

#2. Executive Summary: Undergraduate Program Assessment: Student Outcomes

To be completed by Departments and submitted by the Department Chair to the Assessment Blackboard Site.

Department: History, Geography, Criminal Justice **Date:** 6/12/18

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Tobin Beck, John Hink, Jamie Hink, Chris Phillips, Joel Helmer

See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for: a) *Student Outcome*; b) *Background*; c) *Question(s)*; d) *Methodology*

Analysis of artifacts:

1). **PERFORMANCE CRITERIA*** - *How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).* Data was analyzed using the attached rubric

Summary of RESULTS*:

1). *Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):*

Can students analyze information relating to a specific topic/thesis?

2). *Summarize the assessment results. A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.*

Goal: 80 percent of students at the "excellent" level for each category on the rubric.

For the Departmental Assessment in the 2017-2018 school year, which focused on communication, the Department of History, Geography and Criminal Justice chose to assess the question: "Can students analyze information relating to a specific topic/thesis?" The students were scored on a four-part rubric under the categories: Declarative Sentence, Scope, Effectiveness, and Support. Each category had four potential levels of achievement: Excellent (4), Proficient (3), Adequate (2), and Poor (1).

We applied our rubric to papers completed in two courses: Hist. 335: Renaissance & Reformation and PS111 American Government.

PS111 American Government:

Overall results: Ten student essays were chosen to be representative of the range of essays from 33 members of the spring PS111-01 American Government class. We exceeded the goal, with three students scoring perfect 4's in all four categories. It should be noted that while the thesis statements in all but one case met the rubric criteria at either a 3 or 4 level, the thesis statements were at various locations within the thesis/topic paragraph, and not necessarily the beginning or ending sentence of the paragraph.

Average results within categories:

Declarative: (3.3 out of 4, or 82.5 percent)

Scope: (3.8 out of 4, or 95 percent)

Effectiveness: (3.7 out of 4, or 92.5 percent)

Support: (3.7 out of 4, or 92.5 percent)

Hist 335: Renaissance & Reformation:

Overall results: Students were instructed to write a formal, original research paper on an approved topic of their choosing. These papers were to be based on primary sources and supported by secondary sources, cited according to the Turabian style. Eleven papers were chosen to assess.

Average results within categories:

Declarative: (2.9 out of 4, 81.8 percent)

Scope: (2.9 out of 4, 81.8 percent)

Effectiveness: (2.7 out of 4, 72.7 percent)

Support: (3 out of 4, 81.8 percent)

3). **INTERPRETATION*** - *Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).*

While the results for PS111 show that students met the goal of 80 percent achievement of excellence, there is ample room for improvement in the clarity of writing, which was not directly measured by the rubric. In Hist 335 we met the goal for 3 of 4 categories. Some students simply did not put the effort into the work. Most performed at acceptable levels. However, we could improve these scores by more closely monitoring the students' first drafts and giving them feedback.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s). (i.e. interrater reliability of the scoring tool was low)*

Sharing of Results:

When were results shared? Date: 5/30/18

How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Via email and face-to-face

Who were results shared with? (List names): Tobin Beck, Joel Helmer, Matt Phillips, John Hink, Jamie Hink

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact the teaching process/course/program etc. in your department starting the next academic year?*

This assessment suggests that as an institution we would do well to place more emphasis on essay writing skills in English and other classes for freshmen, so that by the time they get into the intermediate and upper level classes, they can build and polish those skills to the excellence level.

We will continue to place emphasis on building strong writing skills in our courses.

2. **IMPACT***- *What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?*

With intentional focus on writing skills, we should see improvements in student essays, especially in the formation and support of thesis statements.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* (i.e. an additional staff person, new equipment, additional sections of a course).* NA

If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.

What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future? NA

Submitted by: Joel Helmer Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date): 6/14/18

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na

BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na

Approved & Posted to Assessment site: 7/1/18