GHP (Historical Perspectives) Assessment Results: 2012-13, 2013-14

Assessment of UNCG’s General Education Program is done through a partnership with the General Education Council and the Office of Assessment and Accreditation. Information and data about the assessment of learning in the General Education Program can be found on the OAA website: http://assessment.uncg.edu/academic/GenEd/.

The following materials were developed by the General Education Assessment Coordinator in conjunction with the General Education Council.

If you have any questions about the assessment of the General Education Program, please contact David Carlone (david_carlone@uncg.edu), the Chair of the General Education Council, or Teresa Brumfield (tebrumfi@uncg.edu), the General Education Assessment Coordinator.

Introduction

UNCG’s General Education Program is comprised of five Learning Goals (LGs):

- LG1. Foundational Skills (critical thinking, effective communication, quantitative and information literacies)
- LG2. The Physical and Natural World (math and science)
- LG3. Knowledge of Human Histories, Cultures, and the Self
- LG4. Knowledge of Social and Human Behavior
- LG5. Personal, Civic, and Professional Development

These Learning Goals are distributed across eight categories and four markers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNCG General Education Program Learning Goals</th>
<th>Learning Goal 1</th>
<th>Learning Goal 2</th>
<th>Learning Goal 3</th>
<th>Learning Goal 4</th>
<th>Learning Goal 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Categories:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts (GFA)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical Perspectives (GHP)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature (GLT)</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics (GMT)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Sciences (GNS)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophical, Religious, &amp; Ethical Principles (GPR)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reasoning &amp; Discourse (GRD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social &amp; Behavioral Sciences (GSB)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markers:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives (GL)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Perspectives (GN)</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Western</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## GHP (Historical Perspectives) Assessment Results: 2012-13, 2013-14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>UNCG General Education Program Learning Goals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Learning Goal 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking Intensive (SI)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing Intensive (WI)</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The category-and marker-specific student learning outcomes (GEC SLOs) state how students will accomplish these Learning Goals (see [http://utlc.uncg.edu/genedu/slos](http://utlc.uncg.edu/genedu/slos) for current SLOs). To ensure our students are achieving what we state in the GEC SLOs, the GE Program is assessed, using faculty-developed processes.

## GE Program assessment process

In May 2011, a group of faculty developed a process to assess the GE Program. The assessment process includes course faculty assessment, peer faculty validation, and data summary/presentation. The process was approved by the GE Council and has been used since spring 2012 to assess student achievement of the GE Learning Goals.

In the course faculty assessment:

1. Faculty choose existing course assignments aligned to student learning outcomes (SLOs) specific to the course’s General Education category and/or marker(s).
2. Faculty send unmarked student work products for six students, along with the assignment, to the Office of Assessment and Accreditation (OAA). The students are selected by OAA, through a random-selection process, and their student identification numbers are provided to the instructors.
3. Faculty apply a three-point rating scale (Highly Proficient, Proficient, Not Proficient) to all students’ work for each SLO.
4. Faculty complete an on-line survey, recording aggregate (class) results for each SLO.

In the peer faculty validation:

1. The General Education Council invites faculty to participate in a workshop (held in early January before classes begin) to evaluate student work products. A monetary incentive is provided to eligible participants.
2. Workshop reviewers are grouped by General Education category/marker and paired within each group. Each pair receives the same set of student work.
3. Using the same three-point scale as course faculty, reviewer pairs rate student work products (SWPs) provided by the course faculty. Each member scores the work independently. Two scores are gathered for each student work.
4. The workshop concludes with large-group discussion.

In the data summary and presentation:

1. OAA summarizes data from the course faculty assessment and from the peer faculty validation workshop.
2. The General Education Council presents these summarized data to the University in open forums.
3. Forum participants make observations, suggestions, recommendations, etc., to the Council.
4. A summary report is prepared and posted on the Council’s website.

Results: Historical Perspectives (GHP) – 2012-13 and 2013-14

In 2012-13, GHP student learning outcomes were assessed as part of the General Education Program assessment, which included approximately 20 percent of General Education courses. Results were presented at the February 2013 General Education Program Assessment Forum.

For the 2013-14 academic year, three General Education categories—Historical Perspectives (GHP), Literature (GLT), and Social and Behavioral Sciences (GSB)—were selected for assessment. Results were presented at the April 2014 General Education Program Assessment Forum.

As you review the following assessment results, think about how they compare to your course results, and what actions you could take in your course to improve these Program results.

2012-13

Course faculty (CF) participation
Of 15 GHP sections sampled, 11 responded, representing 275-279 assessed students.

Workshop faculty (WF) participation
Ten of the 11 responding sections provided 47 student work products (SWPs) to be rated by peer reviewers.

