

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016

Program: History

Date: June 1, 2016

Completed by: Judy Gaughan

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): N/A

Please describe the 2015-2016 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2016-2017 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2015-2016 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2014-2015. 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? |
|---|---|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| (#1) Demonstrate literacy—analytical reading and effective writing skills—in general, and for historical content. | Sp'15 | One faculty member read and evaluated student papers in the required Capstone Seminar course using a rubric created by the Program Coordinator. | All students (11, total) who earned a grade of C or better in HIST 493 in Fall 2015. The required grade for majors is a C or better in | 80 % of students should be proficient or better when the assessment is based on work in the capstone seminar | 81% of students were proficient or exemplary in Analytical Reading. 100% of students were proficient or exemplary in Writing for Historical | The program is delighted with these results. On the other hand, the program is hesitant to draw conclusions about its apparent great success in the belief that this strong showing may be an anomaly. | Continue the good work the faculty are doing by continuing to have high standards when assessing reading and writing skills through all the stages of the students' academic program from the introductory courses to the capstone. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| | | It is attached. | the course. Three of the 14 enrolled students did not earn a C or better. | | Content. 91% of students were proficient or exemplary in writing in general. | Also, the program wants to keep in mind the three students who did not achieve a C or better before the semester ended and so needed to repeat the course or complete a fourth draft with help from the writing center and the professor. The program's high expectations slow down some students who need more time to achieve proficiency. | The faculty should watch to see whether the remarkable skills demonstrated in the capstone seminar in the Fall of 2015 was a fluke based on a particular combination of exceptional students or whether the combined unique efforts of each faculty member to teach our students to read critically and write clearly is paying off. |
| (#5) Demonstrate skills in historical research, including historical analysis and interpretation | Sp'14 | One faculty member read and evaluated student papers in the required Capstone Seminar course using a rubric created by the Program Coordinator. It is attached. | All students (11, total) who earned a grade of C or better in HIST 493 in Fall 2015. The required grade for majors is a C or better in the course. Three of the 14 enrolled students did not earn a C or better. | 80% of students should be proficient or better when the assessment is based on work in the capstone seminar | 91% of students were proficient or exemplary in research, 91% of students were proficient or exemplary in analysis, 81% of students were proficient or exemplary in interpretation, 100% of students were proficient or exemplary in synthesis | same as for SLO #1 | Continue to teach students methods of historical thinking through all levels of the academic program. Here, too, the faculty should watch to see whether the remarkable skills demonstrated in the capstone seminar in the Fall of 2015 was a fluke or whether the combined unique efforts of each faculty member to train our students to think and study as historians is paying off. |

Comments:

- 1) SLO 1 “Demonstrate literacy—analytical reading and effective writing skills—in general, and for historical content” is tested more frequently than the other SLOs because it is believed to be an indication of skills important for student post-graduate success regardless of future career choice.
- 2) SLO 5 “Demonstrate skills in historical research, including historical analysis and interpretation.” Success in this SLO is particularly impressive because for many students the topic of the seminar was not a field of history in which they had previous experience. This meant that they were able to transfer their skills in the practice of history to a field of history in which they had had no experience.
- 3) SLO#1 and SLO #5 were also tested in successive years in the hopes of improving our ability to “close the gap.” It seems to be working.

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? |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| # 1 Demonstrate literacy—analytical reading and effective writing skills—in general, and for historical content. | 2015 | Continue to emphasize writing in history courses at all levels. Maintain high expectations of student literacy in general and in the discipline of History. | Done! | If this year’s assessment is any indication, we continue to succeed in helping students to achieve this learning outcome. |
| (#5) Demonstrate skills in historical research, including historical analysis and interpretation | 2014 (and 2015; these comments are from the 2014 report) | 1) Provide more emphasis on historiography and historical thinking skills in all upper division courses 2) Work among faculty so that all SLOs are a conscious part of the teaching and learning interactions. | Faculty have had some discussions about how we apply historical skill in all upper division courses and how we might ensure that none of the skills fall through the cracks. | The recommendation is still that the faculty meet to arrive at consensus about what we mean by each SLO and rubric, and perhaps to reconsider and revise the SLOs and the related rubrics. This should happen in AY 2016-2017 before the next annual assessment. |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| | | <p>For both SLOs assessed in 2013-14: The History program faculty will meet during the 2014-2015 academic year for the following purposes: 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> | <p>This history program did not meet to consider our interpretation of the SLOs, how percentages work in conjunction with our methodology or how we close the loop. The program has been hit hard by losses of more than ½ the faculty members in a few years and so each individual faculty member has had to take on far more responsibility, which has hindered our ability to spend more time on assessment.</p> | <p>Other recommendations (Column C, numbers 2 and 3 under "For both SLOs") are more about the process of assessment than the content of assessment so if the content is taken care of, these other items might fall into place. If not, we can reconsider them at a future date.</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

Rubric for Totals for Annual Assessment Academic Year 2015/2016

HIST 493 Papers, Fall 2015

| Student Learning Outcome (#1) Demonstrate literacy— analytical reading and effective writing skills— in general, and for historical content | Not Demonstrated | Emerging | Proficient | Exemplary | % proficient or better |
|---|---------------------|----------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| Analytical Reading | | 2 | 4 | 5 | 82% |
| Effective Writing in general | | 1 | 5 | 5 | 91% |
| Effective Writing for Historical Content | | | 7 | 4 | 100% |
| Comments | | | | | |

| Student Learning Outcome (#5) Demonstrate skills in historical research, including historical analysis and interpretation | Not Demonstrated | Emerging | Proficient | Exemplary | % proficient or better |
|---|---------------------|----------|------------|-----------|------------------------------|
| research | | 1 | 8 | 2 | 91% |
| analysis | | 1 | 4 | 6 | 91% |
| interpretation | | 2 | 5 | 4 | 81% |
| synthesis | | | 7 | 4 | 100% |
| Comments | | | | | |