

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
UNDERGRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT History **DATE** May 8, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW B.A. with major in History

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW *Devon Hansen, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Casey Ozaki*

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The assessment plan for the B.A. in History was last updated in 2012. The plan refers to the following Behavioral skills that will be assessed:

- A) Informational literacy
- B) Critical thinking skills
- C) Communications skills

The departmental objectives with regard to these Behavioral skills show how they relate to the methods of historical research, thought, and writing. Students will be able to:

- “locate, read and analyze the necessary primary and secondary sources that allow them to explore and understand the past.”
- “take this knowledge and understanding and turn it into a clear, cohesive and structured argument where they interpret the past.”

Each objective is written to encompass several skills. It would be beneficial to distinguish the skills into separate objectives to enable better tracking of the specific competencies and their level of achievement.

In addition to the program goals, please also consider UND’s institutional and Essential Studies goals for student learning (shown in alignment within parentheses) and identify which goals are similar to program goals.

- X 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- X 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- X 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- X 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding program goals and alignment with institutional and Essential Studies goals:

The three Behavioral skills (informational literacy, critical thinking skills, and communication skills) are directly related to three Essential Studies goals (Communication, Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking, and Information literacy).

During AY12-13, the Department of History developed a new mission statement

The mission statement relates to the three Behavioral skills (informational literacy, critical thinking skills, and communication skills) and UND’s essential studies goals.

Mission statement: The Department of History seeks to provide its students with an appreciation of diverse human cultures and experiences through a study of our past, while at the same time developing crucial cognitive and behavioral skills, particularly those involving communication, critical reasoning, and research. In addition to providing all UND students with these skills and the background in history that is an essential part of any liberal arts education, we prepare our majors for careers in education, law, public service, journalism, government, and academia.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

Were any specific assessment methods referenced?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach?	YES____	NO__X__	QUALIFIED Y/N ____

Comments:

Research papers from two core classes (HIST 240 and HIST 440) are used to assess Behavioral skills (informational literacy, critical thinking skills, and communication skills) every semester. The assessment rubric uses a scale (excellent, good, fair, and weak) to evaluate student’s performance in five categories (argument, historical methods, sources, content, and structure), relating to specific Behavioral skills. History majors in two additional classes (a 300-level and a 400-level) that require a research paper addressing these skills are also assessed on an annual basis.

The 2012 assessment plan notes a three-year cycle for analyzing and reporting the data collected as History undergraduate students progress through the major from HIST 240 to HIST 440.

The assessment methods are direct measures of student learning. No indirect measures are indicated, either in the plan or annual report.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES__X__	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES____	NO__X__	QUALIFIED Y/N ____
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES____	NO____	QUALIFIED Y/N __X__

Comments:

The annual report states that assessment activities were conducted in five classes (HIST 240, HIST 301, HIST 402, HIST 424, and HIST 440). No individual class assessment results were reported. Instead, the annual report concludes that “while our students can quickly develop an idea of what a thesis is, along with the basic idea of where to find sources, they continue to have trouble in regards to first locating the correct evidence, reading that evidence and then using the evidence to structure their argument.” There was no explanation of how these conclusions were reached from the assessment data collected.

In addition to program goals, some assessment results may be applicable to institutional and Essential Studies goals. Indicate any goals for which the program presents findings, and, for indicated items, describe findings below.

- _____ 1 Communication – written or oral (“able to write and speak in various settings with a sense of purpose/audience”)
- _____ 2 Thinking and reasoning – critical thinking (or “be intellectually curious”; analyze, synthesize, evaluate)
- _____ 3 Thinking and reasoning – creative thinking (or “be intellectually creative”; explore, discover, engage)
- _____ 4 Thinking and reasoning – quantitative reasoning (“apply empirical data...analyze graphical information”)
- _____ 5 Information literacy (“be able to access and evaluate...for effective, efficient, and ethical use”)
- _____ 6 Diversity (“demonstrate understanding of diversity and use that understanding...”)
- _____ 7 Lifelong learning (“commit themselves to lifelong learning”)
- _____ 8 Service/citizenship (“share responsibility both for their communities and for the world”)

Comments regarding results and the application of results to program, institutional, and Essential Studies goals:

No assessment results reported specifically relate to institutional and Essential Studies goals.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☐

- If so, do curricular or other improvements/ changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?

