

2019– 20 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages Environmental Science	Date: 7/6/20	Course(s):
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: Joel Helmer, Grant Rolfsmeier		
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> The Big Here assignment/paper was analyzed using the attached rubric. 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> The same assignment was given in each class.		
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students critically analyze the environment near where they live? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Five DC students completed the Big Here assignment. The mean score was 85.6%. At Concordia University, Nebraska thirty-three students were assigned the same project. The mean score was 90.8%. 3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> According to the mean scores both groups successfully analyzed the environment near their respective homes. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) na 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? They were quite similar, although the high school class scored about 5% lower, although with significantly fewer students.		
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 7/6/20 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Joel Helmer and Grant Rolfsmeier		
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?</i> Perhaps some aspects of the assignment need to be more directly covered during the course. 2. IMPACT *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> This action should assist in students successfully completing the course and learning the course material. 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).</i>		
Submitted by: Joel Helmer Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/15/2020		
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 7/15/2020		
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na		