

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Mathematics Date: 5/23/18 Course(s): Math 186
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:
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). A four point rubric was applied to the outcome. The four categories are "Exceeds Expectations", "Meets Expectations", "Needs Improvements", and "Unacceptable".</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). na</i>
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students apply techniques of integration?</i> 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The only artifact was determined to have met expectations.</i> 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Since there was only one dual credit student for this course it would be inappropriate to make any broad inferences.</i> 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) none</i> 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? <i>unable to compare due to sample size of one</i>
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date: 5/23/18</i> <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) electronically</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names): Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, Andy Langewisch</i>
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION *- <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year? no specific action will be taken at this time</i> 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? none</i> 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <i>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</i>
Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: A Langewisch
Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/7/18
Submitter notified/additional action needed: na
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na
Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18