

## 2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Natural Sciences <b>Date:</b> 6/8/2021 <b>Course(s):</b> Bio 243
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Dual Credit                      Select                      Select
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Kyle Johnson, Rob Hermann, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Freund
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). The scores on a survey of course content were compared between courses 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – 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
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students identify the relevant structures associated with a specific physiological function? Can students recall the function of a tissue, organ, or system that are associated with a specific function? Can students understand the terminology of anatomy and physiology? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> CUNE students averaged 55 ± 10% on the survey of course content. Only two students completed the dual credit course. The scored 62.5% and 45%. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Dual Credit students could answer the questions correctly roughly 50% of the time. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> There were too few students in the Dual Credit to complete a proper statistical analysis. CUNE students did not take the common assessment this year due to a miscommunication between the dual credit liason (Kyle) and the adjunct teaching the course, so the previous year's results were used. 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> Both the Dual Credit Students scored within one standard deviation of the CUNE average.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/8/2021 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Via Email <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Kyle Johnson, Rob Hermann, Kristy Jurchen, Jennifer Freund
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> No change will be made 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> No change will be made 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <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> NA
<b>Submitted by:</b> Kyle Johnson <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 7/9/21
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na