

2024– 25 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: Mathematics and Computer Science	Date: 6/6/25	Course(s): Math 186
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) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>		
Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students were given a 10 questions involving techniques of interation. Each student's score was his or her number of correct or consistent questions out of 10. 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable?</i> (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). 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.		
Summary of RESULTS*: 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students apply techniques of integration? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The 20 traditional students taking the assessment had a mean score of 8.44 and a standard deviation of 2.46. The 10 dual credit students had a mean score of 7.91 with a standard deviation of 2.12. A two sample t-test of the claim that the 3). INTERPRETATION* - <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. This is consistent with data collected in previous years. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) none 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Dual Credit students score at least as well as the traditional students yields a p-value of 0.27. There is no evidence to reject the claim.		
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6/6/25 <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, Tim Schroeder		
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <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. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> none 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <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		
Submitted by: Edward Reinke Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/16/25		
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: approved BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na		