

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18

Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.

Unit/Program Name: History **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Daniel A. Clark Dan.Clark@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities—Last collected Assessment Data was for Graduates of 2017

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p>
<p>1. Strong analytical, communication, quantitative, and information skills</p>	<p>The Assessment Committee routinely requests that faculty members in the department collect and deposit assignments (i.e. assessment artifacts) from history majors in their 300-400 level classes, owing to the fact that all faculty are expected to require assignments that develop the disciplinary knowledge and skills represented by our learning outcomes. Committee members then score students' papers on a 1-5 scale. Members scores are then averaged for each student, and then students' overall scores within the learning outcomes criteria are averaged.</p>	<p>This criterion is an established "best practice" in the field of History as recommended by the American Historical Association. Our faculty members have discussed this and all of the criteria listed here thoroughly. The expectation is that our graduates reach at least a "4" (much evidence of meeting the outcome) upon completion.</p>	<p>As noted previously, each member of the assessment committee rates each artifact on a scale from 1-5, with 1 being little or no evidence and a 5 being much evidence. These scores are then averaged as a whole for all artifacts to represent how the program is fulfilling its learning outcomes. The scores were as follows: I-4 II-4.1 III-3.6 IV-3.7 V-4.1</p>	<p>Compared with many other departments on the ISU campus, the Dept. of History's assessment regime has set a standard of proven quality for a number of years. The learning outcomes assessed do support the conclusion that students in our program acquire a baseline of desired knowledge and skills appropriate for the discipline and in line with broader goals in achieving a liberal arts education. That said, the Assessment Committee has also long recognized the less than ideal manner of collecting suitable artifacts for access. The present system essentially relies on the good will of faculty members to submit material, which while</p>
<p>2. A deep understanding of and hands-on experience with the inquiry practices of the discipline;</p>	<p>(This cell is merged with the previous row's content.)</p>	<p>(This cell is merged with the previous row's content.)</p>	<p>(there were 5 students in the sample) The scores indicate that students/the program are meeting expectations in three</p>	<p>(This cell is merged with the previous row's content.)</p>

		(much evidence of meeting the outcome) upon completion.	out of the five outcome categories. The scores in III and IV were decent (close to our ideal), but not quite there, although this may owe more to not collecting a wide enough array of artifacts to demonstrate competencies assessed in that criteria.	offering a solid random sampling of the work done by students in the department (and while also again demonstrating that our faculty meet the challenge of offering proven value in the program through their courses), also can be viewed as a hap-hazard or unstable method of collecting data for analysis. The committee this year will explore revised methods for collecting data chiefly by identifying more stable collection points (i.e. fixed classes in which to collect artifacts). Owing to the recent revision of the history curriculum, the opportunity to imbed specific types of assignments within the expectations of two new methods courses required in the major (HIST 200 and 400) will allow for two stable points of collection within the program, and also offer a view of student development within the program, potentially. All this would enhance the data that would continue to be collected from all 300-400 level History classes.
3. Acquisition of intercultural knowledge and collaborative problem-solving skills		This criterion is an established “best practice” in the field of History as recommended by the American Historical Association. Our faculty members have discussed this and all of the criteria listed here thoroughly. The expectation is that our graduates reach at least a “4” (much evidence of meeting the outcome) upon completion. The ability of History graduates to attain “intercultural knowledge,” however, is largely dependent upon the subject matter pursued and the collection of such.		
4. Demonstrate an understanding of the historical context that shapes individual, civic, and social choices		This criteria departs somewhat from the American Historical Association’s recommendations. It represents the History Dept.’s alignment with Indiana State University’s mission and is largely dependent upon the subject matter pursued by the students (and its proper collection).		
5. Habits of mind that foster integrative thinking and the ability to transfer skills and knowledge from one setting to another," displayed through advanced research projects		This criterion is an established “best practice” in the field of History as recommended by the American Historical Association. Our faculty members have discussed this and all of the criteria listed here thoroughly. The		

		expectation is that our graduates reach at least a “4” (much evidence of meeting the outcome) upon completion.		
--	--	--	--	--

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

As noted above in section d., the faculty in the Department of History do an admirable job collectively in imparting what we would consider core or defining knowledge and skills of the discipline. The areas of Intercultural Knowledge and Collaborative Skills along with the area of Civic and Social Choices constitute areas where the program could improve with students performing just shy of established program goals, although (as noted) this too might be more a symptom of the less than ideal methods traditionally employed to collect student artifacts. With regard to evidence of “improvement,” compared to past reports the student/program performance averages have held remarkably steady. There is no marked evidence of decline or improvement. The Dept. of History established rather high standards to begin with and student/program performance would indicate that we continue to meet those high standards. As noted in section e. (above), the Assessment Committee will focus its energy on revising learning outcomes and fashioning a new more stable mechanism for collections of artifacts tied to two new courses, one of which functions as a capstone, which the department has not had previously.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals
---	---	--	--	---

				can also be added on a new line.
1.				
2.				
3.				

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific—assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college’s assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Dan,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: BA History	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.75/3.00) Student Success Practice Overall Rating: Undeveloped (0.00/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Excellent approach to incorporating multiple faculty members in the assessment process, as well in communicating findings out to faculty for considerations and use.• Excellent use of reliable artifact assessment procedures.• Clear and professionally supported rationale for selected performance targets, and clear reporting of student performance as evaluated using rubrics relative to targets.• Great description of plans to optimize the artifact collection process to continue high quality assessment without ongoing challenges. I'm unsure of how many BA History majors there are, but 5 artifacts does strike me as a small number (perhaps not depending on the total population size). This might yield more data that is a more accurate reflection of student performance.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Some outcomes are very compound, making it hard to know if the entire outcome is being achieved by the designated measures. Breaking these apart into more specific outcomes or denoting how the measures are complex enough to distinguish between components of the outcomes will be useful for ensuring the precision of your assessment and accuracy of the assumptions drawn from your findings.• Without more data points it might be hard to suggest improvement. The average scores by criterion is a useful way to target specific areas for improvement, especially since the average scores across criterion just misses the overall expected score of 4.

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).

Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided.</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)Unit/Program:

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary