

**Spring 2008 Analysis of SACS Core Curriculum Composite Area 5 Objectives 5, 7, 8 and 9
Data from courses HIS 163 and 164**

The assessment plan for History included the use of two indicators: the IDEA student evaluations and the content-specific test scores on a sample of classes representing at least 20% of the students in HIS 163 during the Fall semesters and at least 20% of the students in HIS 164 during the Spring semesters.

INDICATOR 1:

The first indicator for measuring progress in realizing the Core Composite Area 5 Objectives comes from the student self-assessments of knowledge gained in this area as a result of their enrollment in HIS 163 and HIS 164. The benchmark for the Core Curriculum Composite Area 5 Objectives 5 and 7 is drawn from the student responses to IDEA item 21; Objective 8 from IDEA item 29; and Objective 9 from IDEA item 31. A table of Spring 2008 student responses from each of these items is provided below:

Benchmarks for Objectives 5 & 7 – IDEA Item #21

HIS 163	CID	Students	Score Q #21	National T score	Percentile Ranking
3361		30	4.1	51	54
3439		159	4.4	57	76
3438		47	4.4	58	79
3437		34	4.7	64	92
3364		35	4.5	59	82
3457		35	4.0	49	46
3383		21	2.7	25	01
3375		34	4.6	61	86
3362		25	5.0	69	97
TOTALS		420	4.3	57	76

Percent of HIS 163 sections with higher rankings than the national average = 78% (all sections reporting)
Overall ranking on Item 21 in HIS 163 sections: 76th percentile among institutions using the IDEA system

HIS 164	CID	Students #	Score Q #21	National T score	Percentile Ranking
3451		229	4.3	57	76
3455		47	4.6	62	88
3458		44	4.5	60	84
3442		196	4.7	64	92
3443		147	4.1	53	62
3444		214	4.7	64	92
3445		42	4.6	62	88
3454		30	4.1	52	58
3441		18	4.2	55	69
3448		52	4.2	54	66
3465		26	3.4	32	04
3449		24	3.9	47	38
3464		29	3.9	47	38
TOTALS		1098	4.2	55	69

Percent of HIS 164 sections with higher rankings than the national average = 77% (all sections reporting)
Overall ranking on Item 21 in HIS 164 sections: 69th percentile among institutions using the IDEA system

Benchmarks for Objective 8 and for Objective 9 – IDEA Items #29 and #31

HIS 163	CID	Students	Score Q #29	National T score	Percentile Ranking	Score Q #31	National T score	Percentile Ranking
---------	-----	----------	----------------	---------------------	-----------------------	----------------	---------------------	-----------------------

3361	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3439	159	4.6	65	93	4.5	60	84
3438	47	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3437	34	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3364	35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3457	35	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3383	21	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3375	34	NA	NA	NA	4.1	55	69
3362	25	NA	NA	NA	4.1	55	69
TOTALS	420	4.6	65	93	4.2	57	75

Item 29: Percent of HIS 163 sections with data with higher rankings than the national average = 100% (low sample size)
Overall ranking on Item 29 in HIS 163 sections: 93rd percentile among institutions using the IDEA system

Item 31: Percent of HIS 163 sections with data with higher rankings than the national average = 100% (low sample size)
Overall ranking on Item 31 in HIS 163 sections: 75th percentile among institutions using the IDEA system

Benchmarks for Objective 8 and for Objective 9 – IDEA Items #29 and #31

HIS 164	CID	Students	Score Q #29	National T score	Percentile Ranking	Score Q #31	National T score	Percentile Ranking
3451		229	5.0	75	99	4.5	62	88
3455		47	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3458		44	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3442		196	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3443		147	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3444		214	5.0	77	99	5.0	70	98
3445		42	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3454		30	NA	NA	NA	4.1	55	69
3441		18	NA	NA	NA	3.7	47	38
3448		52	4.1	56	73	4.0	53	62
3465		26	2.9	35	07	2.7	31	03
3449		24	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
3464		29	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
TOTALS		1098	4.3	61	86	4.0	53	62

Item 29: Percent of HIS 164 sections with data with higher rankings than the national average = 75% (low sample size)
Overall ranking on Item 29 in HIS 164 sections: 86th percentile among institutions using the IDEA system

Item 31: Percent of HIS 164 sections with data with higher rankings than the national average = 66% (low sample size)
Overall ranking on Item 31 in HIS 164 sections: 62th percentile among institutions using the IDEA system

Conclusion: Student evaluations of content knowledge gained (item 21), achievement in using sources to answer questions and solve problems (item 29), and achievement in critical thinking skills (item 31) in both HIS 163 and HIS 164 were significantly higher than typical student evaluations of achievement on these items given by students at other colleges across the nation that use the IDEA instrument.

One unexpected problem with the methodology was discovered. The IDEA system does not report student responses to items that professors listed as lower priority objectives within the class. As a result, not all students enrolled in these classes participated in the evaluation for Core Objectives 8 and 9. Specifically, 38% (159 out of 420) and 47% (521 out of 1098) of the students in HIS 163 and HIS 164, respectively, were included in the sample that assessed progress on the Core Objective 8. Similarly, 52% (218 out of 420) of the students in HIS 163 and 52% (569 out of 1098) of the students in HIS 164, were included in the sample that assessed progress on the Core Objective 9.

INDICATOR 2:

The assessment using the second indicator is reported below:

Classes representing 21.5% of HIS 164 students (360 of 1676 students) were given a 25 question exam during April 2008. The exam included questions over the three objectives (#7,#8 and #9) that are listed among the Core Curriculum Composite Area 5 objectives. 218 students completed the test. A composite average (based on all 25 questions) and three sub-composite scores (understanding sources, understanding chronology, and understanding factual information) were obtained for these students.

Because this assessment plan was not completed before the first week of the semester, a pre-test was not given. However, composite and sub-composite scores on the test are available on a population of East Texas American History high school students, and these results were used as a proxy for the pre-test scores of entering SHSU freshmen American history students.

The results were as follows:

	Pre-Test Proxy	Post-Test Results	% Gains
	% Correct	% Correct	
Composite	36%	60%	67%
Understanding Sources	58%	81%	40%
Understanding Chronology	27%	54%	100%
Factual Knowledge	35%	58%	66%

Conclusion: The goal of 20% or more improvement was reached on the overall composite score and on each of the three sub-composite categories measuring the Core Curriculum objectives.