YES ☐ NO ☐ QUALIFIED Y/N ☒

Comments:

The annual report states that “our main response to this assessment data, in our attempt to ‘close the loop’, involves the total revision of our B.A. program.” The revision of the B.A. major and minor is listed as a priority for next year to insure students are acquiring and mastering the skills of informational literacy, critical thinking, and communication. The annual report provides detailed explanations of the revisions, including adding a new required class, HIST340, to bridge the gap between HIST 240 and HIST 440 regarding skill development. All other curriculum changes related to the overall content direction of the discipline or initiated by federal and state regulations (i.e., teacher education).

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☒ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☒ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☐ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
(Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Although the History department has learning objectives, there is a lack of evidence whether those objectives are being achieved. Assessment activities take place in individual History courses; however, assessment data are only reported in an aggregated way. The annual report provides no explanation of how conclusions are reached from the assessment data collected.

It is recommended to include some measures of indirect assessment into the assessment plan. This could provide insightful information on student perceptions of their learning and learning environment.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

- ☒ Annual report
- ☐ Appendices (cited in annual report)
- ☐ Other (please describe)

- ☒ Assessment plan (as posted)
- ☒ Previous assessment review

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Devon Hansen	Casey Ozaki
	Department	Marketing	Geography	Teaching & Learning
	Phone Number	7-2930	7-4587	7-4256
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y ☐ N Section 2: ☐ Q ☐ N Section 3: ☐ Q ☐ N Section 4: ☐ Q ☐ N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected and analyzed in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information reported and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT History **DATE** May 8, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW M.A. in History

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Devon Hansen, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Casey Ozaki

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The graduate assessment plan for History was last updated in 2011. There are three goals listed for the M.A. program. The assessment plan states that graduate study in the History Department seeks to establish “demonstrable competence in the core knowledge bases and skill sets of professional historians.” These competencies are addressed through four learning outcomes (Historiography, Knowledge and Theory; Research, Analysis and Interpretation; Communication and Presentation; and Teaching). The first three learning outcomes relate to the M.A. program. Two of the learning outcomes were assessed AY 2012-13.

The objectives are all encompassing; for example, the objective that relates to research, analysis and interpretation iterates several competencies. “Students will be able to frame research questions and/or projects that significantly engage existing scholarly discourses; students will be able to locate and obtain primary sources of relevant to their research, develop a historically appropriate and nuanced understanding and interpretation of these sources; and integrate and organize evidence into a sophisticated analytical frame; this analysis will form the basis of a sustained, coherent, and rigorously logical academic argument.” Singularity may be more beneficial in tracking assessment results and being able to identify particulars for subsequent closing the loop.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

For direct assessment, the graduate assessment plan states that instructors “will note the appropriate bases for their assessment on each form, and then evaluate each student’s level of achievement in respect to particular learning goals.” On the graduate student assessment form, the graduate program (M.A. D.A., Ph.D.) is selected for each student being evaluated. The plan also notes teaching assessment (D.A and Ph.D.) and terminal or capstone diagnostics (thesis, project, dissertation, comprehensive exam).

The annual report notes collection of assessment data through rubrics for the following program learning outcomes:

- Historiography, Knowledge, and Theory: Historiography (HIST 502); Graduate Readings Courses (HIST 592, 593, 594)
- Research, Analysis and Interpretation : Methods (HIST 501); Graduate Research Seminars (HIST 511,513, 515)

The rubrics have three levels—proficient, developing, and unsatisfactory.

Although several required courses related to each learning outcome are listed, the annual report does not describe how or what assessment data were collected.

