

UW Colleges Assessment Planning and Reporting Form
2005-2006

Email your reports to SAC@uwc.edu

Department	History
Assessment Coordinator(s)	Aharon W. Zorea

PART 1: Assessment of General Education Outcomes

Section 1: Identify the Proficiencies and Performance Indicators Assessed

	Proficiency	Performance Indicators	Courses Fall Semester	Courses Spring Semester
A2	A. Analytical Skills	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Interpret and synthesize information and ideas. 2. Analyze and evaluate arguments. 	HIS101: US to Civil War HIS102: US Since Civil War HIS105: Western Civilization I HIS161: World History Since 1500	HIS101: US to Civil War HIS102: US Since Civil War HIS106: Western Civilization II HIS162: World History Since 1500 HIS118: US & Vietnam HIS256: History of Literature of US South HIS271: History of Science and Technology HIS278: Minorities in America HIS286: US – 1945 to Present

Section 2: Explain how, in general, the institutional rubric was applied to assessment activities. Please attach examples of assessment activities (i.e. modified rubric, assignment, questions) and measurements used to place individuals into the three categories (exceeds, meets, fails to meet). **When completing this section, it may be best to explain the results by course (or course cluster if there were similar tools or results) rather than by instructor.**

Proficiency	Exceeds	Meets	Fails to meet
Analyze and Evaluate Arguments [A2]	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discusses points of view very well 2. Outlines information very well 3. Draws conclusions and examines implications 4. Recognizes the difference between a primary source and a secondary source <p>[326 for year: 27%]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Discusses points of view adequately 2. Outlines information adequately 3. Draws conclusions 4. Recognizes the difference between a primary source and a secondary source <p>[661 for year: 53%]</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Fails to recognize alternative points of view 2. Fails to outline information consistently 3. Fails to draw conclusions 4. Fails to recognize the difference between a primary source and a secondary source <p>[251 for year: 20%]</p>

For the 2005-2006 year, History Faculty assigned primary documents of their own choosing, that were most appropriate for their individual courses. After reading the primary document, students were given a Department-developed worksheet to complete. This worksheet was modified from one used by the National Archives and Records Administration, and it requires students to analyze the both the nature of

the document and its primary argument. Faculty used the document analysis worksheet as the primary tool for assessing student's abilities to analyze arguments, based on the rubrics identified above.

Faculty members were not required to select the same primary document for each course cluster, but were instead encouraged to select a document that best fit into their existing course themes. Examples of excerpted documents used for analysis ranged from, *The Death of Beowulf*, Herodotus' "On the Kings of Sparta," and Machiavelli's *The Prince*, to *The Life of Frederick Douglass*, Ralph Waldo Emerson's *American Scholar* and Henry David Thoreau's *Walden*. Other faculty used short documents in the entirety, such as the French National Assembly's "The Rights of Man", the United Nations' "Universal Declaration of Human Rights" or such complete speeches as Lincoln's "Gettysburg Address", and Booker T. Washington's "Atlanta Compromise". A copy of the Department Assessment worksheet is appended at the end of this report.

At least three faculty used out-of-class essays as their primary assessment tool for the Institutional assessment. Student were given a course-related essay question, and asked to write an appropriate essay. The essay was then evaluated according to the same rubrics identified above. One example of an essay assigned for institutional assessment was, "To what extent was Frederick Douglass a typical American?" These same faculty members still used the Department-developed worksheets for the Department assessment program (as further described below in Part 2(2)).

Section 3: Use of Results

1. Use by instructors - Summarize the ways individual instructors plan to use assessment results to improve the instructional process.

History Department Faculty members all had generally positive comments for this year's assessment program. Since the Institutional and Departmental programs shared the same proficiencies and tools, this satisfaction was shared for both programs.

