

#4. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Alternative Delivery

Submit to the Assessment Committee Chair via email.

Department: History Date: 5/17/17 Course(s): Hist 115: United States History

Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:

Dual Credit Select Select Select Select Select

Members (must include more than course instructor only) involved with analysis of artifacts: John Hink, Jamie Hink, Matt Phillips

See #3 Assessment Plan: Alternative Delivery: Student Outcomes 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). Rubric

2). **COMPARABILITY** – How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative deliver modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). Rubric Comparisons and Artifact Sampling

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students identify a thesis? Can students identify strengths and weaknesses of a historical work? Can students use evidence from the book to support his or her claims?

2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. Every class, both the on campus version and the dual credit version, met the goal of at least 80% of students achieving a score of 8 or more on the common rubric (out of 12). In total 87% of all students earned at least an 8.

Class	Total Students	Students with 80% or Better	Objective Met
DC 1	16	15	94%
DC 2	4	4	100%
DC 3	12	10	83%
DC 4	17	15	82%
CUNE	22	18	82%
Totals	71	62	87%

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). The results suggest that most students are capable of crafting a basically sound book review that achieves the objectives outlined above. This years classes all collectively met the objective, which is an improvement from last year when two fell short. Since the objective has been met, next year's assessment will likely increase the threshold that students must meet in order to achieve the objective and will include an analysis of the specific categories of the rubric (Thesis, Quality, Argument, Conclusion) in order to determine specific areas that need improvement.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) The rubric needs to be further revised for clarity. The scoring scale (3, 2, 1/0) also may need to be refined as some dual credit teachers seemed to struggle with exactly what score to give a student (2.5 as opposed to 2 or 3, for example).

5). **How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Results were comparable**

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/17/2017

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Shared electronically and discussed individually.

Who were results shared with? (List names): Jamie Hink, Matt Phillips

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?* We had planned require that dual credit teachers keep track of student scores in specific categories. That was not done this year, but will be done in the future. We need to know specific areas that students struggle.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Going forth we will focus more on specific categories of achievement and less on the overall score.

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 via email to Assessment Committee Chair by: John Hink

Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 5/19/17

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 5/19/17