

Spring 2017
Core Curriculum Assessment Report

of

Knowledge 2 - Arts and Humanities

from the

US History / Government

Core Curricular Area



submitted by

Michael Heil

on behalf of the

US History / Government
Core Area Assessment Committee

Methods

How was student work (artifacts) collected for assessment?

After identifying a face-to-face, an on-line, and a concurrent section to assess, artifacts were collected from faculty for each format.

What type of artifacts were collected?

Written work, such as papers, exams, or document analyses.

How were the artifacts sampled for assessment?

Assessors considered sets of artifacts from whole classes.

How were the artifacts scored?

Assessors analyzed artifacts following a shared rubric on a four-point scale.

How was reliability in scoring determined and ensured?

Each artifact was scored individually by two different faculty to ensure reliability.

Reflection

What was learned from the assessment results?

Knowledge goals were accomplished in all sections that were assessed, regardless of format (face-to-face, on-line, and concurrent) , or type of artifact (paper, exam, or document analysis).

Continuous Improvement

What changes will be made based upon the assessment results?

Results of assessment do not indicate need for fundamental change in our core courses.

Feedback

What changes are recommended for Core assessment?

Assessors should construe the categorical terminology more broadly. Several sets of artifacts concern the American Civil War, for instance. The topic pre-supposes a student's understanding that the Civil War is, after-all, the preeminent Constitutional crisis in American history. Just to respond to the question requires knowledge of the Constitution. Yet experts in History, the assessors, tended to regard the category as "N/A" (not applicable) because students' responses did not reference the document (the Constitution itself) directly, but instead focused on the war triggered by competing regional interpretations (Union versus Confederate) of the meaning of the document. Re-phrasing the assessment terminology from "US Constitution" to "US Constitutional Issues" may rectify the ambiguity.

Comments

Other comments?

No.

END OF REPORT