



Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011_12

Department History

Representative Morris Bian

Course Name / number HIST1010/1017, HIST1020/1027

1. AGSC Content Area of Alignment: Area IV: History, Social and Behavior Sciences

2. SLO(s) being assessed: Student will..

SLO 8: Students will be informed and engaged citizens of the U.S. and the world.

SLO 9: Students will understand and appreciate diversity of an within societies of the U.S. and the world.

3. Assessment Method(s):

[Explain how assessment for the measures associated with this SLO - not grading for the course as a whole - was conducted. You may cut/paste rubrics for inclusion here, identify faculty reviewing committees, or identify specific kinds of test questions important to your method. Is this the method you initially planned to use? Provide a separate paragraph for each method].

During the previous two academic years (2010-2011 and 2011-2012), The World History program assessed achievement of Student Learning Outcomes 8 and 9. While SLO 8 stipulates that “students will be informed and engaged citizens of the United States and the world”, SLO 9 requires that “Students will understand and appreciate the diversity of and within societies of the United States and the world”. We used the same assessment method for both academic years. Basically, the method entailed linking 6 questions on an objective exam to the 6 SLOs, then gathering the data generated by scantron on student responses to each question. We then determined the total number of correct and incorrect student responses for each SLO for all 1010 sections and all 1020 sections, and then developed an average from the total number of students taking the exam for 1010 sections and 1020 sections. Instructors first submitted 12 questions to the world history coordinator, who reviewed these, and then approved which 6 questions each instructor would link to each SLO and then place on the exam.

4. Findings: What assessment data did each assessment method produce?

During the 2011-12 academic year, the history department completed another round of assessment of general education student learning outcomes in world history sections. We used the same process of direct measurement enlisted in the 2010-2011 academic year. Assessment of SLOs occurred in 11 sections of 1010 and 8 sections of 1020. This does not include honors sections, sections in which instructors did not use an objective exam format, sections in which instructors failed to complete assessment, or sections in which instructors did not complete the assessment process correctly. We did, however, complete assessment in the majority of world history sections taught in 2011-2012. Assessment yielded interesting results in 2011-2012. In the 1010 sections, the highest percentage of students answering correctly an SLO tagged question was 85% (SLO8.1), and the second highest was 82% (SLO8.2). This was a much better result than the previous year. However, the lowest result was 60% on SLO9.1, which was lower than the previous year. In the 1020 sections, the highest percentage of students answering correctly to an SLO tagged question was 84% (SLO9.3), and the lowest was 67% (SLO8.1), which was a poorer performance than the previous year. Moreover, 1010 students still performed most poorly on SLO9.1, and 1020 students still performed the best on SLO9.3.

5. How did you (or will you) use the findings for improvement?

[What questions / issues / concerns did your data raise for the faculty teaching the course? What discussion did the faculty have about the findings? What future actions to improve student attainment of this outcome will the department / program take as a result of this analysis?]

A couple of mitigating factors should be considered in evaluating the meaning of the assessment results from 2011-12. First, in terms of the poor showing by 1020 sections, fewer of these sections were assessed than would normally be the case. Three of these sections, comprising approximately 400-600 students were never



Core Curriculum Assessment Report 2011_12

Department History

Representative Morris Bian

Course Name / number HIST1010/1017, HIST1020/1027

assessed in Spring 2012. Had these students been assessed, the results for the 1020 sections may well have been different. Certainly, that difference could have been either better or worse. Second, although the world history faculty agreed to include the SLOs explicitly on their syllabi for the 2011-2012 academic year, less than half of the world history faculty and instructors actually followed through with that pledge. Certainly, whether or not the SLOs appear on a syllabus alone is not sufficient to account for the quality of student performance on the assessment measure. However, we need a more concerted effort to at least include the SLOs on world history syllabi and to address them explicitly at least once during the course of the semester, in addition to the multiple ways each of our courses already address these themes via our individual historical content. Moreover, this assessment requirement needs to be communicated to instructors and adjuncts who teach a significant portion of world history sections.

6. Additional Comments:

[What else would you like the Committee to know about your assessment of this course or plans for the future?]

None

7. Committee Comments

Mean of rubric score = 2.91 (out of 4) They seem to be more concerned with getting the faculty to acknowledge the SLOs for appearance sake than what they mean. There is no data present to this end. It is assumed that since there was discussion about including the SLOs in the syllabi there was contact with the faculty. Does HIST 1010 and 1020 faculty meet to discuss? Do you have a subset of say full time tenure track faculty on an assessment committee? How many instructors submitted questions for inclusion on the exam? Report shows evidence of discussion among relevant teaching faculty.