

Program Assessment Report

Program: HISTORY

Year: 19/20

Division: Social Sciences

Contact: Amy French

Delta College



Actions Taken in Response to Last Year's Report

Rationale for Current Assessments

Assessment 1 of 1

Goal / Project

Outcome(s)

Describe and analyze historical sources. (16/17)

Standard / Objective

Outcome: evaluate conflicting historical interpretations Objective: 75% of students proficient.

Method of assessment

Capstone Demonstrations(s)

Comment/Details about the method of assessment

Professors used individual assignments to assess how our students are evaluation conflicting historical interpretations. As this is a general history outcome, we assessed it across the board in all of our classes from as many professors as would participate.

Courses Affected

HIS 111, HIS 112, HIS 222, HIS 237, HIS 240

Time Frame

Winter Semester 2020

Submitted By

Amy French

Result

Result

(2) Results met expectation/standard

Data Collection (general or specific stats regarding results)

89% of 225 students studied met expectations (75% or higher on assessment); 67% of students mastered the outcome (84% or higher); 11% of students didn't meet expectations (74% or lower)

What We Learned (areas for improvements, strengths, etc.)

Students are generally able to evaluate conflicting historical interpretations, but a lot of groundwork had to be set to get them up to speed. This skill was developed after the professor had laddered the course to teach this essential objective.

Use of Data to Improve Student Success

• One professor thought it might be helpful to have a general discussion about primary versus secondary sources in history at the beginning of class and the fact that—just as in the present—not all sources are to be trusted. This discussion could also include a talk about what to look for in sources that might indicate they are more truthful. Also, need to discuss what historians do—we do not just present facts, but actually write the past and create history. To do so we must construct a developed argument based on a good deal of historical evidence.

Institutional Student Learning Outcome	Action plan items of what is planned based on the data and results
<input type="checkbox"/> Apply Knowledge and Skills	<input type="checkbox"/> Change assignments/activities <input type="checkbox"/> Update course content
<input type="checkbox"/> Think Critically	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Change materials provided <input type="checkbox"/> Update course outcomes
<input type="checkbox"/> Communicate Effectively	<input type="checkbox"/> Adjust grading rubric <input type="checkbox"/> Update prior courses
<input type="checkbox"/> Act Responsibly	<input type="checkbox"/> Continue to Monitor <input type="checkbox"/> Other

Comments and Action Plan

Discipline/Program Comments

"• One professor wondered if perhaps the results would have been lower if they had used an obscure historiography example. For example, if I had done a lecture about the debate over whether the U.S. should have bombed Auschwitz, the complexity of the material may have obscured the lesson about conflicting viewpoints. . . • One professor questioned where they graded too easily. ☐ One professor found that in-class scores were better on average than online classes. ☐ A professor noticed that students found it easier when they gave them a specific question requiring critical analysis than a more general one. "

Advisory Board Comments

Assessment Committee Comments

So, the assignments were unique to each instructor (based on the statements made in Comments about details of the method of assessment)... was there a common rubric? .. even if it was a crude rubric (3 = great, 2 = good, etc.) like the Gen Ed rubric on a scale of 0 - 3.

Curriculum Council Comments

Action Plan

Actions Taken in Response to Older Reports