

2018 – 19 Departmental Executive Summary

Department: History, Geography, Intercultural Studies and Modern Languages

Date: 06/14/19

Members involved with analysis of artifacts: Tobin Beck, John Hink, Jamie Hink, Matt Phillips, Amy Royuk, Joel Helmer, Vicki Anderson

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):*

Students will be able to craft a paper which clearly states and supports a thesis, is appropriately structured, and uses correct grammar and proper citations.

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.

The students were scored on a four-part rubric under the categories: Purpose or Thesis, Structure, Grammar and Spelling, and Citation. Each category had three potential levels of achievement: Excellent (3), Good (2), Adequate (2), and Poor (1).

Students in Hist 434 – The Medieval Crusades were instructed to write a formal, original research papers 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. There were 10 total papers. Results:

| | Achieved Goal | Missed Goal | Avg: |
|----------------------|---------------|-------------|------|
| Thesis | 6 | 4 | 60% |
| Structure | 7 | 3 | 70% |
| Grammar and Spelling | 7 | 3 | 70% |
| Citation | 5 | 5 | 50% |

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

We did not meet the goal in any of the categories. However, one student did not complete the assignment and another submitted a paper well below the assigned standards. If we included only the other eight students' papers then we would have reached the goal of 80%.

4). *Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).*

Sharing of Results: *When were results shared? Date: 6/14/19 How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) via email Who were results shared with? (List names):* Joel Helmer, Tobin Beck, Vicki Anderson, Amy Royuk, John Hink, Jamie Hink, Amy Royuk, Matt Phillips

Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:

1. **ACTION***- *How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:*

a. *Teaching:* The results suggest additional instruction is necessary in relation to properly citing sources and creating a thesis.

b. *Assignment/course:* More specific examples and instruction on citations and thesis formulation.

c. *Program:* Review how instructors in each program teach writing and research, especially in relation to citations.

d. *Assessment:* Rethink our upcoming 2019-20 assessment plan to address more specifically proper citations.

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

the next academic year? With more intentional focus on teaching how to properly cite sources, we should see improvements.

3. **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS** – *Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION** 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): 6/20/19

Department Chair notified/additional action needed: na **BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment**

Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean: na **Approved & Posted to Assessment site:** 6/20/19