For indirect assessment, the graduate assessment plan states that a survey will be conducted at the end of the first year of graduate study and again as they graduate. No indirect measures of student learning are indicated in the annual report.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

In AY 11-12, the History Department assessed data from HIST 501, 515, and two 594s. In AY12-13, they assessed data from HIST 501 and 593 and also two terminal assessments. Data reported from the HIST 502 (not listed above) used to assess the program learning outcome: Historiography, Knowledge and Theory notes scores being significantly lower for “historical concepts/theory” than for “knowledge.” Similarly, the HIST 501 used to assess the program learning outcome: Research, Analysis and Interpretation states that scores are lower for “analysis and interpretation” than for “ability to develop a research program.” There was no reporting of terminal assessments.

The annual report does not differentiate whether assessment data were collected for the M.A., D.A., or Ph.D. programs.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

The annual report states “with only two years of data, we obviously cannot say much about students and our program, except that we are making a serious effort to identify problem areas in our program.” Commentary followed, but it seems to be a personal opinion of the writer of the annual report.

SUMMARY

Strengths

☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
☐ Results are reported.
☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
☒ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
☐ No results are reported.
☒ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Although the Department of History has program learning outcomes, there is a lack of evidence whether those objectives are being achieved. The annual report does not differentiate whether assessment data were collected for the M.A., D.A., and Ph.D. programs.

The assessment plan notes that the rubrics are “extremely flexible” in order to accommodate the expected competency differences among the graduate programs. It would be helpful to have these competency levels benchmarked for each of the programs.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Devon Hansen	Casey Ozaki
	Department	Marketing	Geography	Teaching & Learning
	Phone Number	7-2930	7-4587	7-4256
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y Section 2: ☒ Q Section 3: ☒ Q Section 4: ☐ N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT History **DATE** May 8, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW Ph.D. in History

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Devon Hansen, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Casey Ozaki

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The graduate assessment plan for History was last updated in 2011. There are four goals listed for the Ph.D. program. The assessment plan states that graduate study in the History Department seeks to establish “demonstrable competence in the core knowledge bases and skill sets of professional historians.” These competencies are addressed through four learning outcomes (Historiography, Knowledge and Theory; Research, Analysis and Interpretation; Communication and Presentation; and Teaching). The four learning outcomes relate to the Ph.D. program. Two of the outcomes differ from the DA in History degree. The PhD related to a broader group of courses qualified to teach and an added written and oral communication competency. Two of the learning outcomes were assessed AY 2012-13.

The objectives are all encompassing; for example, the objective that relates to research, analysis and interpretation iterates several competencies. “Students will be able to frame research questions and/or projects that significantly engage existing scholarly discourses; students will be able to locate and obtain primary sources of relevant to their research, develop a historically appropriate and nuanced understanding and interpretation of these sources; and integrate and organize evidence into a sophisticated analytical frame; this analysis will form the basis of a sustained, coherent, and rigorously logical academic argument.” Singularity may be more beneficial in tracking assessment results and being able to identify particulars for subsequent closing the loop.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

For direct assessment, the graduate assessment plan states that instructors “will note the appropriate bases for their assessment on each form, and then evaluate each student’s level of achievement in respect to particular learning goals.” On the graduate student assessment form, the graduate program (M.A. D.A., Ph.D.) is selected for each student being evaluated. The plan also notes teaching assessment (D.A and Ph.D.) and terminal or capstone diagnostics (thesis, project, dissertation, comprehensive exam).

The annual report notes collection of assessment data through rubrics for the following program learning outcomes:

- Historiography, Knowledge, and Theory: Historiography (HIST 502); Graduate Readings Courses (HIST 592, 593, 594)
- Research, Analysis and Interpretation : Methods (HIST 501); Graduate Research Seminars (HIST 511,513, 515)

The rubrics have three levels—proficient, developing, and unsatisfactory.

Although several required courses related to each learning outcome are listed, the annual report does not describe how or what assessment data were collected.

