

## 2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Business and Mathematics <b>Date:</b> 6/29/21 <b>Course(s):</b> Math 184 <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> Brian Albright and Edward Reinke
<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). Students were given a graphical analysis problem divided into 5 parts. Each student's score was his or her number of correct or consistent questions out of 10. 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). The traditional students and the Dual Credit students taking the exam were treated as two random samples, and a T-Test was used to test the claim that the Dual Credit students come from a population whose average score is at least as high as the average score of the population from which the traditional students come.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students use derivatives to analyze the graph of a function? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The 26 traditional students taking the assessment had a mean score of 1.96 and a standard deviation of 1.82. The 70 dual credit students had a mean of 4.23 with a standard deviation of 0.94. A two sample t-test of the claim that the Dual Credit students score at least as well as the traditional students yields a p-value of 0.999. There is no evidence to reject the claim. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results indicate that students in the dual credit courses are doing well on the material being assessed. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) none 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> The students in the dual credit courses, as a whole, are doing better than traditional on-campus students. This is to be expected considering the two populations.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> When were results shared? Date: 6/29/2021    How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) electronically    Who were results shared with? (List names): Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, Andy Langewisch
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year? no specific action will be taken at this time 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - What is the anticipated impact of the <b>ACTION*</b> on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? none 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the <b>ACTION*</b> (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course). none
<b>Submitted by:</b> Edward Reinke <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 8/9/21
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved 8/9/21 <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na