Department: History	**Date: 6/13/18** **Course(s): Hist 115: United States History**

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

Dual Credit	Dual Credit	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 idenfity 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. Overall, 86% of all students measured earned at least an 8 out of 12. In addition, every section but one met the goal of at least 80% of students earning an 8 or higher. The underperforming section was one student shy of the threshhold.

Class	Total Students	80% or Better	Objective Met
DC 1	40	33	83
DC 2	31	28	90
CUNE	10	9	90
DC 3	1	1	100
DC 4	13	10	77
DC 5	8	8	100
DC 6	4	3	75
Totals	107	92	86%

*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. The high number of students who met the objective indicates that students in both the dual credit and on campus sections are performing as desired. Since this objective has been measured for several years, next years' assessment will focus on specific areas in which students can improve their writing.

In preparation for more detailed assessment, as supplemental information, all course instructors submitted the number of students who earned an excellent in each rubric category in addition to the category average. The category averaged were remarkably consistent, ranging between 2.3 and 2.5 (out of 3). However, out of 107 total students sampled, only 36% of students earned an excellent in "Analysis" and 34% an excellent in "Conclusion," in contrast to 53% in "Quality" and 51% in the "Thesis" category. Thus, next year's assessment will likely focus on the two underperforming categories.

4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low) Anecdotally it appears that there may be too much differentiation in how instructors approach the assignment. One instructor allowed students to read articles as opposed to books. Another had students write short papers on chapters in advance of the review of the book. These varied approaches should be eliminated or accounted for in the future so as to ensure that courses are commensurate and that what is being assessed is consistent across the board.

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

Sharing of Results:
When were results shared? Date: 6/13/18
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?*   Instructors will focus more on specific areas of writing that need improvement rather than the entirety of the assignment.

2. **IMPACT****-* *What is the anticipated impact of the* **ACTION*** *on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*   Assessment goal will focus on Analysis and drawing conclusions within a history paper.

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): 6/14/18

Submitter notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18