

Academic Program:	History	Date:	11/13/2022
Author(s):	Timothy Hawkins, Steven Stofferahn		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .			___x___ Learning Outcomes ___x___ Curriculum Map ___x___ Assessment Plan
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.			___ Yes ___ No ___ Hybrid

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison (if applicable)
	Course	Assignment/Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
The Assessment Committee assessed one core learning outcome (Understanding and Creating Appropriate Historical Context). We reviewed three artifacts from four different students.	HIST 200 & HIST 400	The Committee compared two written assignments from HIST 200 <i>and</i> one research paper from HIST 400, with the goal of identifying possible changes in levels of competency over time.	Rubric. See appendix.	Each artifact received two numerical scores, which were marked on a 0-4 scale, one for <i>understanding</i> and another for <i>creating</i> Appropriate Historical Context. The Scoring Rubric devised by the Committee is attached to the Report in the Appendix, along	Based on our experience from last year, the Committee expected to see an individual and a cohort improvement in scores from the 200 to the 400 level. We also expected to see an improvement in proficiency between the two courses. As the appendix from 2021-22 demonstrates, both these performance benchmarks were achieved. In each case, scores improved. And, more importantly, in each case students scored well above the proficiency expectation.	See appendix for 2020-21 results. The Committee expected to see clear student progress from HIST 200 to HIST 400 in 2020-21. These expectations and results were replicated this year. The Committee is confident that our assessment model is working.



				with the data collected. The Committee decided that a 3 would be our benchmark for proficiency.	Notably, for some students the change in proficiency score over time was dramatic.	
--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Student Success Activities

Use the “Academic Chair” tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program’s data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	<p>The Committee believes that our primary student success activities are working well. As we identified in the 2020-21 report, History majors used to take HIST 300, which broadly covered the practice of history. As a result of curricular revision, we broke that class into two sections: HIST 200 (sophomore-level) and HIST 400 (senior-level). In HIST 200, students learn about the discipline of history and have the opportunity to practice its tools in small assignments. HIST 400 is a capstone course for our majors that provides them with the opportunity to undertake a major project that puts their skills to work. Anecdotal comments and data confirm the wisdom of this strategy. Student evaluations have been consistently positive. While many majors expressed some intimidation about starting 400, a common response at the end of the course was pride in their accomplishments. This year the Committee noted the high quality of the submissions. In addition, it is worth noting that students who complete HIST 400 are expected to do a public presentation, a “professionalizing” aspect of the curriculum that models best practices for the discipline.</p> <p>The Committee would also like to draw attention to the History Club, an active and healthy student organization with 15-20 members. The department has provided dedicated space for Club members in Stalker Hall to encourage a sense of belonging within the discipline.</p>
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	When reviewing the retention data in Blue Reports, the Committee was drawn to the cohort retention number in Year Three. This appears to be an area of relative weakness. The Committee concluded that there might be a curricular



element to this data point, though the evidence is far from conclusive. After students take HIST 200 they are left to chart their own course within the major, according to department guidelines, until HIST 400.

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.

Continuous Quality Improvement

<p>Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. <i>What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?</i></p>	<p>With two years of data in hand, the Committee is confident that curriculum redesign is contributing to student success. In the wake of last year's results, the Committee expected to see evidence of progress as students moved from HIST 200 to HIST 400. This would translate numerically to higher average scores assigned to the artifact from HIST 400 than the artifacts from HIST 200. The rubric offered the Committee the potential to observe the direction for the overall student cohort. It also, of course, tracked individual outcomes. Finally, the Committee could review any significant statistical differences in outcomes between the <i>understanding</i> and <i>creating</i> parts of the learning outcome. As the Appendix shows, the Committee was pleased to see that the data provides real evidence of student improvement in the selected learning outcome.</p>
<p>What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?</p>	<p>Cohort retention will be a priority for the department moving forward. As noted in the previous text box, the Assessment Committee uncovered data regarding the student experience during Year Three that merits examination at a curricular level. There is, in fact, a concurrent discussion taking place now in the Curriculum Committee about the impact of an over-structured curriculum. This committee is also conducting a study to delineate the distinctions between 300 and 400-level courses. Both discussions will inform how the department addresses challenges within the Year Three cohort.</p> <p>In terms of maintaining/improving student performance, the department has an advantage with respect to the flexibility of the major. Most History majors have a double major or a minor in a related field. The Department will continue to explore ways to increase coordination, e.g. cross-listed courses, with other departments to improve student success.</p> <p>Otherwise, the cohort numbers, from first-year retention to five-year graduation rates, appear to fluctuate within a stable range, especially within relation to the overall university numbers.</p>



