

## 2022 – 23 Departmental Executive Summary

<b>Department:</b> History, Geography, Intercultural Studies & Modern Languages <b>Date:</b> 6/16/23
<b>Members involved with analysis of artifacts:</b> Matt Phillips, Joel Helmer, John Hink, Jamie Hink, Vicki Anderson, Tobin Beck, Amy Royuk
<b>See #1 Undergraduate Program Assessment Plan: Student Outcomes for:</b> <i>a) Student Outcome; b) Background; c) Question(s); d) Methodology</i>
<b>Analysis of artifacts:</b> 1). <b>PERFORMANCE CRITERIA</b> * - <i>How was data analyzed? (attach rubrics/scoring tools if used).</i> Students wrote a research paper in which they were tasked to write a clear thesis on an historical topic related to the Europe in the 20th century and support that thesis with sources and evidence.
<b>Summary of RESULTS*:</b> 1). <i>Restate the assessment question(s) (from the Assessment plan):</i> Can students analyze information relating to a specific topic/thesis? 2). <i>Summarize the assessment results. (A narrative summary is required. Charts, tables or graphs are encouraged but optional.)</i> Students conducted research on a specific topic related to 20th-century Europe. We discussed these topics in class as they did their work. When students completed their papers the professor then assessed the papers based on the instructions for formulating a thesis and supporting with historical sources and arguments. The professor collected 10 papers from the students in the course. He examined the papers based on the following categories: declarative sentence, scope, effectiveness, and support. Each category received a score of 1-4 with 4 being the best and 1 being the worst. The averages for the eight papers were the following: Declarative Sentence: 3 Scope: 3 Effectiveness: 3 Support: 3 3). <b>INTERPRETATION</b> * - <i>Discuss how the results answer the assessment question(s).</i> The majority of students effectively implemented the assignment. Three students lagged behind the others in performance especially. Two students completed the assignment almost perfectly. Five students performed satisfactorily to quite well. 4). <i>Observations made that were not directly related to the question(s).</i> Students are able to implement partial requirements of the assignment, but many need to refine the prose and basic arguments.
<b>Sharing of Results:</b> <i>When were results shared? Date: 6/21/23</i> <i>How were the results shared? (i.e. met as a department) Email</i> <i>Who were results shared with? (List names):</i> Matt Phillips, John Hink, Tobin Beck, Vicki Anderson, Amy Royuk, Joel Helmer, Jamie Hink
<b>Discussion of Results –Summarize your conclusions including:</b> 1. <b>ACTION</b> *- <i>How will what the department learned from the assessment impact:</i> a. <i>Teaching:</i> The results suggest additional instruction is necessary in relation to analysing information relating to a specific thesis. Additionally, we must recognize that students enter Concordia with different levels of educational background. b. <i>Assignment/course:</i> Model how to write a proper thesis through the use of more seminar courses. c. <i>Program:</i> Review how instructors in each program teach writing and research, especially in relation to thesis design and effectiveness. d. <i>Assessment:</i> Rethink our upcoming 2023-24 assessment plan to address more specifically teaching research related writing. 2. <b>IMPACT</b> *- <i>What is the anticipated impact of the ACTION* on student achievement of the learning outcome in the next academic year?</i> With more intentional focus on teaching research writing skills, we should see an improvement in student papers. 3. <b>BUDGET IMPLICATIONS</b> – <i>Indicate budget requirements necessary for the successful implementation of the ACTION* NA</i>
<b>If action is taken – it is recommended that the same learning outcome and assessment plan be used for a second assessment cycle.</b>
<b>What assessment questions related to the learning outcome would the program like to investigate in the future?</b> NA

**Submitted by:** Joel Helmer

**Reviewed by the Assessment Committee (date):** 8/1/23

**Department Chair notified approved/additional action needed:** Aproved 8/1/23

**BUDGET IMPLICATIONS – Assessment Committee Chair notified appropriate Dean:** na