Of 94 ratings, peer reviewers categorized 43 (or 46%) for GHP slo-1 and 8 (or 9%) for GHP slo-2 as “no rating”.

Reasons given by workshop faculty for selecting “no rating” included:
- assignment did not explicitly address SLO,
- assignment only partially addressed SLO, or
- student chose an option that did not elicit the SLO.
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Charts: CF ratings and WF ratings

GHP SLO-1: Use a historical approach to analyze and contextualize primary and secondary sources representing divergent perspectives. (LG3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Faculty Ratings</th>
<th>Workshop Faculty Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 279 students assessed</td>
<td>n = 51 ratings of SWPs able to rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Highly Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Faculty</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Faculty</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GHP SLO-2: Use evidence to interpret the past coherently, orally and/or in writing. (LG1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not Proficient</th>
<th>Highly Proficient</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Faculty</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshop Faculty</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Faculty Comments

Course faculty comments included:

- “For SLO1, I looked for specific examples and an indication that the student understood why a certain type of material evidence from the past was created. The point was to see if a student understand that material evidence of the past, although ‘solid’ does not equate with ‘reality.’ In other words, there were reasons why certain types of material culture were created.

  “For SLO2, I looked for at least 3 specific examples of evidence, and for a direct connection between this evidence and their statements about the past.”

- “... I did notice with these short papers, the complete lack of understanding for these students on how to cite internally either by footnote or parenthetical notation. They believed a works cited page was enough. ... I have noted ... that they are generally ill prepared to deal with primary and secondary source citation at all. Something to bring up to the committee.”

- “My short paper assignment addresses both GHP SLO 1 and GHP SLO 2. These two SLOs are fundamental to all well-constructed history courses.”

Workshop faculty commented on:

- Student learning outcomes
  - “Clarify language within the SLOs.”
  - “Multiple verbs in SLOs are problematic”; e.g., if assignment asks for part of SLO, then student’s work product may be categorized as “unable to rate”.

- Assignments
  - When assignment clearly elicited the SLO, “about 70% Prof/30% Not Prof”.
  - “Share examples of ‘good’ assignments (i.e., assignments that clearly communicate its relation to the SLO and that allows students to demonstrate it).”

- Proficiency levels
  - “Need guidelines for proficiency [levels].”
  - “Rubrics—more information, training, and resources [needed]; they helped faculty to more quickly evaluate the proficiency of student’s work.”
2013-14

Course faculty (CF) participation
Of 13 GHP sections sampled, 9 responded, representing 353 assessed students.

Workshop faculty (WF) participation
All nine responding sections provided 54 student work products (SWPs) to be rated by peer reviewers.

Of 94 ratings, peer reviewers categorized 9 for GHP slo-1 and 8 for GHP slo-2 as “no ratings”. Reasons cited by faculty for selecting “no rating” included subject matter was ahistorical, or assignment elicited the SLO but the student work product was not the final product for the assignment.

Prior to beginning to rate the student work products, the GHP group defined criteria for each GHP SLO:
- Criteria for GHP SLO-1 included:
  - Employs primary and secondary sources
  - References source
  - Considers different points of view
  - Evidence of analyzing the source in the given historical period
- Criteria for GHP SLO-2 included:
  - Uses evidence, data, facts (empirical)
  - Clearly connects empirical evidence to interpretation
  - Interpretation situated in course’s historical context

Charts: CF ratings and WF ratings

| GHP SLO-1: Use a historical approach to analyze and contextualize primary and secondary sources representing divergent perspectives. (LG3) |
|---|---|
| **Course Faculty Ratings** | **Workshop Faculty Ratings** |
| n = 352 students assessed | n = 85 ratings of SWPs able to rate |
| Not Proficient 16% | Highly Proficient 15% |
| Highly Proficient 32% | Not Proficient 38% |
| Proficient 52% | Highly Proficient 47% |
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**GHP SLO-2:** Use evidence to interpret the past coherently, orally and/or in writing. (LG1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Faculty Ratings</th>
<th>Workshop Faculty Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n = 353 students assessed</td>
<td>n = 86 ratings of SWPs able to rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Not Proficient 16%
- Proficient 52%
- Highly Proficient 32%

- Not Proficient 32%
- Proficient 49%
- Highly Proficient 19%

**Faculty comments**

GHP course faculty commented on how they used grades to determine the proficiency levels and suggested improving the assessment process by defining the proficiency levels.

Workshop faculty commented on the student learning outcomes; that is, that they were “still problematic” and “too ‘major’ specific”. Faculty also suggested improving the assessment process by offering training that emphasized the need for assignments to be clearly and explicitly linked to the GEC student learning outcome.