

#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 delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). This is an assessment of whether traditional and alternative met the minimum 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 (College Lecture) did not meet the criteria, although it was an improvement on 2018-19. Students in the in alternative delivery (High School AP) met the assessment criteria brilliantly. This was a significant improvement over 2018-19 (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 a hybrid on line and face to face format which will allow for more student interaction and Q&A. For the Alternative Delivery, nothing really needs to change.

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 a written handout, recorded lecture and face-to-face Q&A (Question & Answer).

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): 7/15/2020

Submitter notified/additional action needed: 7/15/2020

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/15/2020