

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

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: Business Administration **Date: 5 June 2019** **Course(s): ECON 101 & 102**

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

Dual Credit **Dual Credit** **Select** **Select** **Select** **Select**

Members (must include more than course instructor only) **involved with analysis of artifacts: Tim Heidorn & 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 concepts of Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Ability and who Entrepreneurs are?*

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; It was a big miss. Students in the in alternative delivery did not meet the assessment criteria either, but they very nearly did meet it; it was a near miss (see attached report for details)*

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). For the traditional delivery, the information - some of which is not in the text book - will be delivered with written handout, as well as presented in the lecture. For the Alternative Delivery, the miss was so close that nothing really needs to change. The one question that did not meet the criterion for this population, may be re-worded for in 2019-20.*

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) This assessment requires students to rethink their preconceptions of who entrepreneurs are and what they do.*

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: 6/5/19

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Presented to department chair.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Andy Langewisch, 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? Present the information with both a written handout and lecture.*

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? We will assess these same criteria next year.*

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): 6/10/19

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 6/10/19

Assessment Summary Macro & Microeconomics 2018 – 2019

The major assessment goal for economics students at Concordia Seward for the 2018-19 academic year was understanding entrepreneurship, entrepreneurial ability and who entrepreneurs are. Students in the traditional delivery mode failed to meet standard, but students in the alternative delivery very nearly met the standard. The lower population size of the non-traditional delivery had an influence. Literally, three students missed one question, if that had been two students missing that particular question, the standard would have been met.

Assessment Criteria

In order to be considered a success, students must perform better than average on the five 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 2018-19 school year was 76.9%. Students must score a minimum of 80% on each of the six questions in order to be considered better than average.

Entrepreneurship Knowledge Assessment Macroeconomics (ECON 101) 2018-19 Concordia University Nebraska – Traditional Delivery (n=73)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
1 & 2	I	63%	80%	-17%
1 & 2	II	71%	80%	-9%
2	III	74%	80%	-6%
2	IV	77%	80%	-3%
15	V	96%	80%	+16%

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, III & IV. The 73 students in this population did not meet the criteria for understanding economic entrepreneurial ability, entrepreneurship and what entrepreneurs do. Although the concept of entrepreneurial ability is presented in the text book, certain aspects of entrepreneurship and what defines an entrepreneur - as opposed to a wage earner – were presented in lecture only. In the 2019 – 20 year, students will be given a handout describing what is not in the book. This, in addition to the lecture, will help the students meet the minimum requirements.

Students will be evaluated on the same subject matter in the 2019 – 20 school year.

Economic Efficiency Knowledge Assessment AP Macroeconomics (Blended) 2018-19 High School – Alternative Delivery (n=13)				
CHAPTER	QUESTION	% CORRECT	% BASELINE	DIFFERENCE
1 & 2	I	77%	80%	-3%
1 & 2	II	92%	80%	+12%
2	III	100%	80%	+20%
2	IV	92%	80%	+12%
15	V	100%	80%	20%

In the alternative delivery course, taught face-to-face at a Lutheran High School, the students met nearly all of the criteria; exceeding the minimum requirement on four of the five questions. Only question I did not meet the minimum requirement. Although the alternative delivery students understood the subject matter better than their peers in college, there were only 13 students in this population. In order to meet the minimum criterion, not more than two students could miss a question. On question I, three students missed the question. It is important to note that this was the most missed question for the college population as well. Question I requires the student to understand the difference between Labor (human actions of employees who get paid a wage regardless of the success of an employer) and entrepreneurial ability (human actions that risk failure and loss). The confusing thing about this is the observation that employees, in addition to their normal, paid actions, often use their entrepreneurial abilities in a firm to risk their position in the cause of advancement. Both qualities can be expressed by the same individual. We need to emphasize this in the future.

Conclusion & Recommendations

Economics instructors in both traditional and alternative delivery modes will continue to emphasize the concepts of entrepreneurial ability, entrepreneurship and the entrepreneur as in individual human actor in the 2019 – 20 school year. In the traditional university class, the instructor will supplement the lecture material with additional written material. Both the college and high school instructors will emphasize the difference between paid work for defined tasks (Labor) and risks taken in the cause of advancement (Entrepreneurial Ability).