

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2013-2014

Due: June 2, 2014

Program: History BA and BS

Date: May 30, 2014

Completed by: Carol Loats

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Judy Gaughan, Jonathan Rees

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, and submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?

# 4, Historical Thinking: Apply the concepts of historical thinking (or example in evaluating change over time) – see rubrics for other examples)	This SLO not previously assessed	Evaluating papers from upper division electives. See rubrics for this SLO, attached separately.	Students who responded to assignments in upper division electives. See Comment section)	80 % of students will demonstrate proficient or exemplary performance	Varying with the assignment assessed, 50-80% of students were achieving at Proficiency or above. On one of the three assignments, 80% scored as Proficient, on one assignment 60% scored as Proficient, and on one assignment 50% scored as Proficient for this SLO. See comments, below.	A majority of students are achieving our goals on this SLO. However, a significant minority are not.	<p>1) Provide more emphasis on historiography and historical thinking skills in all upper division courses</p> <p>2) Work among faculty so that all SLOs are a conscious part of the teaching and learning interactions.</p> <p>For both SLOs assessed in 2013-14: The History program faculty will meet during the 2014-2015 academic year for the following purposes:</p> <p>1) to arrive at consensus about what we mean by each SLO and rubric, and to reconsider and revise the SLOs and the related rubrics; 2) to consider the percentages (Column E) in conjunction with the methodology we have been using in this and prior years; 3) to discuss whether closing the loop works when we don't get back to the same SLO the following year.</p>
#5, Research: Demonstrate skills in	Spring 2011	Evaluating papers from upper division	Students who responded to	*80 % of students will demonstrate	Varying with the assignment	A majority of students are achieving our goals	1) Follow-up on prior year's suggestions on interpretive questions;

historical research, including historical analysis and interpretation		electives. See rubrics for this SLO, a separate document.	assignments in upper division electives (See Comments section)	proficient or exemplary performance (See comments section re: D)	assessed, 50-80% of students were achieving at Proficiency or above. On one of the three assignments, 80% scored as Proficient, on one assignment 60% scored as Proficient, and on one assignment 50% scored as Proficient for this SLO. See comments, below.	on this SLO. However, a significant minority are not.	<p>2) Provide more emphasis on choice of source materials, and analysis of those source materials; 3) Provide more emphasis on articulating arguments. 3) Work among faculty so that all SLOs are a conscious part of the teaching and learning interactions.</p> <p>See the above SLO in this column for further improvements planned for the History Program</p>
---	--	---	--	--	---	---	--

Comments:

D. For each of these SLOs, students responded to three different assignments from three different upper division classes, Hist 304, 414, and 489. Respectively, the assignments were 1) a short research paper regarding 2 assigned books; 2) a movie review based on one assigned film and an assigned book corresponding to that movie; 3) A comparative research paper on an issue related to an assigned course theme. In each case, a sample of the papers were evaluated by 3 members of the history faculty. Five or six student papers were evaluated for each of the three classes, for a total of 16 papers. The diversity of assignments and course levels presented challenges, and not all rubrics were relevant to

all assignments. In spite of the diversity in that regard, the assessment process was valuable as we consider the successes of our students in comparison to our expectations, and as we reconsider our SLOs and rubrics in the coming year.

F. We had unusual divergence in faculty evaluations of the same material, which seem to reflect different interpretations of the SLOs and rubrics. The overall picture of the results as stated above glosses over those, and indicates that next year the program faculty will need to have extensive discussion of the SLOs and rubrics and their meanings.

II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
SLO #4: [Students will] 4. Apply the concepts of historical thinking - for example in evaluating change over time.	Not previously addressed.	N/A	N/A	N/A
SLO #5: [Students will] 5. Demonstrate skills in historical	Spring 2011	Recommendations from program faculty from the previous review: 1) Give students more	Regarding program faculty recommendations: 1-4) Some members of the faculty have implemented	The process was improved, but there is still much work to be done. Closing the "loop" is very important to us. However, since this year the SLOs and

research, including historical analysis and interpretation.		<p>experience answering interpretive questions; 2) Give students additional map exercises to improve geographic literacy; 3) Place more emphasis on chronology, to help students grasp cause and effect; 4) If course includes a final exam, administer a midterm to help students learn professor's testing style, etc.; 5) have the faculty who teach world history courses meet more regularly to discuss specific strategies.</p> <p>Note: Recommendations from assessment reviewers were about the process, not about student performance or program quality.</p> <p>1) SLOs in assessment activities not matching the ones in the Plan.</p> <p>2) Assessment of lower division courses not in the Plan.</p> <p>3) Need to develop rubrics; none provided.</p> <p>4) Grades-based language needs to change to rubric-based language.</p> <p>5) More specifics suggested</p>	<p>specific suggestions, and there is for the future a commitment to meet more regularly for discussion of our SLOs and what they mean, how we assess them, the changes we are seeing in response, and our program in general. Please see Comments section below.</p> <p>Regarding process recommendations: 1) We have aligned wording to Plan, and also numbered the SLOs for more clarity. 2) Assessment of lower division courses has been added to the Plan. 3) We have rubrics, and they are provided here for the relevant SLOs. 4) Rubric-based language is used in this Report in place of grade-based language. 5) We have worked on increasing the specificity. 6) See the revised Plan for the results of our efforts in this regard.</p>	<p>the process were different from what was assessed last year, it is not possible to say that the changes have been effective.</p> <p>Please see Comments section below.</p>
---	--	--	--	---

		for columns F, G, and H. 6) Strengthen wording in Plan regarding how SLOs will be assessed.		
--	--	--	--	--

Comments:

H. Regarding “Closing the loop” as well as the assessment *process* in the History Program, this was a tumultuous year in which other priorities sidetracked much of the work we would like to have done.

- Coordination of the History Program has changed hands and involved gaps, so there has not been consistency in terms of communication and response to recommendations.
- The more general University turmoil has not bypassed our department. It has been very important to address losses and vacancies, budgets, planning, etc..
- In those contexts, not nearly as much follow-up and communication about assessment took place as would be desirable.