2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Mathematics and Computer Science   **Date:** 6/9/25   **Course(s):** Math 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:** Brian Albright
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).* Five prototypical questions, selected from four categories -- calculations, linear analysis, functional analysis, statistical applications -- were selected from final or late term exams and student performance was evaluated on a 5 point scale according to the attached rubric. Dual credit student scores were compared against the rubric and against the scores of the traditional students. *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). For each question category (two questions from the application category), the traditional students and the dual credit students 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. The sample means of the dual credit student scores were also checked against the attached rubric.
Summary of RESULTS*: *1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):* Can students perform statistical calculations, execute statistical tests, and make statements based on statistical findings? *2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.* In all four categories, the sample means of the 133 dual credit students fell in the 'Acceptable' to 'Very Good' range on the attached rubric. Via T-test, no significant difference between the dual credit students and the traditional students was found in the scores on three of the 4 categories, with the traditional students scoring higher on calculation based questions. *3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).* The results indicate that students in the dual credit courses are doing well on the material being assessed. *4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).* (*i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low*) none *5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare**?* see above
Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date:* 6/10/25   *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)* email   *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Timothy Schroeder, Brian Albright, Ed Reinke, Kent Einspahr, Marcus Gubanyi
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 specific action will be taken at this time *2. **IMPACT***- What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* none *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: Timothy Schroeder   **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/23/25
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** na