

2019– 20 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Human and Social Sciences					Date: 06/18/2020		Course(s): PSY 101	
Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable: Dual Credit					Select		Select	
Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: Sara Brady								
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:								
a) <i>Course requirement evaluation;</i> b) <i>Student Outcome;</i> c) <i>Question(s);</i> e) <i>Methodology</i>								
Analysis of artifacts:								
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Data was analyzed using the attached test and key. It was given via paper copies in face-to-face courses in Fall 2019. In Spring 2020, this assessment was put online for students to take.								
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).</i> A <i>t</i> test was conducted to compare the mean total scores and mean scores on all the topic areas between dual credit and CUNE courses. In addition, percentages were compared between delivery modes among students who scored a 75% or higher on the total score and topic areas.								
Summary of RESULTS*:								
1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 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 traditional PSY 101 classes retain comparable knowledge in the field of psychology on the same measure?								
Note that out of the 6 Dual Credit instructors that were scheduled to send assessment data in the spring, only two sent back data. Out of the two, only one instructor sent data in a format that was usable for this assessment. Therefore, the data underrepresents spring dual credit instructors.								
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i>								
Descriptive statistics on the overall score and each topic area were calculated according to how many students received a 75% or higher on the questions (see Table 1). Only Dual Credit students achieved the cutoff in one area: States of Consciousness.								
Table 1								
<i>Frequency and Percentages of Students with 75% or Higher Topic Area Scores</i>								
Area	CUNE		Dual Credit					
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%				
Subfields	64	59.26	49	73.13				
Neuroscience	43	39.82	45	67.16				
Sensation and Perception	38	35.19	37	55.22				
States of Consciousness	61	56.48	55	82.09				
Learning	38	35.19	36	53.73				
Memory	51	47.22	48	71.64				
Motivation	64	59.26	47	70.15				
Development	47	43.52	53	79.10				
Personality	31	28.70	47	70.15				
Health	34	31.48	40	59.70				

Disorders	67	62.04	47	70.15
Social Psychology	46	42.59	46	68.66
Total	28	25.93	36	53.73

In addition, independent sample *t* tests were conducted to determine to what extent dual credit students differed from CUNE students for each of the topic areas (see Table 2). Dual Credit students consistently outperformed CUNE students in all areas except psychological disorders.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Assessment Scores by Topic Area and Delivery Method

Topic Area	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Subfields				2.06	.041	0.32
CUNE	108	66.90	28.36			
Dual Credit	67	75.75	26.46			
Neuroscience				3.60	< .001	0.56
CUNE	108	69.78	31.11			
Dual Credit	67	85.57	22.64			
Sensation and Perception				2.43	.016	0.38
CUNE	108	62.97	34.54			
Dual Credit	67	75.62	31.56			
States of Consciousness				3.83	< .001	0.60
CUNE	108	69.07	25.41			
Dual Credit	67	83.28	21.06			
Learning				3.89	< .001	0.61
CUNE	108	53.70	32.20			
Dual Credit	67	71.64	24.90			
Memory				4.36	< .001	0.68
CUNE	108	59.26	27.26			
Dual Credit	67	77.24	25.28			
Motivation				2.08	.039	0.32
CUNE	108	64.35	28.23			
Dual Credit	67	73.13	25.49			
Development				5.53	< .001	0.86
CUNE	108	63.33	27.41			
Dual Credit	67	84.78	20.33			
Personality				5.30	< .001	0.83
CUNE	108	56.11	25.13			
Dual Credit	67	77.61	27.53			
Health				3.97	< .001	0.62
CUNE	108	46.76	32.26			
Dual Credit	67	66.79	32.68			
Disorders				1.86	.065	0.29
CUNE	108	67.82	27.35			
Dual Credit	67	75.37	24.03			
Social Psychology				3.12	.002	0.49
CUNE	108	56.25	28.83			
Dual Credit	67	70.15	28.28			

Total Percent				5.23	< .001	0.81
CUNE	108	61.09	19.92			
Dual Credit	67	76.48	17.19			

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).

Overall, Dual Credit students did not retain knowledge according to the criteria cutoff (75% or higher). Overall, Dual Credit do not compare to traditional PSY 101 classes. Dual Credit retention appears to be better than traditional PSY 101 students according to the assessment tools used.

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

Based upon a post hoc t test, Spring 2020 students in the spring ($M = 81.48, SD = 23.87$) did significantly better than students in the fall semester ($M = 63.86, SD = 18.08$), $t(173) = 4.63, p < .001, d = 0.92$. This suggests that the online format of the assessment was likely the cause of the increase in performance.

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** The outcomes are not comparable, and plans are being made to assess not cumulative learning, but to assess to what extent Dual Credit and PSY 101 students change over the course.

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date:* 6/18/20 *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email* *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Thad Warren, Nancy Elwell, Kathy Miller, Mark Blanke, Ed Hoffman, Tim Huntington, and Sara Brady

Submitted by: Brady **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 8/18/2020

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 8/18/2020

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na