After reviewing the results of their individual course assessments, History Faculty who taught survey courses (100 level) during the Fall term generally echoed three basic proposals for how they planned to use the results during the next time they teach the course. The most common plan was to integrate more primary documents into their regular reading schedule for each course. Most history faculty already used sources outside those provided by the text alone, but they often emphasized more secondary than primary materials. As a result of their assessment results, many professors planned to revise their assignment schedule to include more attention to primary materials. One professor planned to include numerous short documents throughout the semester, which could be done briefly during class and thereby expose students to more examples of historical writing.

In line with the emphasis on greater numbers of primary documents, History professors also planned to incorporate more discussion of the primary document readings and analysis into their regularly scheduled classroom discussions. One professor planned to more formal activities that specifically focused on outlining the arguments made by historical figures. Several professors planned to assign the document analysis worksheets many times throughout the semester, in order to ensure that students fully understood the expectations of the assessment assignment before they were formally assessed on it. Others planned to either choose documents that were more relevant to the lecture-based discussions, or adapt the lectures to provide greater historical context for the assigned documents. Others simply planned to incorporate more "hands-on" analysis during class time of the assigned primary documents. A less common plan was to introduce more writing assignments that focused more specifically on the kinds of critical thinking required to understand and analyze primary sources. Another less common plan was to provide students with a list of standardized questions applicable to any historical source, which students could use to help them "dig deeper" with their analysis. Amongst the diversity of individual course modifications, there was a general consensus among all professors that they wanted to encourage greater understanding of primary document materials through more active student participation in the necessary historical analysis.

The third most common type of proposal mentioned by History Faculty was some plan to provide more incentives (or penalties for non participation) to encourage students take the assessment program more seriously. One solution proposed by several professors was to assess assignments that were already ingrained into the course curriculum, and attach a grade to it. Other faculty planned to more

specifically discuss the expectations and definitions of the assessment rubric with the goal of both improving student results as well as emphasizing the importance of the program itself.

The responses from History Faculty teaching 200+ level courses in the Spring term were generally similar to those responses given during the Fall for survey level courses. The only significant difference was the greater emphasis placed on providing students with more frequent primary document readings, accompanied by more frequent in-class discussions of the readings and of the analytical process as it relates to history. One faculty member teaching a 200+ level course noted that the results of the Spring assessment program clearly further demonstrated the need for incorporating prerequisites for 200+ level courses (a change that was proposed by the Department last year, and was approved by Central in the early Spring.)

2. Use by department - What changes will you and/or the department assessment committee recommend to your department. Include changes to:

a. assessment process

There were few comments on the Institution's assessment process. The majority of History faculty members recognized the usefulness of assessing individual courses and the Department's curriculum policies. Most Departmental discussion indicated general satisfaction with the process and results of the current Institutional assessment process. There was, however, also considerable support for a new "integrated" approach to the Department's assessment program (which will be discussed with more detail below in Section 2(3)(2). While the needs of the institution often differ from the needs of the Department, the general consensus among History faculty members was that the Institutional assessment process should be made as relevant and as useful to the Department as possible (without upsetting the needs of the Institution).

b. proficiencies selected

Based on discussions during the Fall Convocation and during the Spring meetings, the Assessment Committee recommended that History Department focus on either Analytical or Communication proficiencies as part of the annual Institutional assessment program. For the 2006-2007 year, the Assessment Coordinator will recommend that the Department focus on assessing student's Communication skills.

c. performance indicators used to measure proficiency

Based on discussions during the Fall Convocation and during the Spring meetings, the Assessment Committee recommended that History Department focus on either Analytical or Communication proficiencies as part of the annual Institutional assessment program. For the 2006-2007 year, the Assessment Coordinator will recommend that the Department select Institutional Proficiency Indicator C2, which measures a student's ability to "communicate clearly, precisely, and in a well-organized manner."

d. assessment activities

The Department continues to discuss which activities would best assess student's skills in a manner that is relevant for History. There are some voices in the History Department that would like to establish more clearly defined and standardized assessment tools, including the Department-developed worksheet. Other voices, however, oppose narrow definitions that might conflict with diverse styles of teaching that are appropriate for different courses. The Assessment Coordinator recommends that during the year before the Department next measures Analytical Skills, the Assessment Committee should consider revising the Department-developed document analysis worksheet. The Assessment Coordinator further recommends that discussions over the definitions and standards of the institutional (and Departmental) assessment tools be conducted through the forums already established on D2L. These discussions should provide not only constructive criticism for existing assessment tools, but should also provide a forum for sharing innovative and effective methods of practically implementing those tools. The Assessment committee will rely heavily on the discussions in the D2L forums when they next present the question of institutional assessment tools before the Department for person-person discussions.