<p>What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?</p>	<p>This report follows the second year that the Department has had the 200/400 sequence in place for History majors. As noted above, the Department moved from HIST 300 to two required courses as part of a larger curriculum redesign to improve learning outcomes ahead of graduation. We determined that two sequential and interrelated methodology courses would have a significant impact on student success. With two years of data in hand, the Committee believes that there is compelling evidence in the value of the new model, and it looks forward to confirming this trend next year and beyond with additional review of this particular learning outcome. At the same time, the Committee also understands the importance of maintaining an artifact baseline. As it prepares for the coming year, the Committee will regularize its communication with the instructors of HIST 200/400 to ensure the preservation of sufficient submissions. (N.B. Some student artifacts were lost in the transition from Blackboard to Canvas this year.) It will also modify the assessment rubric as necessary to ensure that artifact assessors remain consistent in their review.</p>
<p>Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?</p>	<p>The Assessment Committee comprises five regular faculty, plus the department chairperson. Members represent all ranks. They reviewed and discussed the data presented here at a committee meeting in October. The Assessment Committee will discuss the 2021-22 results and conclusions at a regular departmental meeting before the end of the semester.</p>



Rubric for Assessment Committee

Assessing the Major at the 200 and 400 level

Levels of achievement for ranking each essay	Excellent - Proficient	Very Good - Meets most expectations	Acceptable - Meets some levels of expectations	Weak – Under-developed in terms of expectations	Insupportable/ Missing - Significantly absent of expectations
Student demonstrates that they understand historical arguments	4 pts Essay identifies, explains, and integrates relevant historical argument(s)	3 pts Essay identifies and explains relevant historical argument(s)	2 pts Essay identifies and mentions relevant historical argument(s)	1 pt Essay identifies and mentions minimally relevant historical argument(s)	0 pts No clear evidence of recognizing historical argument(s)
Student is able to create (an) historical argument(s)	4 pts Essay advances clear, relevant historical argument with supporting evidence.	3 pts Essay advances relevant historical argument(s) with sufficient support and explanation.	2 pts Essay includes basic historical argument(s) with minimal or narrow support.	1 pt Essay includes elements of historical argument(s).	0 pts No explicit explanation of historical argument(s).

[Appendix: Table II](#)

HIST Assessment Fall 2022 AVERAGES	HIST 200 Chicago	HIST 200 Debate	HIST 200 Average		HIST 400 Paper		200-400 CHANGE
Student A: Understand	3	3	3		3.7		0.7
Student A: Create	2.2	2.7	2.45		3.5		1.05
Student B: Understand	3.7	3.2	3.45		3.7		0.25
Student B: Create	3	2.8	2.9		3.8		0.9
Student C: Understand	2.7	1.7	2.2		3.3		1.1
Student C: Create	3	2.7	2.85		3.5		0.65
Student D: Understand	3.3	2.7	3		4		1
Student D: Create	3.5	2.2	2.85		4		1.15

Appendix: Table III

HIST Assessment Fall 2021	HIST 200 Chicago	HIST 200 Debate	HIST 400 Paper
	AVG	AVG	AVG
Student A: Understand	3.17	2.83	3.83
Student A: Create	2.67	2.25	3.50
Student B: Understand	2.67	2.17	3.00
Student B: Create	1.83	1.83	2.83
Student C: Understand	2.00	1.83	1.67
Student C: Create	1.33	1.00	1.33
Student D: Understand	1.58	1.83	1.50
Student D: Create	0.75	1.83	1.58
Student E: Understand	2.00	2.67	2.83
Student E: Create	2.50	2.50	3.00
Student F: Understand	1.17	1.58	2.00
Student F: Create	0.33	1.00	1.50
Student G: Understand	2.00	1.17	2.17
Student G: Create	1.50	1.17	2.92
Student H: Understand	2.17	2.00	2.50
Student H: Create	2.08	1.17	2.67

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: BA History Evaluation: Exemplary

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
<p>Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.</p>		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>		Mature
<p>Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.</p>	<p>Great use of multiple points of data from early and later points in the curriculum to provide insights into student learning progression.</p> <p>Assessment strategy includes analytical tools that allow for precise evaluation of mastery relative to each LO.</p>	<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>	<p>What is the overall population size from which the sample is determined? Is 4 samples an adequate reflection? It may be – just raising the question for consideration. No need for further justification.</p>	Exemplary

<p>Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>		Mature
<p>Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.</p>	<p>The History program has developed an intentional assessment process designed to provide quality data through comparisons over time.</p>	<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>		Exemplary

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.