



UNIVERSITY OF ARKANSAS
PULASKI TECH

Assessment Report:
2019-2020

**Due to Chair/Program Director and
Assessment Coordinator by
September 1st**



Name of program: **History**

Name of individual compiling report: **Dr. Jason C. Martin**

Date of submission: **August 31, 2020**

The assessment plan is: **revision of
an old plan**

Course-Level Learning Outcomes

1. What are the Course-Level Outcomes (CLOs)?

Students will develop and utilize: 1) critical thinking and (2) communication skills in order to (3) gain historical perspective. The CLOs are directly linked to General Education Learning Outcomes (GELOs) of Critical Reasoning, Communication and Cultural Awareness.

2. Which CLOs were addressed for this academic year? (2019-2020) All CLOs were addressed, including: 1) critical thinking, 2) improving communication skills, and 3) gaining historical perspective.

3. Which CLOs are being addressed in your assessment plan next academic year? (2020-2021)

History faculty will continue stressing all three CLOs in the coming academic year/assessment cycle. The value of critical thinking, improved communication skills and a better understanding of historical perspective are crucial during the extraordinary times we currently experience.

However, we will conduct an in-depth analysis on **critical thinking**. Eighty percent (80%) of students will score 3 (Proficient) or above on the Historical Analysis (critical thinking) portion of our rubric. The rubric already measures critical thinking, which will reduce difficulties collecting data. Faculty will separate scores on Historical Analysis (critical thinking) and submit results to the course lead at semester's end.

4. Explain the assessment cycle. We are starting year 3 of a 3-year (assessment cycle. Data will be reviewed at the end of this cycle to determine trends.

5. What are the assessment methods? Direct or indirect? History uses direct assessment methods. All history instructors use essays and writing exercises as the primary assessment instrument each semester. Instructors have flexibility developing their questions, and can choose the number of essays and/or writing exercises deployed during the course. All instructors, however, must design questions and exercises that address the program's three CLOs, including: 1) critical thinking, 2) improving communication skills, and 3) gaining historical perspective.

All written work is graded with a standardized grading rubric emphasizing the three CLOs. Instructors are urged to explain the purpose and use of rubrics to each class long before essays are assigned so that student preparation is guided by their understanding of the course grading rubric. Explaining the rubric's function and purpose hopefully improves student work, and is another way to reinforce the CLOs.

Faculty deploy assessment instruments throughout the semester and collect data. Instructors were required to collect data at mid-term and again at the end of the course. Mid-term assessment data collection was stopped, and assessment data is only collected at semester's end.

Upon completion of each semester, faculty submit their data to the lead instructor for analysis. All instructors meet to determine the assessment plan's strengths, weaknesses, and corrective measures. Meetings to review the fall semester's assessment occur during convocation week in early January. Meetings to review the spring semester's assessment occur in mid-May after grade submission.

6. What are the assessment goal(s)?

The threshold (assessment goal) for all history ACTS courses is 75% of students score a 3 (Proficient) or above on a standard grading rubric.

7. What were the findings for this academic year? (2019-2020)

HIST 1311—300 students enrolled in traditional (live) classes; 100 students enrolled in online. Three full-time instructors taught live classes; no adjuncts taught live classes. No full-time instructors taught online; one adjunct taught online.

No concurrent courses offered.

of students assessed in live classes=300;

of students in live classes successfully completing assessment=184 (62.5%)

of students assessed in online classes=100

of students in online classes successfully completing assessment=68 (68%)

Total # of students assessed=400

Total # of students successfully completing assessment=252 (63%)

Total # of students taking no assessments=88 (21.9%)

HIST 1312—Enrollment data unavailable for live classes; 100 students enrolled in online classes. One full-time instructor taught live classes; one full-time instructor taught online classes. No adjuncts taught any live or online courses

No concurrent courses offered.

of students assessed in live classes=data unavailable;

of students in live classes successfully completing assessment= approx. 73%

of students assessed in online classes=100

of students in online classes successfully completing assessment= approx.40%

HIST 2311—307 students enrolled in live classes; 113 enrolled in online courses

Four full-time instructors taught live classes; one adjunct taught a live class

No full-time instructors taught online; one adjunct taught online,

No concurrent courses offered.

of students assessed in live classes=307

of students in live classes successfully completing assessment=185 (60.2)

of students assessed in online classes=113

of students in online classes successfully completing assessment=70 (62.2)

Total # of students=420

Total # of students successfully completing assessment=255 (61%)

Total # of students taking no assessments=88 (21%)

HIST 2312—306 students enrolled in live classes; 122 enrolled in online courses

Three full-time instructors taught live classes; no adjuncts taught live classes.