For the upcoming Institutional assessment cycle (2006-2007), the Assessment Coordinator recommends that the Department encourage individual faculty members to use student essays to assess student Communication skills. These essays should already be integrated in course assignment schedule (though individual faculty may consider alternative essays formats as appropriate). The Assessment Coordinator further recommends that each essay will be evaluated according to the specific rubrics defined by the Institution.

e. evaluative rubrics

Based on discussions during the Fall Convocation and during the Spring meetings, the Assessment Committee recommended that History Department continue to use the evaluative rubrics for Institutional assessment, as defined by the Senate Assessment Committee. The Assessment Coordinator further recommends that the Department encourage faculty to continue to discuss the particular effectiveness of those rubrics in the appropriate D2L forums.

f. student performance in a specific course (if there is something that stands out with department discussion).

There were no specific courses (or course clusters) that stood out as needing special attention. The common consensus among the Department was that student performance improved as professor consciously devoted more attention to the specific proficiency being evaluated. The implication of this observation has yet to be determined. The Assessment Committee and Assessment Coordinator have no specific recommendations in this area, except that the Department encourage individual faculty to voice their observations in the appropriate forums on D2L.

3. Course of action - After discussion of the results by the department, what course of action will the department take to improve student performance with respect to the assessed proficiency?

The Department overwhelmingly approved its curriculum committee's proposal to renumber many of the courses listed in the course catalog in order to more accurately reflect 100+ or 200+ levels. The Department also supported accompanying measures that set prerequisites for 200+ level courses, and established a maximum class sizes. These measures were part of the Department's response to the first Departmental assessment program launched in 2004-2005. These measures were approved by the UW-Colleges and will be implemented in the 2006-2007 year. The Department will continue to monitor assessment results in order to determine the impact of these changes in the coming years.

In addition, the Department formed an assessment committee at the start of the fall term. The new committee met online during the year, hosted a discussion on Departmental assessment during the Spring meeting, and also attended a special half-day workshop after the meeting. The purpose of the workshop was to: consider problems or successes of the Institutional (and Departmental) program; reconsider the appropriateness of existing proficiencies, proficiency indicators, and rubrics; compare the results of the Institutional assessment with the Departments expected outcomes; and finally to arrive at one positive course of action. The majority of discussions by the Department at its Spring meeting, and by the assessment committee at its workshop, focused on introducing a new "integrated" approach to the Department's assessment program (which will be discussed with more detail in Part III, Section 3(2&3).

The specific course of action recommended by the Assessment Committee for the Institutional assessment program was for the Department's curriculum committee to continue to re-evaluate the extended descriptions that are listed in the course catalog. The purpose of the re-evaluation will be to ensure that the descriptions more closely reflect both the de facto expectations of the courses as they are currently being taught, and the specific proficiencies evaluated by the Institutional and Departmental assessment programs.

PART 2: Assessment of Department-Specific Outcomes

Section 1: Identify department-specific learning objectives.

Outcomes/Performance Indicators	Courses Fall Semester	Courses Spring Semester
1. After taking any History course, a student will be able to analyze a primary source document, which involves: a) identifying whether the document is a primary or secondary source, b) breaking the document down into its separate parts, c) discussing or outlining each part, and d) drawing appropriate conclusions.	HIS101: US to Civil War HIS102: US Since Civil War HIS105: Western Civilization I HIS161: World History Since 1500	HIS101: US to Civil War HIS102: US Since Civil War HIS106: Western Civilization II HIS162: World History Since 1500 HIS118: US & Vietnam HIS256: History of Literature of US South HIS271: History of Science and Technology HIS278: Minorities in America HIS286: US – 1945 to Present

