

2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences Date: 6/8/2021 Course(s): Bio 111
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: Kyle Johnson, Rob Hermann, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Freund
See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan 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). The scores on a survey of course content were compared between courses 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). NA
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Do students understand basic concepts of the process of science, cell biology, biochemistry, genetics, and molecular biology, and can they apply their knowledge of these topics? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. CUNE students averaged 59 ± 18% on the survey of course content. The dual credit students averaged 44 ± 20%. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). CUNE students understood about 60% of the basic concepts surveyed on average. Dual credit students only understood 45% of the basic concepts on average. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The dual credit school had two very low performers (<33% of the questions correct) out of a class of 5 students. CUNE also had two low performers (and one just above the 33% cut-off), but had 22 students. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Although CUNE students averaged higher, the difference was not significant (P = 0.116).
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 6/8/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Via Email Who were results shared with? (List names): Kyle Johnson, Rob Hermann, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Freund
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? No change will be made 2. IMPACT* - What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? No change will be made 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). NA
Submitted by: Kyle Johnson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 7/9/21
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na