

2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Natural Sciences Date: 6/29/2023 Course(s): Bio 111
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: Rob Hermann, Jennifer Freund, Kristy Jurchen
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). The scores on a survey of course content were compared between courses 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). Used a ttest to compare scores.
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Do students understand basic concepts of the process of science, cell biology, biochemistry, genetics, and molecular biology, and can they apply their knowledge of these topics? 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. Dual credit school 1 scored 92 +/- 6% while CUNE scored 62 +/- 17%. Dual credit school 2 failed to give the alternative assessment. 3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). Dual credit students had a greater understanding of the basic concepts. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The school that failed to give the common assessment usually scores better than CUNE students. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The dual credit school scored significantly better.
Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: 6/29/2023 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Among dual credit liasons within the department. Who were results shared with? (List names): Rob Hermann, Jennifer Freund, Kristy Jurchen
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? For Dual credit school one, nothing needs to change. For dual credit school 2, the school will need to give the common assessment. 2. IMPACT* - What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? NA 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). NA
Submitted by: Kyle Johnson Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/30/23
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved 6/30/23
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na