

2022 – 23 & 2023 - 24 General Education Executive Summary

Department: History . . . **Date:** 6/22/2023

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: John Hink, Matt Phillips, Jamie Hink

See General Education Assessment Plan for:

a) Learning Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).*

Rubric

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

Can students critically assess the relative strengths and weaknesses of the work [Book Review]? Can students use evidence from the work to support their own arguments regarding its merits.

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

Overall, we are pleased that the data shows the dual credit course and the CUNE course are reasonably commensurate. Out of 17 total students measured, 14 earned 8 points or more on the 12 point scale. According to our rubric, this would indicate that students are generally performing at least in the “good” range or higher, although our measuring tool did not allow us to investigate whether they earned a “good” in each specific category. Our evidence thus indicates a solid performance by our students across sections.

Class	Total Students	8 or Better
CUNE	10	7
DC	6	6

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

According to the chart, 13 out of 16 students earned at least eight out of 12 points on the rubric (81%), which would indicate scores in the “Good” or “Excellent” category. This number exceeds our goal of the 80% we hoped to see. These scores are on par with those recorded for HIST 131 (82%) and also slightly better than the reported (69%) of students who achieved an 8 or better in HIST 115 courses, which uses the same assessment (although there was a larger sample size). Notably, only there were only seven times when a student was marked in the poor category, most commonly in the Analysis and Conclusions section. These all occurred in the CUNE section.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)* As I noted in the HIST 131 report, I am hesitant to draw too many conclusions given that there is only one dual credit section being analyzed. Also, as I reported elsewhere non-CUNE classes tend to have better results for students, although not to such an extent that the data is unreliable. Refinement of the rubric and further discussion of standards with dual credit teachers will be beneficial going forward.

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date:* 6/22/2023

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 the department learned from the assessment impact:*

a. *Teaching:* Instructors will spend more time with students discussing historical analysis and the writing of conclusions.

b. *Assignment/course:* This assignment will be reviewed this year as part of a larger course overhaul.

c. *Program:* Click or tap here to enter text.

d. *Assessment:* Our rubric needs to be revised

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?* Click or tap here to enter text.

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).
na

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? Click or tap here to enter text.

Submitted by:John Hink **Assessment Committee Reviewed:** 6/27/23

Department Chair notified – approval/additional action needed:Approved 6/27/23

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na