For indirect assessment, the graduate assessment plan states that a survey will be conducted at the end of the first year of graduate study and again as they graduate. No indirect measures of student learning are indicated in the annual report.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

In AY 11-12, the History Department assessed data from HIST 501, 515, and two 594s. In AY12-13, they assessed data from HIST 501 and 593 and also two terminal assessments. Data reported from the HIST 502 (not listed above) used to assess the program learning outcome: Historiography, Knowledge and Theory notes scores being significantly lower for “historical concepts/theory” than for “knowledge.” Similarly, the HIST 501 used to assess the program learning outcome: Research, Analysis and Interpretation states that scores are lower for “analysis and interpretation” than for “ability to develop a research program.” There was no reporting of terminal assessments.

The annual report does not differentiate whether assessment data were collected for the M.A., D.A., or Ph.D. programs.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

The annual report states “with only two years of data, we obviously cannot say much about students and our program, except that we are making a serious effort to identify problem areas in our program.” Commentary followed, but it seems to be a personal opinion of the writer of the annual report.

SUMMARY

Strengths

☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
☐ Results are reported.
☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
☒ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
☐ No results are reported.
☒ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
 (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Although the Department of History has program learning outcomes, there is a lack of evidence whether those objectives are being achieved. The annual report does not differentiate whether assessment data were collected for the M.A., D.A., and Ph.D. programs.

The assessment plan notes that the rubrics are “extremely flexible” in order to accommodate the expected competency differences among the graduate programs. It would be helpful to have these competency levels benchmarked for each of the programs.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Devon Hansen	Casey Ozaki
	Department	Marketing	Geography	Teaching & Learning
	Phone Number	7-2930	7-4587	7-4256
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y Section 2: ☐ Q Section 3: ☐ Q Section 4: ☐ N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13

UNIVERSITY ASSESSMENT COMMITTEE
Feedback to Academic Departments on Assessment Activities Reported in 2012-13 Annual Reports
GRADUATE PROGRAMS

DEPARTMENT History **DATE** May 8, 2014

PROGRAM(S) COVERED IN REVIEW D.A. in History

COMMITTEE MEMBER(S) CONDUCTING REVIEW Devon Hansen, Mary Askim-Lovseth, and Casey Ozaki

1. STUDENT LEARNING GOALS

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| • Were any goals referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were goals well articulated? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Do goals address student learning? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |

Comments:

The graduate assessment plan for History was last updated in 2011. There are four goals listed for the D.A. program. The assessment plan states that graduate study in the History Department seeks to establish “demonstrable competence in the core knowledge bases and skill sets of professional historians.” These competencies are addressed through four learning outcomes (Historiography, Knowledge and Theory; Research, Analysis and Interpretation; Communication and Presentation; and Teaching). The four learning outcomes relate to the D.A. program. Two of the learning outcomes were assessed AY 2012-13.

The objectives are all encompassing; for example, the objective that relates to research, analysis and interpretation iterates several competencies. “Students will be able to frame research questions and/or projects that significantly engage existing scholarly discourses; students will be able to locate and obtain primary sources of relevant to their research, develop a historically appropriate and nuanced understanding and interpretation of these sources; and integrate and organize evidence into a sophisticated analytical frame; this analysis will form the basis of a sustained, coherent, and rigorously logical academic argument.” Singularity may be more beneficial in tracking assessment results and being able to identify particulars for subsequent closing the loop.

2. ASSESSMENT METHODS

- | | | | |
|--|----------------|---------------|--------------------------|
| Were any specific assessment methods referenced? | YES <u>X</u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u> </u> |
| • If so, were specifically chosen assessment methods appropriately aligned with individual goals? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |
| • Were both direct and indirect assessment methods used as components of a “multiple measures” approach? | YES <u> </u> | NO <u> </u> | QUALIFIED Y/N <u>X</u> |

Comments:

For direct assessment, the graduate assessment plan states that instructors “will note the appropriate bases for their assessment on each form, and then evaluate each student’s level of achievement in respect to particular learning goals.” On the graduate student assessment form, the graduate program (M.A. D.A., Ph.D.) is selected for each student being evaluated. The plan also notes teaching assessment (D.A and Ph.D.) and terminal or capstone diagnostics (thesis, project, dissertation, comprehensive exam).

