

## 2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> Natural Sciences	<b>Date:</b> 6/9/2025	<b>Course(s):</b> PHYS 110															
<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> Robert Hermann, Kristy Jurchen, Kyle Johnson, Raegan Skelton																	
<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). Scores (means and distributions from a 40 question multiple choice comprehensive final exam) were analyzed. 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). Scores (means and distributions from a 40 question multiple choice comprehensive final exam) were analyzed.																	
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Are students able to analyze natural situations and communicate understanding and information about the world in verbal, graphical, and analytical languages. 2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. The averages and p-values (from CUNE scores) for the four schools teaching Phys 110 are shown below:  <table><thead><tr><th>School</th><th>Mean Percent Score</th><th>P-Value (from CUNE)</th></tr></thead><tbody><tr><td>DC1</td><td>81.3 ± 8.9</td><td>0.0033</td></tr><tr><td>DC2</td><td>54.0 ± 10.0</td><td>0.229</td></tr><tr><td>DC3</td><td>70.0 ± 15.1</td><td>0.207</td></tr><tr><td>DC4</td><td>57.1 ± 5.6</td><td>0.442</td></tr></tbody></table> The results are very similar to past years, and they compare favorably to the scores taught on the Seward campus, where the average score is 61.5 ± 18.2%. The overall average for the DC schools was 65.3%±15%, higher than CUNE's average but within the uncertainty. Two the schools averaged higher than CUNE, and averaged lower. The schools' average scores each overlap the CUNE average within one standard deviation, except for DC1 which is slightly higher (1% outside the uncertainty range). The low scores are not statistically different from the CUNE scores, and only one of the higher scores (DC1) is. The scores for the individual DC schools are consistent with their usual results and vary one school from another in large part due to the manner in which they administer the exam. Two schools were unable to provide assessment results in time for this summary, but both have been providing dual credit instruction before with good results, so there is no need for concern over this year. 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The assessment instrument consists of 40 multiple choice questions from the test bank for the standard textbook for the course. The questions require students to analyze physical situations and answer questions about them from a physics perspective. Several of the questions involve analyzing graphs of motion or other types of graphs, and many involve using equations and calculations. The fact that students overall average nearly 80% on this exam is solid evidence that students are indeed able to analyze natural situations and to communicate their understanding. 4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> The scores from the dual credit sites are similar to and sometimes better than those scored by the students in the course offered on Seward's campus. It is worthwhile noting that while the CUNE scores are consistently lower than most of the dual credit sections, (a) the CUNE sections typically have very few students (five to eight), (b) the students taking the course on campus are generally non-science students taking it instead of a more rigorous physics course, while students taking it dual credit are generally highly-motivated and successful students taking it as a means of taking the most advanced course available, and (c) the manner in which the tests are administered varies from school to school, with the CUNE manner being fairly difficult for students (the exam is a part of a closed book, closed notes in-class final exam). So the populations are very different, as is the manner of administering the exam.			School	Mean Percent Score	P-Value (from CUNE)	DC1	81.3 ± 8.9	0.0033	DC2	54.0 ± 10.0	0.229	DC3	70.0 ± 15.1	0.207	DC4	57.1 ± 5.6	0.442
School	Mean Percent Score	P-Value (from CUNE)															
DC1	81.3 ± 8.9	0.0033															
DC2	54.0 ± 10.0	0.229															
DC3	70.0 ± 15.1	0.207															
DC4	57.1 ± 5.6	0.442															
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> When were results shared? Date: 6/9/2025 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a																	

department) Email and on Teams Who were results shared with? (List names): Kristy Jurchen, John Jurchen, Andrea Watson, Kim Clark, Brent Royuk, Gregg Einspahr, Raegan Skelton, Kyle Johnson, Connie Callahan.

**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? Since the dual credit students are demonstrating admirable mastery of the concepts, we will try not to do too much to change this. Each year dual credit instructors are asked for ideas on improving the assessment instrument, and there are fewer and fewer comments, so the instrument seems to be reaching a point where it is doing what it needs to do.

2. **IMPACT\***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION\*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Hopefully it will not deter from the learning that students are demonstrating.

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:** Robert Hermann **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/16/25

**Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:** Approved

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** na