

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Human and Social Science **Date:** 06/14/18 **Course(s):** PSY 101/ Dual Credit

Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:

Dual Credit

Members (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts:** Kathy Miller, Sara Brady, Thad Warren

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).* Content knowledge in 12 topic areas of psychology was assessed in the dual credit and on-campus PSY 101 Introduction to Psychology classes. An exam consisted of 50 multiple choice questions in 12 specific psychology topic areas (see attachment). The 50 question multiple choice exam and answer sheets were emailed to instructors to administer. The completed exams were sent to the chair of the Human & Social Science department to be scored.

2). **COMPARABILITY** – *How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared).* Statistical comparison (t-test and ANOVA) were computed for CUNE vs. Dual credit by topic and overall score.

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* 1. Do students in Dual Credit PSY 101 classes retain knowledge of the field of psychology presented to them throughout the course, as measured through an assessment at the end of the educational experience?
2. Do students in Dual Credit compared to on-campus PSY 101 classes retain comparable knowledge in the field of Psychology on the same measure?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

Total Percent Correct:

An analysis of variance was conducted on the assessment scores using the percent correct as the dependent variable and the 10 separate courses as the independent variable. The analysis revealed that the scores significantly varied by course, $F(9, 243) = 15.66, p < .001, \eta^2 = .367$ (see Figure 1). Scores ranged from 56.5% to 91.8%. Bonferonni post hoc analyses revealed that the six traditional courses did not significantly vary from one another, $ps > .05$. These scores ranged from 56.5% to 65.4%. Therefore, these six traditional courses were combined into one group = traditional. In addition, two out of the four dual credit courses were not significantly different from the six traditional courses, $ps > .05$.

Percentage Correct Across Content Areas:

Percentage correct for the content areas were calculated for each course and are presented in Table 1. To simplify the analysis, dual credit and traditional courses were combined into their respective categories. A *t* test analysis was conducted to determine whether there were mean differences in the percentages correct across content area (see Table 2). The analysis revealed that dual credit courses scored significantly higher than traditional CUNE courses, $ps < .01$. Dual credit courses on average scored 75% or higher on six out of the 12 content areas, whereas traditional CUNE courses only scored on average 75% or higher on two out of the 12 content areas. For the total score, CUNE scored on average 59.8%, whereas dual credit courses scored 75.8%..

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Overall, students in the dual credit PSY 101 courses retained knowledge of the field of psychology, as measured through the end-of-term assessment. Two out of four dual credit courses were significantly comparable to the on-campus courses. If anything, dual credit courses outperformed on-campus PSY 101 courses, based upon the assessment.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* There were questions regarding the variance of the data for one dual credit instructor. Specifically, this dual credit instructor scored above a 90%, which was significantly higher than all other courses. Questions about whether or not some dual credit instructors knowingly prepare students for answering the assessment correctly have been raised.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** Overall, traditional and two (out of four) alternative format courses were similar on the overall percentage correct. The other two alternative format courses were significantly higher than the other dual credit and on-campus courses. Regarding percentage correct across content area, dual credit courses consistently outscored on-campus courses when aggregating dual credit and traditional courses together.

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 06/14/18

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Face-to-face meetings, as well as email.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Thad Warren, Sara Brady, and Kathy Miller

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?

2. **IMPACT***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Teaching: A review of instructional practices with couple of Dual Credit instructors appear to be teaching to the test or reviewing material right before the assessment. This could be due to student population and instructional time but review should take place. Assessment: Review of the instrument is recommended for the next assessment cycle. Program: Overall the data would indicate that the program is covering the material at an adequate level in both formats. The course: Outcomes are targeted and seem to be covered across the differing modalities and offerings Review of course guides and outcomes are recommended for the next assessment cycle.

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). Review of instruction via visit and course material is recommended.

Submitted via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: Thaddeus Warren

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/28/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

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