

## 2023– 24 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

<b>Department:</b> History . . . <b>Date:</b> 6/10/2024 <b>Course(s):</b> HIST 115
<b>Alternative Format(s) – select as many as are applicable:</b> Dual Credit      Select      Select
<b>Members</b> (must include more than course instructor only) <b>involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> John Hink, Matt Phillips, Jamie Hink
<b>See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for:</b> a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i>
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). Student Outcome: <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*</b> - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used). Rubric</i> 2). <b>COMPARABILITY</b> – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). We use a rubric that articulates how each respective standard is to be judged.</i>
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> 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). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> Overall, we are pleased with the results. The goal was for at least 80% of students to earn an 8 or better (out of 12) according to the rubric. Across all sections 84% of students achieved this goal. The section with the lowest percentage was the on-campus section (60% of those sampled). 3). <b>INTERPRETATION*</b> - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> According to our rubric, our students on average are able to write a solid college paper that assesses a work's strengths and weaknesses while proving the points that they (the student) made with regard to the book. Given that we fell short of our goal last year (69%), we are encouraged to see scores improve this year. As in previous years, students performed well in terms of the overall quality of the paper. While their average scores are not horrible in the "Conclusion" portion of the rubric, students do seem to struggle with writing strong conclusions. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> Generally we believe that the grading standards between sections is comparable in light of the detail of the rubric, the clarity of expectations, and the experience of the instructors in this collective effort. However, anecdotally, there are some sections that allow students to submit rough and final drafts before grading, which is not a practice done in the on-campus section. This perhaps is skewing the results a bit and needs to be discussed and perhaps addressed. 5). <b>How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare?</b> The on-campus performance was a bit lower. This is not the first time we have seen this. Some of this may be due to the aforementioned allowance of some of the dual-credit sections to revise drafts before grading. The additional periods in the high school class could be an additional advantage for those students. Finally, and this would be tough to prove without a deeper data analysis, it is possible that given the proliferation of dual credit classes, there are fewer high performing students left in survey-level college courses.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 6/10/2024 <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department)</i> Shared and discussed electronically <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> John Hink, Matt Phillips, Jamie Hink
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION*</b> - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> What we are doing now is basically sound. Given the proliferation of AI, however, this course and this assignment are under review for revision. 2. <b>IMPACT*</b> - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We will continue to tweak how we introduce and assess this assignment going forward. 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).</i> none
<b>Submitted by:</b> John Hink <b>Assessment Committee Reviewed (date):</b> 6/24/24
<b>Submitter notified approval/additional action needed:</b> Approved <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:</b> NA