Section 2: Insert the rubrics used here and explain how the rubric or standards were used to assess each outcome or performance indicator. Please attach examples of assessment activities (i.e. modified rubric, assignment, questions) and measurements used to place individuals into the three categories (exceeds, meets, fails to meet). **When completing this section, it may be best to explain the results by course (or course clusters if there were similar tools or results) rather than by instructor.**

Departmental Outcome/Performance Indicator	# Exceed	# Meet	# Do Not Meet
1. Analyze Arguments	1. Discusses points of view very well 2. Outlines information very well 3. Draws conclusions and examines implications 4. Recognizes the difference between a primary source and a secondary source [337 for year: 27%]	1. Discusses points of view adequately 2. Outlines information adequately 3. Draws conclusions 4. Recognizes the difference between a primary source and a secondary source [660 for year: 53%]	1. Fails to recognize alternative points of view 2. Fails to outline information consistently 3. Fails to draw conclusions 4. Fails to recognize the difference between a primary source and a secondary source [250 for year: 20%]

In the 2005-2006 school year, the History Department and the Institution adopted essentially the same performance indicators. As a result, we utilized the same rubrics and the same assessment tools for both the Institutional and Departmental Assessment programs. The Department was cognizant of the fact that this confluence was unique for the 2005-2006 year only. In future years, it is more likely that the Institution will focus on different performance indicators than the Department.

The Department more specifically elaborated its performance indicator by defining “analysis” of an argument as the ability to “break into separate parts and discuss or outline each part.” The

Department also defined “discussion” as the ability to “write about conflicting views.” And the Department defined “outline” as the ability to “describe the main ideas, characteristics, or events” of an argument.

For the 2005-2006 year, History Faculty assigned primary documents of their own choosing, that were most appropriate for their individual courses. After reading the primary document, students were given a Department-developed worksheet to complete. This worksheet was modified from one used by the National Archives and Records Administration, and it requires students to analyze the both the nature of the document and its primary argument. Faculty used the document analysis worksheet as the primary tool for assessing student’s abilities to analyze arguments.

Faculty members were not required to select the same primary document for each course cluster, but were instead encouraged to select a document that best fit into their existing course themes. Examples of excerpted documents used for analysis ranged from, *The Death of Beowulf*, Herodotus, “On the Kings of Sparta,” and Machiavelli’s *The Prince*, to *The Life of Frederick Douglas*, Ralph Waldo Emerson’s *American Scholar* and Henry David Thoreau’s *Walden*. Other faculty used short documents in the entirety, such as the French National Assembly’s “The Rights of Man”, the United Nations “Universal Declaration of Human Rights” or such complete speeches as Lincoln’s “Gettysburg Address”, and Booker T. Washington’s “Atlanta Compromise”. A copy of the Department Assessment worksheet is appended at the end of this report.

A copy of the Department-developed worksheet is attached at the end of this report.

Section 3: Use of results.

1. Use by instructors - Summarize the ways individual instructors plan to use assessment results to improve the instructional process.

Since the History Department adopted the same proficiencies and proficiency indicators as the Institution, Faculty members used the results of the assessment programs in similar ways. The following narrative duplicates the summary provided in Part 1, Section 3(1).

After reviewing the results of their individual course assessments, History Faculty who taught survey courses (100 level) during the Fall term generally echoed three basic proposals for how they planned to use the results during the next time they teach the course. The most common plan was to integrate more primary documents into their regular reading schedule for each course. Most history faculty already used sources outside those provided by the text alone, but they often emphasized more secondary than primary materials. As a result of their assessment results, many professors planned to revise their assignment schedule to include more attention to primary materials. One professor planned to include numerous short documents throughout the semester, which could be done briefly during class and thereby expose students to more examples of historical writing.

