

2019– 20 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Human and Social Science Date: 6/1/2020 Course(s): PSY 221												
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Online Select Select												
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Elwell, Ristow, Warren												
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: <i>a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>												
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Quizzes were scored</i> 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). Mean, SD and T test values were computed.</i>												
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Are students retaining information from assigned text reading..</i> 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Review your data: <table style="margin-left: 20px; border: none;"><tr><td>Group</td><td>cune</td><td>oNLINE</td></tr><tr><td>Mean</td><td>0.9250</td><td>0.9000</td></tr><tr><td>SD</td><td>0.0414</td><td>0.0568</td></tr><tr><td>SEM</td><td>0.0146</td><td>0.0201</td></tr></table> 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The means for both groups of 90% or higher suggest that students are retaining informaion from assigned tex readings.</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? P value and statistical significance: The two-tailed P value equals 0.2924 By conventional criteria, this difference is considered to be not statistically significant	Group	cune	oNLINE	Mean	0.9250	0.9000	SD	0.0414	0.0568	SEM	0.0146	0.0201
Group	cune	oNLINE										
Mean	0.9250	0.9000										
SD	0.0414	0.0568										
SEM	0.0146	0.0201										
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date: 6/10/2020 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) emailed Who were results shared with? (List names): Ristow, Elwell, Warren</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? na</i> 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? na</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). na</i>												
Submitted by: Elwell Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/10/2020												
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/10/2020												
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na												