018-19 school year. In the traditional university class, the instructor will avoid assessing with questions on the first exam. Most of the class at CUNE is made up of Freshmen and they are often bamboozled with their first exam in economics. These inexperienced students typically improve markedly on subsequent exams. From now on, we will ask assessment questions starting with Exam 2.