In line with the emphasis on greater numbers of primary documents, History professors also planned to incorporate more discussion of the primary document readings and analysis into their regularly scheduled classroom discussions. One professor planned to more formal activities that specifically focused on outlining the arguments made by historical figures. Several professors planned to assign the document analysis worksheets many times throughout the semester, in order to ensure that students fully understood the expectations of the assessment assignment before they were formally assessed on it. Others planned to either choose documents that were more relevant to the lecture-based discussions, or adapt the lectures to provide greater historical context for the assigned documents. Others simply planned to incorporate more “hands-on” analysis during class time of the assigned primary documents. A less common plan was to introduce more writing assignments that focused more specifically on the kinds of critical thinking required to understand and analyze primary sources. Another less common plan was to provide students with a list of standardized questions applicable to any historical source, which students could use to help them “dig deeper” with their analysis. Amongst the diversity of individual course modifications, there was a general consensus among all professors that they wanted to encourage greater understanding of primary document materials through more active student participation in the necessary historical analysis.

The third most common type of proposal mentioned by History Faculty was some plan to provide more incentives (or penalties for non participation) to encourage students take the assessment program more seriously. One solution proposed by several professors was to assess assignments that were

already ingrained into the course curriculum, and attach a grade to it. Other faculty planned to more specifically discuss the expectations and definitions of the assessment rubric with the goal of both improving student results as well as emphasizing the importance of the program itself.

The responses from History Faculty teaching 200+ level courses in the Spring term were generally similar to those responses given during the Fall for survey level courses. The only significant difference was the greater emphasis placed on providing students with more frequent primary document readings, accompanied by more frequent in-class discussions of the readings and of the analytical process as it relates to history. One faculty member teaching a 200+ level course noted that the results of the Spring assessment program clearly further demonstrated the need for incorporating prerequisites for 200+ level courses (a change that was proposed by the Department last year, and was approved by Central in the early Spring.)

2. Use by department - What changes will you and/or the department assessment committee recommend to your department. Include changes to:

a. assessment process

After discussions held with the Department at large, the Assessment Committee recommended that the History Department implement a more “integrated” assessment program for the History Department. The purpose of this new approach is to make the assessment program more relevant to the Department, to the Faculty, and the students of the Department. Rather than isolating assessment as a separate, institutionally-mandated process, the History Department sought to adopt a “culture of assessment” by adapting the assessment program to the Department’s strengths and by focusing on our Faculty’s professional experience with interpreting and analyzing historic trends.

In theory, this means that our History faculty will utilize narrative analysis of student feedback, which takes most advantage of the subjective nature of each faculty member’s personal style of student observation. Rather than rely on naked statistics alone, the Department will analyze the results of these observations in language that is most appropriate for historical analysis. With full participation of its members, the Department will use the results of this analysis to modify its curriculum as necessary.

In practice, at the start of each year the History Department will hold a round-table discussion during the Fall Convocation meeting. This discussion will be narrowly confined to a single item of concern (also known as a “proficiency”), which was determined by the Assessment Committee during the year before. The goals of the discussion will be: 1) that each teaching faculty member fully understands the single item of concern to be observed, and 2) that each teaching faculty member fully understands the criteria used to evaluate the single item (also known as “rubrics”). After the Fall Convocation meeting, the Department members will begin a discussion of their observations of student performance as it relates to the single item of concern. This discussion will be hosted on the Department’s D2L page, and will be kept as a record for future analysis and reports. At the end of the term, each faculty member will post conclusions in a special reporting forum on the same D2L site. Before the Spring term begins, the Assessment Committee will draft a synopsis of the Fall term’s discussions, and share it with the curriculum committee. Faculty members will be reminded about the single item of concern (as modified through on-going discussions, if appropriate) and they will be asked to engaged in another on-going discussion of their observations during the Spring term.

During the Spring Department meeting, the Assessment Committee will host another round-table discussion, wherein each faculty member contributes specific observations of student’s performance as it relates to the single item of concern. This information will be used by all relevant Departmental committees, but especially by the curriculum and assessment committees. Following the Spring meeting, the Assessment Committee will attend a half-day workshop where they discuss the results of the year-long observations of the single item of concern. These results will be augmented by any statistical information gathered for the institutional assessment program. After appropriate discussion, the Assessment committee will arrive at a single action item for the agenda of next year’s Fall Convocation meeting. It will also make a recommendation on the next year’s single item of concern. Over the summer, the Assessment Coordinator will continue to report the results of the Department’s assessment program in language that is appropriate to the Institution’s reporting methods. The only difference will be that there will be more narrative explanations of assessment results and of Departmental actions.

