

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

Course: Math 122, Intro to Stats Alternative Format: Online Explain "Other" if selected:

Department: Math Date: Summer, 2018

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Brian Albright, Ed Reinke

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). We compared average test scores of the online students to average scores from college students in our traditional face-to-face classes.

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). We compared average scores.

Summary of **RESULTS***:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Do students demonstrate understanding of basical statistical concepts covered on tests

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. Online students take the same 4 tests as students in Brian Albright's face-to-face classes. The average scores from the online summer class and the face-to-face classes are shown below:

Online - 82.15%
Face-to-face - 84%

The average scores are very similar. This indicates that online students understand the concepts nearly as well as face-to-face students.

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The tests indicate that online students perform as well as traditional on-campus face-to-face classes. The average online score was slightly lower in part because the class was small (only 7 students) are two of them were weak students requiring lots of help.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) (see the summary)

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** (note "na" if delivery modes were not compared). **Very similar**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 8/1/28

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Met as a team

Who were results shared with? (List names): Brian Albright and Ed Reinke

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? Minor refinements and improvements will be made.

2. **IMPACT***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Scores will continue to be similar to face-to-face classes.

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: 8/1/18

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 8/2/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 8/2/18