

Assessment Plan 2005: Humanities & Integrated Studies
Prepared by: Tami S. Carmichael, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Humanities & Integrated Studies

Department Overview:

The Humanities Department services the University of North Dakota in a variety of ways. It provides heavily enrolled, highly popular, essential general education courses like Humanities 101 and Humanities 102. In addition, this department provides continuing education correspondence courses to facilitate the education of non-traditional students. Beyond these first year courses, the Humanities department also offers select, upper-level seminars for students, advanced in their college careers, who still desire interdisciplinary courses that challenge their critical thinking perspectives.

Housed within Humanities is the **Integrated Studies Program (ISP)**. Referred to by the national consortium on integrative learning, The Washington Center, as “the fine granddaddy of integrated learning communities,” Integrated Studies offers a more refined, intensive, integrative, interactive general education experience for first and second year students at UND. The Integrated Studies Program, which has been in successful operation for 19 years, constitutes the primary focus of the Humanities department and faculty.

An extraordinary option for students, the **Integrated Studies Program** offers a cluster of 3-5 courses each semester which helps students fulfill general education requirements necessary for all University undergraduate degrees. The program offers a “model learning community wherein students engage in active learning projects, primary research, and lively discussions of challenging and exciting texts.”¹ Each semester includes credit from the four general education categories: Communications, Social Sciences, Arts and Humanities, and Math, Science, and Technology.

Work and study in the program are organized around a central theme, and carried out in a variety of small group settings in which discussion among students is encouraged. Close contact between students and faculty members is a strong feature of this learning community; students and faculty spend the entire semester together studying the same materials and form close relationships.²

Class readings, activities and assignments are structured to aid students in both the cognitive and affective domains of educational growth, with particular attention paid to helping them develop skills in analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Additionally, faculty in Integrated Studies believe that a student’s classes should be related to what is happening in the world. By so doing, the student will be stimulated into taking a more active role in his or her own education and will ‘learn to learn,’ and become a lifelong learner, not just someone who works for grades.³

Integrated Studies works well with University majors at UND that value students with strong abilities in communication and critical thinking; it is also particularly good for deciding students and is recommended by the Education Department for anyone interested in an Elementary or Special Education major.

¹ President Kupchella, *State of the University: Past, Present, and Future*. UND, August 2000.

² UND Catalog 1999-2001, p 113.

³ Barrentine, Carl. *Annual Departmental Assessment Report*. UND, March 2000

Assessment Goals, Strategies, and Outcomes:

Learning goals in Integrated Studies are formulated around Bloom’s and Krathwohl’s taxonomies of cognitive and affective development. Particularly, Integrated Studies classes seek to aid students in the development of the higher domains of Bloom’s cognitive domain including: analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. Both direct and indirect methods of assessment are used to determine whether students are making progress toward meeting these goals.

Student Learning Outcome Goals

1. To analyze, form opinions on, and articulate responses to new ideas and topics by bringing information and viewpoints from several disciplines to bear on a subject.

Corresponding Levels of Bloom’s Cognitive Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis • Synthesis • Evaluation 	<p>Direct Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre/Post Essay (in-class) • Portfolios • Checkpoint Seminars (oral exams) • Cooperative Learning Unit (Random Sample/ pre-post test) <p>Indirect Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • General Education Letter • Gen. Ed. Course Evaluations (Evaluative Statement 1: “The [humanities/social science/science related) 	<p>Pre/Post Test Results (2004):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 78% of students showed improvement in ability to carefully analyze text • 81% demonstrated stronger ability to understand complex terms/ideas by bringing new learning to bear (synthesis) • Overall, students show more subtlety of thought; though they often didn’t change their opinion on the reading material, 73% of students were better able to articulate their opinion/viewpoint. <p>Portfolios (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 83% of students show improvement in critical thinking skills and writing 	<p>Assessment indicates that students are making improvements in their abilities to understand complex ideas and to address those ideas by articulating new views or by more clearly stating old opinions on the material. We feel this indicates that our methods are already successful.</p> <p>After using the Pre/Post test and the Portfolios, however, we realized that we need a clearer, more concrete articulation of learning goals for students, and that we also needed to provide both written and oral opportunities for directly</p>