The Department's new integrated approach to assessment should not interfere with the Institutional Assessment program in any way. Instead, it should fit in as an appropriate compliment to the existing statistic-based program established by the colleges. History faculty will continue to implement assessment activities based on the more universally defined proficiencies, performance indicators, and rubrics. The statistics will still be gathered and reported both to the institution and to the Assessment committee. For the purposes of the Department, however, this new integrated approach will be appropriate to our discipline, and thereby become more meaningful to the Department, to its faculty, and to its students. This new approach will play on the Department's strengths, and will also further the institution's goals of ensuring a more thorough "culture of assessment" at all levels. Faculty who may have been hesitant about the relevance of assessment, will be fully included in the discussion because they will be able to convey their observations of specific student performance in a way that is most familiar to their expertise. Using the integrated model, our History faculty will not only assess their students in a discipline manner, but they will also be sharing their observations through a continuous discussion that the Department can then utilize in other areas such as curriculum and scholarship of teaching and learning. By the end of the Spring meeting, our Department was very excited at the prospect of taking assessment to a new level of relevance and usefulness.

b. Learning objectives selected

After discussions held with the Department at large, and after a half-day workshop devoted to the question, the assessment committee recommended that the Department should focus on student's abilities to identify and distinguish between historical chronology and historical causation. While the specific explication of this item of concern will be more fully elaborated at the Department's Fall Convocation meeting, the basic question that Faculty will be asking is: can student's understand the basic "story line" of the historical subject? By "story line", we mean whether or not the student understands: 1) the relevant chronology of events, and 2) the role of causation in a specific sequence of events.

c. performance indicators used to measure proficiency

The Department will discuss types of specific performance indicators more specifically through round-table discussion during the Fall Convocation meeting. The Assessment Committee, however, will start the discussion with some anecdotal examples to demonstrate what faculty members should be looking for. Specifically, the Assessment Committee will provide examples of student essay answers, which obviously reflect a lack of understanding of chronology and causation. To ensure that each professor implements the assessment observations in a manner most relevant to their own course program, the Department will not necessarily restrict individual faculty to a narrowly defined set of performance indicators (although, it may choose to do so if widespread consensus is reached). Each faculty, however, will know precisely what to look for before the term begins. The Assessment Coordinator, with the help of the Assessment Committee, will post a specific narrative of appropriate performance indicators on D2L. Any lingering questions about expectations will be further discussed during the semester through the appropriate forums on D2L. Faculty members will be encouraged to refer to, discuss, and suggest improvements on these indicators through the course of the year (but especially during the first weeks of the Fall term).

d. assessment activities

Faculty members will be asked to utilize tools that are already available in their scheduled course activities. The Department will discuss this more specifically during the Fall Convocation meeting, but the Assessment Committee will start the discussion with a recommendation that professors frame a section of their already scheduled quizzes or exams in a way that will indicate student's understanding of this chronology and causation. Faculty will not be limited to a single activity, but will be asked to specifically observe student performance through a variety of activities including in-class discussions, out-of-class discussions, essays, and other quantitative examinations. While the specific assessment activity may not be universally defined, each individual professor will be asked to narrowly focus their own observations through whatever tools are most appropriate for their specific course.

e. **evaluative rubrics**

The Department will discuss the necessary rubrics to evaluate student's performance more specifically through round-table discussion during the Fall Convocation meeting. These rubrics will be posted in specific bullet points on the D2L website, and faculty members will be encouraged to refer to, discuss, and suggest improvements on these rubrics through the course of the year (but especially during the first weeks of the Fall term).

f. **student performance in a specific course (if there is something that stands out with department discussion).**

After discussions held with the Department at large, and after a half-day workshop, which considered the question, the assessment committee did not find any specific concern of student performance in a specific course. There was some general concern that students taking 200+ level courses were not sufficiently prepared for them. But now that the courses have been renumbered, and 200+ level courses given specific prerequisites, the general consensus among the assessment committee was that we should wait to see the results of next year's assessment program before proceeding with any new recommendations.

