

## 2021– 22 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Business <b>Date:</b> 6/13/22 <b>Course(s):</b> Macroeconomics (ECON 101 & 102) <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> Tim Heidorn & Glen Worthington
<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). See Attached Report 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). This is an assessment of whether traditional and alternative delivery modes met the minimum standards of 80% of students (or more) with correct answers to specific questions.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Do students understand the concepts of Entrepreneurship, Entrepreneurial Ability and who Entrepreneurs are? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The student populations in the traditional delivery (College Hybrid Lecture) as well as the students in the in alternative delivery (High School AP) did not meet the assessment criteria. However, the alternative delivery mode was a near miss (see attached report for details). 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Certain concepts of entrepreneurship will be reemphasized. The same assessment will be used in the 2022-23 school year. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) This assessment requires students to rethink their preconceptions of who entrepreneurs are and what they do. 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> Traditional and Alternative deliver both failed to meet standard.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> When were results shared? Date: 6/13/22    How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) e-mail attachment    Who were results shared with? (List names): Andy Langewisch, Glenn Worthington
<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? Certain concepts will be reemphasized with new lecture material. 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? We will assess these same criteria next year. 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> Tim Heidorn <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/14/22
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> 6/14/22 <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na