

History, Department of

Advanced Education

Goal Description:

The history department will promote matriculation of undergraduate students into advanced educational programs

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS-----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Promoting Advanced Degree Work

Performance Objective Description:

History majors will demonstrate competency in knowledge and skills necessary to seek advanced degrees in history and related fields.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Admission Into Graduate School

KPI Description:

Admission of history students to history graduate programs will indicate success. The department will seek to place at least 10% of BA or BS graduates into history MA or other history graduate programs.

Results Description:

In 2016-17, 19 holders of the History undergraduate degree were accepted to History graduate programs. History graduated 83 BA's and BS's at this time, for a rate of 23%.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Graduate Admission Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a new method to fit its changing student profile.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Advanced Degree Programs Outside Of History

KPI Description:

Admission of history graduates to programs for other advanced other degrees, such as the PhD, the JD, and the M.L.S. will indicate success. The History Department will encourage such study and will seek to place at least 3 BA, BS, or MA graduates in programs for advanced or specialized degrees at other universities.

Results Description:

In 2016-17, three History degree-holders were accepted into non-History graduate programs. One was for a PhD in Transnational Studies, another for an MA in Counseling, and the third for an MA in Japanese Studies.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Advanced Degree Outside History Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a new method to fit its changing student profile.

Scholarly Endeavors

Goal Description:

The Department of History will engage in scholarly activities to maintain a high-quality curriculum.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS-----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Faculty Scholarship

Performance Objective Description:

The Department of History will maintain a constant flow of faculty research and scholarly activities.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Faculty Research Presentations

KPI Description:

At least 60% of the graduate faculty will present in scholarly venues each year.

Results Description:

In 2016, 15 of 21 graduate faculty presented in scholarly venues, a rate of 71%.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Research Presentation Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a new plan/assessment method that is geared towards building an intellectual community and fit its changing faculty profile better.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Faculty Research Publications

KPI Description:

The History faculty will contribute to the field by publishing in scholarly venues. At least 55% of the graduate faculty will publish a scholarly work each year. The history faculty will average at least 35 published pages per graduate faculty member per year.

Results Description:

In 2016, 10 of 21 graduate faculty published in scholarly venues, a rate of 48%.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Research Publication Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a new plan/assessment method that is geared towards building an intellectual community and fit its changing faculty profile better.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Grant Activity

KPI Description:

At least 60% of the graduate history faculty will submit at least one grant proposal each year, and at least one of these proposals will be funded.

Results Description:

In 2016, 7 of 21 graduate faculty in History applied for grants, a rate of 33%.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Grant Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a new plan/assessment method that is geared towards building an intellectual community and fit its changing faculty profile better.

Teaching Excellence

Goal Description:

Instructional faculty receive high ratings of their teaching.

RELATED ITEMS/ELEMENTS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Faculty Teaching

Performance Objective Description:

History instructors will be rated above the national average on the Individual Development and Educational Assessment (IDEA) instrument.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

IDEA Student Ratings: % Classes

KPI Description:

At least 70% of the classes taught by History faculty will have IDEA Student ratings at or above the national average among professors of history at institutions using the IDEA system.

Results Description:

In Spring 2017, 80% of History courses were "similar," "higher," or "much higher" in the IDEA Summary Evaluation compared to the national average. The results were the same to the percentage point in fall 2016.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

IDEA: %Classes Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will adjust the IDEA score expectations to better reflect Sam Houston State University’s standing and the department’s changing faculty profile.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

IDEA Student Ratings: Average

KPI Description:

The average adjusted student evaluation of all SHSU History teachers as measured by the IDEA Center will place the average SHSU History faculty in the top 30% among teachers in the nation who use the IDEA instrument.

Results Description:

IDEA slightly changed its reporting this year, enabling this conclusion: History instructors were above the mean IDEA score by one or two percentage points in aggregate in "Excellence of Teacher" and "Excellence of Course."

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

IDEA: Average Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will integrate this assessment to the new assessment method that will be developed for **IDEA Student Ratings: % Classes.**

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Students Taught By PhD Faculty

KPI Description:

During any academic year the percentage of history students taught by tenured and tenure track faculty holding the PhD will exceed 85%.

