

2021– 22 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Business **Date:** 6/9/2022 **Course(s):** BUS 121

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:** Todd Johnson, Tony Smith, Laura Vance

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). Comprehensive Final Exam comparative
- 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). All students completed the same comprehensive final exam. Results were compared across the board.

Summary of RESULTS*:

- 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students create the basic financial statements? Can students apply the framework and the concepts of the accounting process necessary to create the basic financial statements? Can students make decisions using financial information common to business?
- 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The dual credit class had a total of 11 students representing two high schools. The goal for the comprehensive final exam is that at least 70% of the students score at least 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam. In the Dual Credit classes, only 18% of the students scored 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam. It is important to note that 9 of the 11 students that did not meet the criteria were from one high school. After speaking with the instructor from that school, the instructor informed me that she is retiring. The new instructor does not have the credentials to teach dual credit. The school will no longer be participating in the dual credit program through Concordia University. The 2 students that completed the final exam from the other participating school met the requirements. For the Concordia University students, 76% of the students scored 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam.

Class	Total Students	Students scoring 70% or above	Objective Met
DC1	11	2	18%
CUNE	85	65	76%
Totals	96	67	70%

- 3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results show that the Dual Credit students overall did not meet the objective. One of the dual credit schools was able to meet the objective where 100% of the students were able to score 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam. This school has been in the dual credit program for multiple years. The second school was not able to meet the objective. The second dual credit school was not able to meet the objectives. They do not plan to be part of the dual credit program in the next academic year. The CUNE students met the objective as 76% of the students were able to score 70% or higher on the comprehensive final exam.

- 4). **Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).** (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The comprehensive final exam is a multiple choice exam that includes all topics covered throughout the semester. The format and length of the exam can be difficult for some students due to interpretation of the information provided in each question. The first time through the comprehensive final exam for some instructors will allow for an instructor to determine alternate teaching methods to ensure the material is delivered and students are able to retain the material at a higher rate.

- 5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?** The CUNE students met the objective. The dual credit students, as a whole, did not meet the objective.

Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: May 13, 2022 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Shared at our department meeting. Who were results shared with? (List names): Andy Langewisch, Curt Beck, Melissa Davis, Tim Heidorn

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? After reviewing the specific results in areas that needed improvement from the 2020-2021 exam results for the CUNE students, I continue to adjust the schedule to invest more time needed to cover difficult areas that students had trouble with on the exam. This change in schedule showed an increase in the overall final exam scores by 2% from last year. We were able to see improvement in the areas

we concentrated on but found other areas declined as well due to the shift in schedule. We will continue to modify the schedule for teaching certain areas to improve the overall scores but need to be careful if we continue to see declining scores in other areas as a result of this shift. Currently, we are meeting the overall objective so we see this shift in the timeline as a positive result.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* See above.

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).* None

Submitted by: Todd M. Johnson **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/14/22

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/14/22

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na