Three full-time instructors taught online courses; no adjuncts taught online courses

No concurrent courses offered.

of students assessed in live classes=306

of students in live classes successfully completing assessment=172 (56%)

of students assessed in online classes=122

of students in online classes successfully completing assessment=80 (66%)

Total # of students=428

Total # of students successfully completing assessment=252 (59%)

Total # of students taking no assessments=88 (20%)

HIST 2355—No data available.

8. What is your analysis of the findings?

HIST 1311—Enrollment in live classes (300) exceeded online enrollment (100). Courses taught by full-time instructors exceeded adjuncts (3 to 1). Online assessment success rates were higher than traditional (live) class assessment success rates (68% compared to 62.5%). The threshold or assessment goal of 75% was not met, with 62.5% at or above the “proficient” level. The number of students completing no assessments was 21%.

HIST 1312—Enrollment numbers in live classes is unavailable. All courses (live and online) were taught by full-time instructors.

HIST 2311—Enrollment in live classes (307) again exceeded online enrollment (113). More full-time instructors (4) taught live classes, with only one adjunct teaching live. No full-timers taught online, with one adjunct teaching online. Online assessment success rates were slightly higher than traditional (live) assessment success rates (62.2 compared to 60.2). The threshold or assessment goal of 75% was missed, with 60.6% at or above the “proficient” level. Students completing no assessments was 21%.

HIST 2312—Enrollment in live classes (306) surpassed online enrollment (122). All classes (live and online) were taught by full-time instructors. Online assessment success was higher than traditional (live) success rates (66% compared to 56%). The threshold or assessment goal of 75% was not met, with 61% at or above the “proficient” level. Students completing no assessments was 20%.

Trends for all history courses include:

- 1) The ratio of classes taught by full-time instructors compared to adjuncts has improved significantly.
- 2) The number of students taking traditional or live classes was quite high compared to online, which in some ways defied the trend. Unfortunately, the current pandemic has caused traditional (live) enrollment to decline precipitously; and traditional (live) classes may be suspended indefinitely in the near future.
- 3) Online assessment success rates were slightly better than traditional class assessment success rates, which has not always been the case.
- 4) All courses, regardless of instructor status (full time or adjunct) and methodology (traditional or online) missed the assessment goal of 75% at the proficient or advanced level. There are two reasons for this unfavorable outcome. First, there were errors in the Excel system used to calculate student performance. Second, some instructor data was not properly input into the Excel system. Both are reasons for skewed numbers in the history assessment results for this cycle.

5) All courses had high numbers (+20%) of students who did not complete any assessments. Essay point values were raised to encourage better participation, but no significant improvement occurred.

6) Faculty participation in assessment was not unanimous. One reason for the lack of full faculty participation in the 2019-2020 assessment cycle was due to COVID19. Faculty neglect in collection and submission of assessment data is certainly understandable during the end of an extraordinarily chaotic academic year.

7) All faculty adjusted their classes at mid-semester (March 2020) to cope with the pandemic's upheaval. Course assessment goals remained, however, student retention was everyone's primary focus. Innovations to retain students included: deadline extensions on assignments, re-opened modules after deadlines, modified assignments to accommodate the Blackboard App., posted short audio lectures helping students transition from face-to-face classes to online, posted Power-point slides with voice-over, diligently reported and notified students via the Early Alert feature, sent frequent emails to the entire class, sent frequent emails to individuals showing periods of inactivity, called and encouraged individuals to keep up their course participation.

9. What is the action plan for the next academic year? (2020-2021) Explain.

1) Faculty will stress the importance of student participation in the assessment process by emphasize how student assessment is critical for reaching the Institutional Learning Objectives (ILOs), the GELOs, our CLOs, faculty improvement, and student success.

2) Faculty will take more time to ensure students are prepared for assessment, including (but not limited to) a detailed explanation of our grading rubric, instructor expectations, and practice-writing exercises.

3) All faculty must participate in assessment and remember assessment is a semester's long endeavor. The same reasoning behind Question 9, Item #1 above (regarding students) also applies to faculty

4) All faculty will familiarize themselves with the Blackboard learning system. Blackboard contains valuable assessment features, which are extremely helpful once built and deployed. Also, the likelihood of faculty teaching some form of online is all but guaranteed for the foreseeable future.

5) Different assessment instruments may be offered. All history faculty used essays as our sole assessment instrument. However, different assessment methods (oral presentations and discussion) will be an option.



6) Faculty will conduct an in-depth analysis on critical thinking (see Question 3—*“Which CLOs are being addressed in your assessment plan next academic year-2020-2021?”* on page 2 of this report.

DRAFT