

## HISTORY DEPARTMENT FINAL REPORT ON FACULTY DEVELOPMENT GROUP

### Position prior to the FIG:

Prior to the recent series of meetings, we had all done quite a bit of assessment and were fairly well practiced. However, there remained important differences in our respective methods and disagreements on what would be preferred/acceptable to the SLO authorities. We had not developed a method of aggregating data.

We benefitted greatly from the meetings and the opportunity to address questions with the various experts present.

Listed below are the areas in which we made progress.

### Achievements:

1. We determined that we can use a single essay question to assess all three history SLOs. And, each instructor can choose their own question.
2. There should be uniformity, however, in that we should agree on an outside essay or an embedded test question.
3. Each SLO must be assessed separately. There would be three scores on each Nichols form submitted.
4. We agreed upon a grading rubric that can cover all 3 SLOs.
5. We determined that we can aggregate scores from various assessments as long as we all use the 1-4 point scale. In this way apples and oranges all become just fruit.
6. We developed a plan to aggregate data by designating which instructors are responsible for which class. They will collect data, aggregate and forward information to the Office of Institutional Effectiveness.
7. We agreed upon an assessment schedule. We plan to assess each SLO for each class every Fall. In the Spring, we will evaluate the data and discuss results and lessons learned.
8. Communication with adjuncts has been difficult, in part, because there was so much flexibility in our method. Now that we have agreed upon a more uniform system, we plan to offer adjuncts a more concrete example.

May, 3013  
Scott Howell  
Stephen Reed  
Narges Rabii