

2023– 24 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

| | | |
|--|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Department: History | Date: 6/13/2025 | Course(s): HIST 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: John Hink, Matt Phillips, Jamie Hink | | |
| See Alternative Delivery Assessment Plan for: a) <i>Course requirement evaluation</i> ; b) <i>Student Outcome</i> ; c) <i>Question(s)</i> ; e) <i>Methodology</i> | | |
| Analysis of artifacts: 1). Student Outcome: PERFORMANCE CRITERIA* - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Rubric 2). COMPARABILITY – <i>How did you determine if the outcomes of the traditional and alternative delivery modes were comparable?</i> (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared). We use a rubric that articulates how each respective standard is to be judged. | | |
| Summary of RESULTS*: 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> The results look good. 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 96% of students achieved this goal. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <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 an work's strengths and weaknesses while proving the points that they (the student) made with regard to the book. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> The results may be askew as it was discovered that some high school instructors allow their students to submit multiple drafts before the final review is turned in. This is not allowed in the on-campus or traditional HIST115. Furthermore, due to the emergence of AI and the increase in academic dishonesty among students it became evidence that (perhaps) assigning a book review is not the most prudent way to enhance and assess student learning. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The outcomes were similar with class results across several sections showing that students read similar historical monographs and were able to adequately comprehend and write about such studies. | | |
| Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared?</i> Date: 6/13/2025 <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 | | |
| Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including: 1. ACTION* - <i>How will what was learned from the assessment impact the alternative format teaching of this course starting the next academic year?</i> Next year we will be replacing the regularly assigned book review with another type of common assessment. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> We anticipate that the impact of the above action will enhance student learning and, more specifically, their ability to critically think about a historical question. 3. BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – <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 | | |
| Submitted by: Jamie Hink Assessment Committee Reviewed (date): 6/17/25 | | |
| Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: approved | | |
| BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na | | |