The annual report notes collection of assessment data through rubrics for the following program learning outcomes:

- Historiography, Knowledge, and Theory: Historiography (HIST 502); Graduate Readings Courses (HIST 592, 593, 594)
- Research, Analysis and Interpretation : Methods (HIST 501); Graduate Research Seminars (HIST 511,513, 515)

The rubrics have three levels—proficient, developing, and unsatisfactory.

Although several required courses related to each learning outcome are listed, the annual report does not describe how or what assessment data were collected.

For indirect assessment, the graduate assessment plan states that a survey will be conducted at the end of the first year of graduate study and again as they graduate. No indirect measures of student learning are indicated in the annual report.

3. ASSESSMENT RESULTS

Were any assessment results reported?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they specifically affirm achievement of goals?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
• If so, were the results clear in terms of how they indicate need for improvement?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• Were the results tied to goals for student learning?	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

In AY 11-12, the History Department assessed data from HIST 501, 515, and two 594s. In AY12-13, they assessed data from HIST 501 and 593 and also two terminal assessments. Data reported from the HIST 502 (not listed above) used to assess the program learning outcome: Historiography, Knowledge and Theory notes scores being significantly lower for “historical concepts/theory” than for “knowledge.” Similarly, the HIST 501 used to assess the program learning outcome: Research, Analysis and Interpretation states that scores are lower for “analysis and interpretation” than for “ability to develop a research program.” There was no reporting of terminal assessments.

The annual report does not differentiate whether assessment data were collected for the M.A., D.A., or Ph.D. programs.

4. CLOSING THE LOOP

Were any actions taken on the basis of assessment results reported?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>
• If so, do curricular or other improvements/changes arising from assessment results directly address goals for student learning?	YES <input type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>	QUALIFIED Y/N <input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

The annual report states “with only two years of data, we obviously cannot say much about students and our program, except that we are making a serious effort to identify problem areas in our program.” Commentary followed, but it seems to be a personal opinion of the writer of the annual report.

SUMMARY

Strengths

- ☐ A specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are well-articulated.
- ☐ Assessment methods are clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are well-implemented.
- ☐ Direct and indirect methods are implemented.
- ☐ Results are reported.
- ☐ Results are tied to closing the loop.
- (Decision-making is tied to evidence.)

Areas for Improvement

- ☐ No specific plan for assessment is in place.
- ☐ Student learning goals are not well-articulated.
- ☒ Assessment methods are not clearly described.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not appropriately selected.
- ☐ Assessment methods are not well-implemented.
- ☐ A single type of assessment methods predominates.
- ☐ No results are reported.
- ☒ Results are not clearly tied to closing the loop.
- (Decision-making is not directly tied to evidence.)

OVERALL SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Although the Department of History has program learning outcomes, there is a lack of evidence whether those objectives are being achieved. The annual report does not differentiate whether assessment data were collected for the M.A., D.A., and Ph.D. programs.

The assessment plan notes that the rubrics are “extremely flexible” in order to accommodate the expected competency differences among the graduate programs. It would be helpful to have these competency levels benchmarked for each of the programs.

MATERIALS REVIEWED

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Annual report	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment plan (as posted)
<input type="checkbox"/> Appendices (cited in annual report)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Previous assessment review
<input type="checkbox"/> Other (please describe)	

Reviewer(s):	Name	Mary Askim-Lovseth	Devon Hansen	Casey Ozaki
	Department	Marketing	Geography	Teaching & Learning
	Phone Number	7-2930	7-4587	7-4256
	e-mail	maskim@business.und.edu	devon.hansen@und.edu	carolyn.ozaki@und.edu

Section 1: ☒ Y Section 2: ☒ Q Section 3: ☒ Q Section 4: ☐ N

Coding Key:

- Y = yes, this is done appropriately and well (bearing in mind the kind of program(s) reviewed and recognizing that assessment is a cyclical process, i.e., with additional kinds of data to be collected in other years)
- Q = qualified yes as action or progress is apparent; however, evidence is lacking that this is completely and appropriately done
- N = no, this is not done at all, or it is not done in relationship to student learning
- NA = no information available and it's unclear whether it was done

Revision 9/25/13