Results Description:

In 2016-17, of the 9761 students in History courses, 79.4% were taught by professors holding the Ph.D., and 65.1% by tenure-track professors holding the Ph.D.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Students Taught by PhD Faculty Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a new method to fit its changing student and faculty profile.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Teaching Reviews

KPI Description:

Each year, members of our tenured faculty meet with our assistant professors to discuss teaching quality. This involves classroom observations, evaluations of the syllabi, and post-observation discussions. The department will collect reports from these experiences and score their results.

Results Description:

In 2016-17, the Department conducted seven such reviews. An example of the post-discussion letter is attached. We have not yet developed a scoring instrument for these reviews.

Attached Files

 [example](#)

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Teaching Reviews Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will develop a mentoring program for its all faculty.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

1. We shall look into developing an assessment program of pool faculty, beginning via mentoring relationships with tenure-track faculty.

2. We shall measure faculty research productivity against well-defined external metrics.

3. We shall measure our departmental success against assessment initiatives from major organizations in our field, such as those of the AHA.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

2016-17 was a transitional year in the Department of History. The Department now has a new Chair, Associate Chair, and Graduate Director. The Department did not accomplish any of the stated goals in the previous PCI. The Department has spent the last year working to create a new system of committees and processes for governance and assessment.

2016–2017 Plan for Continuous Improvement

Closing Summary:

The Department of History will

1. develop a new assessment plan to fit the changing student and faculty profile better.
2. strive to build an intellectual community in the department.
3. develop a new teaching mentoring program for all its faculty.
4. streamline and reform its undergraduate program.

- 5. develop new Pre-Post tests.
- 6. streamline and reform its Graduate Program

History BA/BS

BA Graduate Preparation

Goal Description:

History BA graduates often seek to teach. In addition, all History BA graduates should possess certain analytical skills best evinced by the historical research process. As appropriate, the department will monitor student preparation for teaching certification and, in general, student mastery of history-thinking skills.

RELATED ITEMS -----

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

History Research And Thinking Skills

Learning Objective Description:

History students will demonstrate specific history thinking and research skills through the writing of finished history research projects.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Senior Level Student Learning Outcome Assessments

Indicator Description:

During the course of the semester, students enrolled in 4000-level (senior level) courses will demonstrate mastery of historical scholarship and writing skills, as determined by a panel of history faculty.

A panel of two faculty members will select at random a sample of at least one-quarter of the total of 4000-level final research papers and scrutinize them according to an assessment instrument. This is the instrument perfected in previous years by panels of 4000-level evaluators and can be modified every year by that year's panel.

Criterion Description:

The rubric specifies four areas: Thesis; Evidence; Documentation; and Organization. The benchmark of success is an average score of 3.5/5 on each and a score of 14 overall.

Findings Description:

A sample of 12 papers (one quarter of the fall semester) received average scores of 3.75 on each criterion and 15 overall. The spring semester papers will be scored in August.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Research and Thinking Skills Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will streamline/reform its undergraduate program to fit its changing student profile

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

History Teacher Certification Preparation

Learning Objective Description:

To equip would-be public school history teachers with the skills to pass the Texas state examination for certification.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

TEXES Examination

Indicator Description:

Teacher education students who major or minor in History will pass the TExES examination.

Students who major in History and minor in secondary education must pass a state examination in History (or Social Studies) to be certified to teach in Texas. The School of Education informs each of these students of their obligation to take the "TExES" test. Generally a third of all History majors have this minor.

Passage of the TExES by a score of 80% qualifies the graduate to teach in Texas schools.

To qualify to take the TExES test, a student must score 80% on an official practice test. This test is furnished to the department by the Texas Education Agency. As of February 2015, both the History and Social Studies tests are new. The department administers the practice tests and furnishes scores to the School of Education, which in turn informs the students if they are qualified to take the final test.

Criterion Description:

70% of all teacher education students who major or minor in History will pass the TEXES history examination with at least a score of 80%.

Findings Description:

In 2016-17, 12 of 17 History students passed the TExES History test with a score of at least 70%, a rate of 71%. 6 of 16 passed the Social Studies test, a rate of 38%.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Research and Thinking Skills Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will streamline/reform its undergraduate program to fit its changing student profile

Skills In And Knowledge Of History

Goal Description:

B.A. History graduates will be prepared for successful careers and productive citizenship by gaining ample knowledge and skills in departmental courses.

