Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19   *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

Unit/Program Name: Department of History, Master's Program   **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Lisa.Phillips@indstate.edu

Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	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?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? *Can expand on this in Part 2.*
1. Analytical, quantitative, and informational skills (G4 and G5)	Final papers from Hist 621 (Research Seminar)	Mid-level (some analysis but in need of guidance from expert faculty member, more research)	About there … 3/4 students mid-level; 1/4 beyond expectations.	We will assess the same students' culminating projects, normally the final draft of the project they started in Hist 621, assessed here.
2. Hands-on experience with the "inquiry practices," of the discipline (G3 and G4)	Final papers from Hist 621 (Research Seminar)	Mid-level (some primary sources, some secondary sources, some archival research)	Above what was expected; all made use of a significant number of primary and secondary sources.	We will assess the same students' culminating projects, normally the final draft of the project they started in Hist 621, assessed here.
3. Integrative thinking including all of the skills listed above and the ability to communicate findings effectively to an audience (G1 and G4)	Final papers from Hist 621 (Research Seminar)	Good (demonstrate an ability to synthesize information from a number of sources)	All are able to synthesize information from a number of sources, both primary and secondary.	We will assess the same students' culminating projects, normally the final draft of the project they started in Hist 621, assessed here.

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.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table
   a.   Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
   b.   Each outcome should 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 should 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. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
   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: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use Blue Reports to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):

1) Cohort Sizes   2) Year-to-Year Retention   3) 5-Year Graduation Rate

We admit roughly 5 students each semester (10) and graduate about 5-7 each year (two in the fall, three in the spring). At the moment, we have 32 active, matriculated students. That number seems to be increasing by 1-2 each year. Our students are online, part-time students. It takes them between three and five years to complete the degree. Our first 2014 admits have all, save two, graduated now. The remaining two should finish this year. Our retention rate year to year is strong, albeit some of our teachers will take a semester off to coach, etc.

--What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Our faculty were in better communication, ensuring our reading and writing expectations were similar across the board. We made some key changes to the curriculum, all now approved at the department level and going through the college/university-level channels now.

--What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

By the fall 2020, we will be able to offer a new Hist 600 "Historical Research and Methods" to our incoming graduate students. The course will better set expectations along the lines of what we are assessing here. This year, we are working on what was suggested in the AY 2018-2019 assessment report, that is make assessable criteria (we thought we had but we are now using two "artifacts" instead of just one so that we can actually assess the progress each student makes while in the program). It will take us the year to develop a point scale, etc., and we are not quite sure how we will collect the artifacts this year in particular as our students part-time and online. It is doable as we have the artifacts from the spring 2019 section of our "Research Seminar" course but not all of them are graduating this year. It will be a small sample but will still enable us to develop workable criteria.

Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)

This is not applicable as the majority of our students are employed full-time. Most are teachers who enroll in our program part-time for the purposes of advancing in their already chosen career.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:

1) **the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness**

Based upon last year's assessment feedback, we realized we need two artifacts, rather than one, and are developing a system by which to collect them. We are discussing from which courses to collect the first artifact and are trying Hist 621, the "Research Seminar." Students take this course about midway through the program. The paper they produce has all of the elements we assess for here but is only the first run through of what usually becomes their culminating project. We intend then to compare the papers produced in the research seminar with their final paper, usually produced about a year later and the basis of their master's defense. The students who took Hist 621 in the spring of 2019 (assessed here) should graduate this year or next (that's the trick). We have now, though, a score for each "621" paper and will compare those with the same student's culminating papers when they successfully defend. At that point we should have a beginning and ending score for the same student for each of the three criteria listed.

2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)

Faculty have coordinated with each other about course reading and writing expectations and we are in the process of implementing our new Hist 600 "Research Methods" for Fall 2020.

3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year

We are committed to the criteria listed but, with "mid-way" and "after" artifacts, we should be able to develop a scale for each student on each criteria, e.g., "went from 3 to 5" or "stayed at 3." Presumably, those criteria with the least movement will need attention.

4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders

The Graduate Committee will present its new two-artifact assessment plan to the department over the course of the year, for its approval.

Dear Lisa,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were 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: M.A. History	Overall Rating: Mature (2.38/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
- Learning outcome 3 is pretty clear, specific, and measurable. - Courses and assignments used for assessment are clearly defined. Great information about future assessment of culminating projects that reflect growth from the first point of assessment in 621. - Expected and actual results presented. - Good insights into the development of the assessment plan to provide richer data by using multiple points of assessment, coordinating course reading and writing expectations among faculty, and development of an evaluation scale. - Good information is provided about how faculty are involved in and informed of the assessment practice/process and how information will be shared with stakeholders. This is clearly a meaningful approach to shared practice.	- Learning outcome 1 needs a verb to indicate the type of student achievement you want to see. Learning outcome 2 is less about learning and more about what students will do to achieve a certain type of learning – one way to word would be Apply discipline-specific inquiry practices to historical research. - It might not be available at this time, as it is noted that a scale is in development, but a little more information about the mid-level and beyond expectations ratings of students would be helpful in providing context. Also, should all students meet expectations, or a certain number of students? Standards are usually appropriately higher in graduate programs, so there's not a specific right way to do this – just a question to consider.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	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. (outcome 1)
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. 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.).	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome. (somewhat) Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

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