2024 - 2025 General Education Executive Summary

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies & Modern Languages Date: 6/16/2025
Members involved with analysis of artifacts: John 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).
Data was analyzed with a rubric
Summary of RESULTS*:
1). Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):
Who are my neighbors and how should I love them?
2). Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional. Assessment was conducted using a random sampling of ten from the fall semester. The specific example from the final exam was: "Drawing upon specific examples from the course, how does history help us to understand
the United States and all those who live here?" The rubric had two categories: "Awareness of History as a tool
for understanding neighbors"; "Application of Historical Examples". Students were awarded three points for
excellent answers in a category, two points for good, and zero to one for poor. The average score overall was
a 4.1 out of 6 possible points. The average in the "Awareness" category was 1.7 our of 3. The average and
the "Application" category was 2.4 out of three.
3). INTERPRETATION* - Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s). As this is the first time using this assessment in the new Gen Ed, we hesitate to make any qualitative
conclusions about the students' relative success. This year's performance will be used to set goals for next
year's assessment cycle. Having said that students' average performance in the "Awareness of History as a
tool for understanding one's neighbor" category were lower than one might assume, showing that they
struggled some to articulate how history could help them to know their "neighbors." Part of this shortcoming is
the question used in the final exam which was designed to ask the enduring question that had been brought up since the beginning of the course. The fact that the exam question was not exactly the same as the enduring question (despite the fact that this had been discussed in class) seemed to have thrown students off or at least allowed them to answer the question in ways we did not anticipate. Student performance was considerably
stronger in the "Application" category and looks about where we would assume it should be.
4). Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring
tool was low) Click or tap here to enter text. Sharing of Results: When were results shared? Date: Results were shared 6/16/2025
How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Results were shared in person and through email. Who were results shared with? (List names): Matt Philips, Jamie Hink, John Hink
Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:
1. ACTION*- How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:
<i>a. Teaching:</i> Professors need to continue to emphasize the enduring question itself and help students to understand the concepts behind it even when discussed in different ways.
b. Assignment/course: None
c. <i>Program:</i> None
d. <i>Assessment:</i> The artifact that will be assessed, in this case the final exam, needs to align more closely with the terms used throughout the course.

2. **IMPACT*-** What is the anticipated impact of the **ACTION*** on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year? Anticipate students will perform better overall, but especially in the awareness 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

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: 6/30/25

Department Chair notified - approval/additional action needed: Approved

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS - Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na