

# Assessment Reports Electronic Template\*

## Rosemont College --Undergraduate

Form updated: 3/10/09

### I. General information:

Date of Report: May 5, 2009  
Semesters or Academic Years Covered: 2008-2009  
Division:  
Department: History  
Chair or Person Preparing the Report: Rich Leiby

### II. Departmental Profile:

Number of Majors: 8  
Number of Faculty:  $\frac{2}{2}$  *full time*  
*part time*

Courses Offered in the Assessment Period:

Factors that Affect Assessment: The absence of Prof. Leiby from the classroom for much of 2008-09 may have affected student choices on the Comprehensive exam. Likewise, reduced adjunct offerings may have affected student performance in European history.

### III. Assessment results

#### A. Learning Outcomes for Majors

This year, we collected data dealing with Goal III, Objectives 1 (a, b, and c) and 3. Please refer to plan for details.

#### B. Assessment of Majors

Goal III, Objective 1a: We received a total of five questions returned (out of a possible 8) that dealt with American history. The average score of the five was 90.6, thereby satisfying the requirement of the outcome.

Goal III Objective 1b: We received a total of three answers returned (out of a possible 8) that dealt with European history. The average score of the three was 83, thereby satisfying the requirement of the outcome.

Goal III Objective 1c: We received a total of four answers returned (out of a possible 4) that dealt with synthesizing European and American history. The average score of the four was 78, thereby not satisfying the requirement of the outcome.

Goal III Objective 3: Our four graduates achieved a raw score average of **138**, which is lower than the Rosemont median of 144. Also, only one of the four achieved a level higher than the 50<sup>th</sup> %ile nationally.

### **Three-year analysis:**

Goal III, Obj. 3: The data from ETS results over the last three years (2007,08,09) reveal that our median score for nine graduating seniors is **150**, or well above the Rosemont (twelve-year) median of **144**. Despite the fact that three of four did not make the national 50<sup>th</sup>%ile this year, our three-year data has us achieving a result of six out of nine majors accomplishing this goal. (66%).

### C. Changes Based on Assessment

The scores from this year indicate that several changes may be necessary. One is that the comprehensive exam no longer tests what we want our students to learn, particularly in the skills section (document analysis, writing, data organization, etc.) Therefore, we will completely revise the comprehensives next year to measure those outcomes.

Second, the low scores on the ETS are troublesome because they indicate that the majors this year have underperformed expectations. This is especially troublesome because the subscores sometimes indicated that students did better on Asian, African, and non-western history (which we do not stress) than they did on American and/or European (which we do stress). This will force us to reevaluate our major requirements and perhaps stress the surveys more.

Third, the scores on the comprehensive exam do not correlate well with the students' course grades or their ETS results. This is further evidence that we need to revise our exam to conform to real learning experiences.

Fourth, the difficulties in scoring may be due to the lack of student exposure to enough variety in history instruction. Perhaps we should explore more adjuncts with an eye on varying up what we present better.

### D. Recommendations for Improving the Assessment Process

1. Revise comps to emphasize skill building more, and less emphasis on knowledge accumulation.
2. Apply rubrics to those questions rather than grade with a 100 pt scale.
3. Consider putting more coercive emphasis on ETS results in order to have students take them more seriously.

\*This template is adapted from *Assessment Clear and Simple, A Practical Guide for Institutions, Departments and General Education* by Barbara E. Walvoord, 2004, John Wiley and Sons, Inc.