

2020– 21 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History **Date:** 6/8/2021 **Course(s):** United States History
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:**

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). Rubric*
 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). Rubric comparisons and artifact sampling*

Summary of RESULTS*:
 1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan): Can students identify the author's primary argument(s)? Can students critically assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of the work? Can students use evidence from the work to support their claims?*
 2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

Coming out of the pandemic this year's assessment was important for restoring a baseline. Overall, we are very pleased with the results. Our assessment goal had been for 80% of students to earn at least a good in each category. What our recording mechanism mistakenly did not allow us to measure that goal, our evidence does indicate broad success.

Class	Total Students	8 or Better
1	19	17
2	9	9
3	10	7
4	6	6
5	7	7
6	10	10
7	6	5
Totals	67	61

	Excellent in Quality	Ex in Thesis	Ex in Analysis	Ex in Conclusions
1	11	12	12	14
2	9	5	7	4
3	6	0	1	1
4	6	5	4	4
5	7	2	2	0
6	5	8	7	5
7	2	2	2	0
Totals	46.0	34.0	35.0	28.0

	Avg in Qual	Avg in Thesis	Avg in Analysis	Avg in Conclusion
1	2.57	2.42	2.42	2.73
2	3	2.5	2.7	2.4
3	2.6	1.8	2	1.7
4	3	2.58	2.5	2.42
5	3	2.29	2.29	2
6	2.5	2.8	2.7	2.5
7	2	2.2	2.3	1.8
	2.7	2.4	2.4	2.2

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). According to the first chart 61 of 67 students earned at least eight out of 12 points on the rubric, indicating a strong performance overall. The second chart, which indicates the number of students who earned an "excellent" also indicates*

promise, particularly in the "Quality" category. Notably students did not perform as well in the conclusions category, an issue that we had noticed in previous years. Indeed, this might simply indicate the difficulty of crafting college-level conclusions within a writing assignment. Nonetheless, this should be an area of greater attention moving forward.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)*

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

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date: 6/8/2021 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Shared electronically and in person 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?* Next year we will ask instructors to discuss conclusions in greater detail.

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 across the board and in the conclusion 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).* None

Submitted by: John Hink **Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):** 7/9/21

Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: Approved

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na