

2018– 19 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History Date: 6/18/19 Course(s): History 115																																																	
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:																																																	
Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: <i>a) Course requirement evaluation; b) Student Outcome; c) Question(s); e) Methodology</i>																																																	
Analysis of artifacts:																																																	
1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Rubric</i>																																																	
2). COMPARABILITY – <i>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</i>																																																	
Summary of RESULTS*:																																																	
1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students identify a thesis? Can students identify strengths and weaknesses of a historical work? Can students use evidence from the book to support their claims																																																	
2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> This year we sought a more ambitious goal than in the past, looking to assess not merely our students' performance overall, but also performance within particular categories. Our official goal was for "80% of our students to earn at least a "good" rating in each category. Unfortunately, due to a typo, the data that was collected recorded the number of students who earned an "Excellent" in each category. Nonetheless, the data that was collected is quite valuable and informative.																																																	
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;">Class</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Total Students</th> <th style="text-align: left;">8 or Better out of 12</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>DC 1</td><td>28</td><td>25</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 2</td><td>19</td><td>18</td></tr> <tr><td>CUNE</td><td>10</td><td>6</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 3</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 4</td><td>12</td><td>11</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 5</td><td>40</td><td>40</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 6</td><td>2</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Totals</td><td>112</td><td>102</td></tr> </tbody> </table>					Class	Total Students	8 or Better out of 12	DC 1	28	25	DC 2	19	18	CUNE	10	6	DC 3	1	1	DC 4	12	11	DC 5	40	40	DC 6	2	1	Totals	112	102																		
Class	Total Students	8 or Better out of 12																																															
DC 1	28	25																																															
DC 2	19	18																																															
CUNE	10	6																																															
DC 3	1	1																																															
DC 4	12	11																																															
DC 5	40	40																																															
DC 6	2	1																																															
Totals	112	102																																															
<table style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th style="text-align: left;"></th> <th style="text-align: left;">Excellent in Quality</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Ex in Thesis</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Ex in Analysis</th> <th style="text-align: left;">Ex in Conclusions</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>DC 1</td><td>23</td><td>19</td><td>13</td><td>3</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 2</td><td>16</td><td>15</td><td>14</td><td>12</td></tr> <tr><td>CUNE</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>2</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 3</td><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 4</td><td>9</td><td>5</td><td>3</td><td>0</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 5</td><td>30</td><td>30</td><td>33</td><td>21</td></tr> <tr><td>DC 6</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>0</td><td>1</td></tr> <tr><td>Totals</td><td>84.0</td><td>72.0</td><td>67.0</td><td>40.0</td></tr> </tbody> </table>						Excellent in Quality	Ex in Thesis	Ex in Analysis	Ex in Conclusions	DC 1	23	19	13	3	DC 2	16	15	14	12	CUNE	3	1	3	2	DC 3	0	1	1	1	DC 4	9	5	3	0	DC 5	30	30	33	21	DC 6	3	1	0	1	Totals	84.0	72.0	67.0	40.0
	Excellent in Quality	Ex in Thesis	Ex in Analysis	Ex in Conclusions																																													
DC 1	23	19	13	3																																													
DC 2	16	15	14	12																																													
CUNE	3	1	3	2																																													
DC 3	0	1	1	1																																													
DC 4	9	5	3	0																																													
DC 5	30	30	33	21																																													
DC 6	3	1	0	1																																													
Totals	84.0	72.0	67.0	40.0																																													
3). INTERPRETATION * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> According to the first chart 102 out of 112 (91%) of our students scored at least eight points out of twelve on the rubric, a strong performance overall. The second chart, which indicates the number of students who earned an "excellent" too indicates promise. The fact that 84 students (75%) achieved the highest category in quality suggests that most of our students, regardless of institution are capable of mechanically writing a qualit college-level paper. The number of students earning excellent in the Thesis and Analysis categories are also quite solid. Notably, only 40 students (36%) earned an excellent on their conclusions. While this number itself is not a cause for trepidation as it does not account how many students earned a "good", our evidence suggests that our students could use additional instruction or examples in this area.																																																	
4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Typo prevent us from accurately assessing stated goal; Senechal's class reported very high marks.																																																	
5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? Results were comparable.																																																	

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date: 6/18/2019* *How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) In person and electronically* *Who were results shared with? (List names):* Matt Phillips, Jamie Hink

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?* Overall, the students are performing well. Next year, we will instruct teachers to spend more time with students regarding how to write a strong conclusion.
2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Student performance will improve in the conclusions category.
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).* non

Submitted by: John Hink **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 6/20/19

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: approved

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na