3. **Course of action** - After discussion of the results by the department, what course of action will the department take to improve student performance with respect to the assessed proficiency?

After discussions held with the Department at large, and after a half-day workshop which culminated in a single action item, the assessment committee recommended that the Department begin its integrated assessment program in the 2006-2007 year. The Fall Convocation meeting will include a round table discussion, which will: 1) inform the entire Department of the new item of concern (student's understanding of chronology and causation); 2) define some specific performance indicators; and 3) define some key rubrics to determine student performance.

In addition, the Assessment Committee also recommended immediate creation of a special Assessment Discussion section in the Department's D2L website.

PART 3: Additional Assessment and Contributions

Section 1: Please discuss activities that were supported by the assessment budget for the department assessment committee. In particular outline the department assessment committee activities for the academic year.

The History Department formed its Assessment Committee during the first part of the Fall term. The assessment budget was used primarily to fund the Assessment Workshop held in the Spring. This half-day workshop was held immediately following the Department's meeting. The workshop was divided into three main sessions. The first session was devoted to brainstorming ideas; particularly on the questions of student, teacher, and campus relations and how assessment programs (and results) might be used to invigorate teaching methods. Other issues dealt with how to keep the assessment program relevant to the Department, to the faculty, and to the students. The second session was devoted evaluating the Department's current assessment program, including the existing proficiencies, activities and rubrics. In addition, committee members were asked to consider the results of last year's assessment program as it relates to existing practices. The third session was devoted to arriving at a single action item.

The assessment budget was used to pay for transportation costs, room reservations, overnight accommodations, a meal, and refreshments.

Section 2: Please discuss activities that were supported by the assessment budget for overall department assessment activities. In particular outline the department assessment activities for the academic year.

A significant portion of the Department's Spring meeting was devoted to assessment. The assessment committee hosted a discussion on the objectives, the course and direction of the Department's current assessment program, and available options for improvement. Of special concern were proposals to make the Assessment program more relevant to the Department, to faculty, and to students in the department. Remaining moneys, that were not used to fund the workshop, were spent to offset the costs of the Spring Department meeting.

Section 3: Please ask for and include in the report information from department members about any other assessment activities they have conducted, particularly in conjunction with grant-funded innovations. Also ask for and describe briefly any additional contributions to assessment such as publications, presentations, qualitative classroom innovations (**such as** Scholarship of Teaching and Learning activities), and other items relating to assessment that the department wishes to note.

Several professors have implemented assessment programs for their own use. One junior professor has instituted a simple survey which asks students to comment on their reactions to the texts, the quizzes and exam questions, and the professors style of teaching. This survey is handed out at mid-term and at the end-of-term. The students are asked not to put their names on the surveys, and are not required to complete them. The professor uses the information to gauge the student's perceptions of the classroom experience.

One of the Departments senior professors undertook three other assessments in Fall 2005. One was an assessment of another class on the same skills (using document analyses and an out-of-class essay). The only difference in approach was that the students in the assessed class only wrote one out-of-class essay and so ended up with more N/A scores on that method of assessment. Also, for reasons that the professor did not understand, there were fewer students who exceeded expectations on the Document Analysis Worksheet, even though the number who failed was not appreciably greater.