	<p>CLUs, seminars, readings, films, and activities challenged me to think critically.”)</p>	<p>skills from portfolio 1 to portfolio 3</p> <p>Checkpoint Seminars (fall 2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students participated in two checkpoint seminars during the fall 2005 semester. This is a new method of assessment for ISP, so data from the first checkpoint was not collected in a manner useful to this assessment report. As a result, data collection mechanisms were changed for the second checkpoint and the following data was yielded: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All students passed the exam. 2. 23% received A’s 3. 73% received B’s 4. 4% received C’s <p>Cooperative Learning Unit Pre/Post Test (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During first cooperative learning unit presentations, 46% of students were able only to deliver research information. They had not analyzed or synthesized information and could not think through the information in a critical manner in order to answer questions posed by classmates. • During second cooperative learning unit, 100% of students 	<p>assessing these goals. Thus, we have now restated our goals (as seen here) and are using both oral, Checkpoint Seminars, pre/post test cooperative learning units, and written exams to assess student learning.</p> <p>The second Checkpoint Seminar (oral exam) tested students’ abilities to synthesize and evaluate new information in light of prior learning. Evaluations indicate that by the second half of the semester, students are making adequate, if not superior, progress toward meeting this goal.</p>
--	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>talked knowledgeably about topics, gave smooth, well-informed presentations, encouraged class interaction <i>and</i> could answer new questions by analyzing and evaluating information in light of previous learning in order to formulate educated guesses about the questions posed.</p> <p>Indirect Assessment: General Education Letter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The General Education Letters that students compose, provide strong anecdotal evidence that students feel that this goal, above all others, is being met best. <p>Indirect Assessment: Gen. Ed. Course Evaluations</p> <p>Humanities 101: “A Lot”: 56.5% “Somewhat”: 40% “Not much”: 2%</p> <p>Humanities 102: “A Lot”: 45.5% “Somewhat”: 45% “Not much”: 9%</p> <p>Humanities 224: “A Lot”: 45% “Somewhat”: 52% “Not much”: 3%</p> <p>Humanities 225: “A Lot”: 40% “Somewhat”: 57%</p>	
--	--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>“Not much”:</p> <p>Humanities 270: “A Lot”: 44% “Somewhat”: 54% “Not much”: 2%</p> <p>Humanities 271: “A Lot”: 49% “Somewhat”: 39% “Not much”: 12%</p>	
--	--	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

2. To engage actively in the learning process by asking questions, sharing ideas, and findings, and by formulating connections between readings, ideas, and world events.

Corresponding Levels of Bloom’s Cognitive Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Synthesis 	<p>Direct Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Checkpoint Seminars Cooperative Learning Unit (Random Sample; Pre/Post Test) <p>Indirect Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gen. Ed. Course Evaluation (Evaluative Statement 4: “The [humanities/social science/science related] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data being compiled <p>Cooperative Learning Unit Pre/Post Test (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During first cooperative learning unit presentations, 46% of students were able only to deliver research information. They had not analyzed or synthesized information and could not think through the information in a critical manner in order to answer 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> To be determined after data is collected

	<p>CLUs, seminars, readings, films, and activities helped me recognize or conceptualize connections between ideas, events, or knowledge areas.”)</p>	<p>questions posed by classmates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During second cooperative learning unit, 100% of students talked knowledgably about topics, gave smooth, well-informed presentations, encouraged class interaction <i>and</i> could answer new questions by analyzing and evaluating information in light of previous learning in order to formulate educated guesses about the questions posed. <p>Indirect Assessment: Gen. Ed. Course Evaluations</p> <p>Humanities 101: “A Lot”: 61% “Somewhat”: 35% “Not much”: 3%</p> <p>Humanities 102: “A Lot”: 45% “Somewhat”: 41% “Not much”: 13%</p> <p>Humanities 224: “A Lot”: 44% “Somewhat”: 51.5% “Not much”: 4.5%</p> <p>Humanities 225: “A Lot”: 50% “Somewhat”: 50% “Not much”:</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>Humanities 270: “A Lot”: 46% “Somewhat”: 46% “Not much”: 8%</p> <p>Humanities 271: “A Lot”: 41% “Somewhat”: 37% “Not much”: 22%</p>	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

3. To consider, distinguish, and/or use multiple choices, beliefs, and diverse ethical frameworks when making decisions about or responding to ethical situations or problems.

Corresponding Levels of Bloom’s Cognitive Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis • Evaluation 	<p>Direct Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pre/Post Essay Test (in class) • Portfolios • Checkpoint Seminars • Cooperative Learning Unit (Random Sample/Pre-Post Test) 	<p>Pre/Post EssayTest (2004):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment tool did not show any indication of whether students were reaching this goal or not. However, students did seem overwhelmingly better able to understand nuances and complexities of arguments. • 47% of students did indicate more uncertainty in their initial pre-test reading/opinion formulation. They felt that they had misread or not 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developed new assessment mechanisms – primarily the checkpoint seminar which requires that students formulate, in a discussion setting, opinions and ideas about new topics/issues based on multiple forms of information encountered in ISP classes.

