

2025– 26 Alternative Delivery Executive Summary

Submit to the BlackBoard Assessment Site.

Department: History Date: 6/5/2026 Course(s): HIST115 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, Jamie Hink and Matt Phillips
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* - <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? (note “na” if delivery modes were not compared).</i> 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 a scholarly monograph? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.</i> The assessment results were generally 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 84% of students achieved this goal. 3). INTERPRETATION* - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> According to our rubric, it is clear that students in HIST115 can read and generally comprehend a scholarly monograph. Students specifically did well in the categories of identifying a book's topic and thesis, as well as writing about the book's sources. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)</i> None. 5). How did the outcomes of the traditional and alternative format analysis compare? The outcomes of the traditional and alternative formats were similar proving that the assignment is an effective one for this dual credit course and that students are reading similar studies.
Sharing of Results: <i>When were results shared? Date:</i> 06/05/2026 <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, Jamie Hink and Matt Phillips
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 implement the same common assignment and rubric. However, the results from this year's assessment showed that instructors and students were less confident with one standard on the rubric, i.e. discuss how the assigned book fits into the greater historiography. Thus, prior to the start of next year CUNE's dual credit lead will disseminate educational materials on the topic to those participating during the 2026/27 school year. 2. IMPACT* - <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> The anticipated impact is that students will score higher on the standard mentioned in the above. 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): 6/16/26
Submitter notified approval/additional action needed: 6/16/26
BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na