Name of Class Assessed: HIS 127 (World in the Twentieth Century) Section 001

Number of Students: 32

Method of Assessment Used for Departmental Assessment: Document Analysis Worksheet

<i>Number of Students Exceeding Expectations:</i>	0
<i>Number of Students Meeting Expectations:</i>	29
<i>Number of Students Failing Expectations:</i>	1
<i>N/A</i>	4

Method of Assessment Used for Institutional Assessment: Out-of-class Essay

<i>Number of Students Exceeding Expectations:</i>	1
<i>Number of Students Meeting Expectations:</i>	16
<i>Number of Students Failing Expectations:</i>	3
<i>N/A</i>	12

The second assessment was focused on students' learning of concepts that the Department indicated should be taught in all classes. The professor recorded the results in an Excel spreadsheet, which is attached below. Students were given extra credit on the final exam if they could correctly define five of the concepts used in the class. Some of these were from the list that the entire department devised and accepted; some were more specific to the particular class. The professor did tell students that extra credit would be available, nor had the professor hinted that they might be tested on specific definitions of the concepts. Consequently, this method probably served a fair test of what they understood simply as a result of having become familiar with the concepts in class. As the professor expected, students did not necessarily understand exactly what these ideas meant when they arrived in class, and sometimes they

still did not completely understand at the end of the semester either. (See the Excel chart for details.) The professor plans to use these results in the Spring 2006 semester, and is already thinking about possible ways to improve the quality of students' understanding of these concepts. The professor believes that more frequent practice may be the key, and is considering adding these activities as extra credit to all exams.

The third assessment activity required students in both classes to complete the online Student Assessment of Learning Gains, which is a survey instrument available from the UW System that the professor modified for these two classes. This survey has about 75 questions regarding all aspects of the class with frequent comment boxes. The professor has not analyzed those results thoroughly, but plans to use them to discover if students feel that they learned the main ideas that were intended to be conveyed in the course; if they found the materials and resources useful in learning; if they believed they learned from the assignments and grading methods used; and if they think they will retain or use any of what they learned. In the past, the professor has changed materials and resources in response to their comments, and I have changed my approach in class to try to enhance the students' learning of the most important subjects.

ASSESSMENT OF CONCEPTS IN 100-LEVEL CLASSES: FALL 2005

HIS 101-002

CONCEPT NAME	EARNED 3 POINTS	EARNED 2 POINTS	EARNED 1 POINT	EARNED 0 POINTS	DIDN'T ANSWER	TOTAL
Civilization	1	4	2	11	12	30
Natural rights	10	4	2	3	11	30
Politics	1	7	5	1	16	30
Religion	6	6	4	1	13	30
Society	3	6	5	5	11	30
TOTAL	21	27	18	21	63	

HIS 127-001

CONCEPT NAME	EARNED 3 POINTS	EARNED 2 POINTS	EARNED 1 POINT	EARNED 0 POINTS	DIDN'T ANSWER	TOTAL
Conservatism	6	2	2	3	11	24
Economy	2	10	3	1	8	24
Imperialism	9	0	2	1	12	24
Secularism	7	3	0	4	10	24
Socialism	7	0	2	3	12	24
TOTAL	31	15	9	12	53	

HIS 127-001 (Make-Up Exam)

CONCEPT NAME	EARNED 3 POINTS	EARNED 2 POINTS	EARNED 1 POINT	EARNED 0 POINTS	DIDN'T ANSWER	TOTAL
Authoritarianism	0	2	0	0	2	4
Capitalism	1	1	1	0	1	4
Liberalism	0	0	1	0	3	4
Militarism	1	1	1	1	0	4
Religion	0	4	0	0	0	4
TOTAL	2	8	3	1	6	

PART 4: Historical Trends

Section 1: History of General Education activities.

Proficiency	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results
A1	2003–2004	E =237 (20%) M=608 (52%) F =334 (28%)	2005–2006	E =326 (27%) M =661 (53%) F =251 (20%)	Closed after 2006 after Department noted satisfactory improvements	
C2	2004–2005	E =228 (19%) M=617 (51%) F =357 (30%)				

Section 2: History of department learning objective activities.

Objective	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results	Year Assessed	Results
Analyze Arguments	2004 – 05	E=228 (19%) M=617 (51%) F=357 (30%)	2005–2006	E = 337 (27%) M = 660 (53%) F = 250 (20%)	Closed after 2006 after Department noted satisfactory improvements	