

## 2022– 23 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Mathematics and Computer Science <b>Date:</b> 6/6/23 <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> Edward Reinke, Brian Albright
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> <i>a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students were given 10 questions involving techniques of differentiation. Each student's score was his or her number of correct or consistent questions out of 10. 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).</i> 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). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students apply techniques of differentiation? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The 9 traditional students taking the assessment had a mean score of 6.44 and a standard deviation of 3.36. The 74 dual credit students had a mean of 6.69 with a standard deviation of 2.99. 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 0.058. There is no evidence to reject the claim. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The results indicate that students in the dual credit courses are doing well on the material being assessed. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> 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 as well traditional on-campus students. The small number of on-campus students being assessed makes any meaningful comparisons difficult.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/8/23 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Ed Reinke, Brian Albright, Kent Einspahr, Marcus Gubanyi
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> no specific action will be taken at this time 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> none 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> none
<b>Submitted by:</b> Edward Reinke <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/15/23
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> na