

2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Business Date: 5/30/23 Course(s): BUS 122
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: Jeanette Sorensen, Todd Johnson, Andrew Langewisch
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 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). Look at student scores and at least 70% of all students taking the comprehensive final exam will score 70% or higher on the exam.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students create a detailed budget using Microsoft Excel? Can students determine product cost for a manufacturing facility? Can students determine sales output necessary to breakeven and/or generate a target profit? Can students use cost information to make decisions? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. There were 55 students from Concordia University that completed the comprehensive final exam. Of those 55 students, 50 students scored better than a 70% on the comprehensive final exam which equates to 91% of the students scored better than 70% on the comprehensive final exam. There was 1 Dual Credit student that completed the comprehensive final exam. That Dual Credit student scored an 88% on the comprehensive final exam which equates to 100% of the students scored better than 70% on the comprehensive final exam. 3). INTERPRETATION * - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Both Concordia University students and the Dual Credit students met the object where 70% of the students will score at least a 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) Even though not part of the assessment, all students completed a detailed budget using Microsoft Excel. This project also helped students reach the Student Outcomes noted above. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 5-30-23 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Shared the results via email. Who were results shared with? (List names): Andy Langewisch & Jeanette Sorensen
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 changes needed at this point. 2. IMPACT *- What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION * on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? N/A 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). N/A
Submitted by: Todd M. Johnson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/5/23
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 6/5/23
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: NA