RELATED ITEMS - - - - -

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Learning Outcomes

Learning Objective Description:

To expose students, especially during their lower level classes, to various methods of teaching and intellectual stimuli all promoting key historical thinking skills.

Students will have multiple pedagogical experiences designed to ascertain which forms produce best results.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Self- And Instructor Evaluations In History Core Curriculum

Indicator Description:

Students will have multiple pedagogical experiences designed to ascertain which forms produce best results. We will sample a group of students representing 5% of our total 1300-level students in a study. The faculty selected for this exercise are those teaching multiple sections of 1301/2 of similar size.

In the Fall of 2014, two sections of HIST 1301 were employed in an experiment. Using one section as a control, a comparison was made to an identically populated related section. (This was repeated in Spring 2015 using HIST 1302.) The following methods were used in the test section:

- 1. Reduction of lecture in favor of interactive student research activity.
- 2. Frequent promotion of small-group and team co-operative learning.
- 3. Use of Jeopardy-style gaming to promote information rehearsal.

Changes in assessments were:

- 1. Shift from memorization performance to researched essay responses.
- 2. Increased emphasis in grading expectations on appropriate use of critical thinking and analysis skills in addition to content recitation.
- 3. Provision of a consistent critical thinking and writing analysis rubric in preparation for all exams.

The traditionally taught course consisted of lecture and power point delivery assessed through short-answer and multiple-choice testing as is commonly practiced in freshman sections.

Success would be indicated by enhanced assessment performance from students in experimental sections.

Criterion Description:

Testing outcomes will be compared. Success would be indicated by enhanced assessment performance from students in experimental sections. Because this is a new program objective, the specific amount of desired demonstrable performance is difficult to estimate.

Findings Description:

In 2016-17, in the first control group, the pre-post-test increase was 8.63% and in the experimental group 14.21%. In the second control group, the pre-post-test increase was 18.17% and in the two experimental groups 6.81% and 9.53%. However, both experimental groups in the second example scored higher on the post-test vs. the control group.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Learning Outcomes Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use this assessment method/matrix and will streamline/reform its undergraduate program to fit its changing student profile

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 1

Learning Outcomes: Tests

Learning Objective Description:

Students will acquire relevant historical knowledge and the ability to put it to use.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 2

Pre-Post Testing In History Core Curriculum

Indicator Description:

Students enrolled in lower-level US history courses, by far the largest enrollments in the department's curriculum, will demonstrate an enhancement in historical knowledge over the course of the term. The department, consulting Texas norms, has devised pre-and post-tests based for this purpose.

Criterion Description:

The department devised a new instrument (attached) of 25 questions, based on the norms the state of Texas has expressed for the introductory history courses mandated for every public university student. The department expects measurable improvement in the post-test results versus the pre-test, of at least 10%.

Findings Description:

In 2016-17, students averaged 54% on the pre-test and 62% on the post-test, an improvement of 14.8%.

RELATED ITEM LEVEL 3

Pre-Post Testing Action

Action Description:

The Department of History will cease to use the current Pre and Post tests and will develop a new assessment to fit its changing student and faculty profile.

Update to Previous Cycle's Plan for Continuous Improvement

Previous Cycle's Plan For Continuous Improvement (Do Not Modify):

- 1. We shall introduce skill, and non-merely content-based classroom assessments.
- 2. We shall develop a plan of rolling out such assessments over the levels of our courses from the service/core courses through our major.

Update of Progress to the Previous Cycle's PCI:

2016-17 was a transitional year in the Department of History. The Department now has a new Chair, Associate Chair, and Graduate Director. The Department did not accomplish any of the stated goals in the previous PCI. The Department has spent the last year working to create a new system of committees and processes for governance and assessment.

2016–17 Plan for Continuous Improvement

Closing Summary:

The Department of History will

- 1. develop a new assessment plan to fit the changing student and faculty profile better.
- 2. strive to build an intellectual community in the department.
- 3. develop a new teaching mentoring program for all its faculty.
- 4. streamline and reform its undergraduate program.
- 5. develop new Pre-Post tests.