		<p>fully considered the arguments in the essay.</p> <p>Portfolio Assessment (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 76% of final portfolios indicated improvement in this area. Since the portfolios only include written work, it was difficult to determine how much comfort and expertise in writing may or may not have warped this finding. <p>Checkpoint Seminars:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data being compiled 	
--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

4. To evaluate personal beliefs and assumptions by recognizing them as part of a conscious value system.

Corresponding Levels of Bloom's Cognitive Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evaluation 		<p>Cooperative Learning Unit Pre/Post Test (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> During first cooperative learning unit presentations, 46% of students were able only to deliver research information. They had not analyzed or synthesized information and could not think through the information in a critical manner in order to answer questions posed by classmates. 	

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During second cooperative learning unit, 100% of students talked knowledgably about topics, gave smooth, well-informed presentations, encouraged class interaction <i>and</i> could answer new questions by analyzing and evaluating information in light of previous learning in order to formulate educated guesses about the questions posed. 	
--	--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

5. To grow more comfortable with and capable of public, oral communication by formulating questions, stating ideas, and presenting ideas and information informally in discussion seminars and by presenting in a public, formal setting.

Corresponding Levels of Bloom's Cognitive Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Analysis • Synthesis • Evaluation 	<p>Direct Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Checkpoint Seminars • Cooperative Learning Unit (Random Sample; Pre/Post Test) 	<p>Checkpoint Seminars</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Please see data and explanation in chart 1. <p>Cooperative Learning Unit Pre/Post Test (2005):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During first cooperative learning unit presentations, 46% 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preliminary data indicates that students are making progress in this area and no changes are needed at this time.

	<p>Indirect Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Gen. Ed. Course Evaluations (Evaluative Statement 2: “The [humanities/social science/science related] CLUs, seminars, readings, films, and activities encouraged oral and written communication.” 	<p>of students were able only to deliver research information. They had not analyzed or synthesized information and could not think through the information in a critical manner in order to answer questions posed by classmates.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • During second cooperative learning unit, 100% of students talked knowledgably about topics, gave smooth, well-informed presentations, encouraged class interaction <i>and</i> could answer new questions by analyzing and evaluating information in light of previous learning in order to formulate educated guesses about the questions posed. <p>Indirect Assessment: Gen. Ed. Course Evaluations</p> <p>Humanities 101: “A Lot”: 61% “Somewhat”: 37% “Not much”: 2%</p>	
--	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

		<p>Humanities 102: “A Lot”: 65% “Somewhat”: 28% “Not much”: 6.5%</p> <p>Humanities 224: “A Lot”: 53% “Somewhat”: 45% “Not much”: 2%</p> <p>Humanities 225: “A Lot”: 69% “Somewhat”: 31% “Not much”:</p> <p>Humanities 270: “A Lot”: 42% “Somewhat”: 48% “Not much”: 9%</p> <p>Humanities 271: “A Lot”:30% “Somewhat”: 51% “Not much”: 16% “Not at all”: 2%</p>	
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

6. To develop, communicate, and justify a personal philosophy or aesthetic.

Corresponding Levels of Krathwohl’s Affective Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valuing Organization 	<p>Direct Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre/Post Test Philosophy Essay Assignment <p>Indirect Assessment</p>	<p>Pre/Post Test Assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Process <p>Longitudinal Study</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Determined Yet

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ISP Longitudinal Study 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Attachment A 	
--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------------------------------------------------------------	--

7. To gain a sense of comfort and support in the learning process that will engender curiosity and life-long learning habits.

Corresponding Levels of Krathwohl's Affective Domain	Assessment Mechanisms (Direct & Indirect)	Reported Outcomes	Actions Taken
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Valuing Organization 	<p>Direct Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Pre/Post Test Philosophy Essay Assignment <p>Indirect Assessment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> General Education Letter ISP Longitudinal Study 	<p>Pre/Post Test Assignment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In Process <p>Longitudinal Study</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> See Attachment A 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not Determined Yet

Conclusion:

Direct and indirect assessment of student learning outcomes indicate that Integrated Studies students are making above average progress in meeting all of the program/course goals.

Integrated Studies Faculty will continue to hone their assessment mechanisms to fit both the goals and the students' needs.