

IS QUALITY IN EDUCATION/TEACHING A NECESSITY OR A FIXED IDEA?

(Quality Assurance at CSU-Pueblo)

Galina Pshegusova Rostov State University

“In all societies, throughout human history, people have educated their children. Indeed, one of the fundamental characteristics of human civilization is a concern for the preparation of the next generation. From one generation to the next, we seek to pass on what we know and have learned, hoping to ensure not merely the survival of our offspring, but that of our culture as well” (*R.Reagan, 1996*)

Introduction

Once reading Plato I came across with his words “Music gives the soul to the Universe, wings to the mind, flight to the imagination, and life to everything.” These words can be without any doubt said about education. Today every country, whether it is East or West, Europe, Asia, or America, is aware of its education, its future and perspectives for development. If we have a look at Higher Education, for example, in Europe we’ll see that it is in transition and being subjected to further pressures to change. At the moment Russia is undergoing great changes in education as well. The traditional role of just equipping students with extremely broad but mostly theoretical knowledge is becoming outmoded. In other words, the knowledge-oriented approach typical of the Russian education system is now being replaced with a competence-based approach. In the USA educators cooperate with governmental and non-governmental organizations to develop effective principles and practices and apply them to institutional activities. Therefore, one cannot look at a single issue and correct all educational problems within a country. Education is a very sophisticated topic, because people involved in it are also complex and unpredictable individuals. Educational systems are also complex systems, whose quality depends on variety of components, such as teachers, students, different stakeholders, training institutions, resources, etc...

Due to the importance of education today, researchers have been looking at how nations are restructuring their funding, governance, teaching and evaluation to determine what effects they have on student learning. The reason is because it is considered that international comparative studies can help researchers and educators identify factors that promote educational achievement, and which correlate with excellence in student performance (Lazer, 1992; Griffith & Medrich). Joint international studies are aimed at providing rich collection of data, and conceptualized interpretation of the results. In other words, they consider educational outcomes in relation to different characteristics, such as social, economic and political systems. An international perspective always provides a better and deeper understanding of what works in education and what doesn’t (Papanastasiou, 1999). Therefore, countries cooperate in different international studies to compare themselves normatively with other countries and other educational systems.

That's why the idea of "Administration Support" Program of the Carnegie Foundation and IREX is worth mentioning. It helps Russian educators of different levels of administration to study the experience of US Universities, make their own conclusions and implement the new positive things at their home Universities.

Why investigate the problem?

Rather often, when stakeholders are not satisfied with the results produced by their educational systems the ones to blame are teachers and their qualifications. They usually say that society should pay more attention to what teachers do in the classroom, what methods are used, i.e. what is done to assure the quality of teaching. The aspect itself is to some extent subject to evaluation. Nevertheless, all the countries and educational establishments are engaged in quality assurance. In Russia, for example, since 2000 the Ministry of education has been holding a competition, giving grants to the institutions, which pay attention to issues of quality in teaching and research. The competition is aimed at stimulating institutions to introduce new systems of self-evaluation and monitoring the quality. Rostov State University is on this track. We have our own internal procedures for attaining appropriate standards, assuring and enhancing their quality. We are doing it through the assessment of students, monitoring and review of programs.

In Europe, for example, one of the major objectives formulated in Bologna, Italy in 1999, is the establishment of a system-based evaluation of the quality of education. The so-called Bologna Declaration includes a number of statements relating to quality:

- Credit systems – there is a need for the more widespread adoption of either European Credit and Transfer System (ECTS) or systems (e.g. the US system) which can easily be converted to it. This will enable more precise comparison of academic standards.
- Greater Autonomy for Universities – this is encouraged and we can see this movement. Though greater autonomy leads to greater responsibilities. These responsibilities include the need to assure the quality of each program offered.
- Systems for more stringent and more detailed procedures for quality assurance and evaluation need to be developed.

Some European countries already have agencies to assure and evaluate quality in Higher Education (HE). The United Kingdom has an established system, which is conducted through the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA).

In the United States the American Council on Education (ACE) has been working with the Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada (AUCC), and the International Association of Universities (IAU) to develop a draft statement, titled "Sharing Quality Higher Education Across Borders: A Statement on Behalf of Higher Education Institutions Worldwide"(reference web site <http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international/quality/>). It is said there: "We believe that such a statement will help ensure a strong and thoughtful voice for higher education institutions in the global dialogue on cross-border education and promote self-regulation as a cornerstone of quality assurance." The Association of American Universities has initiated a five-year pilot project to develop improved measures of the quality of education and research. The purpose of this project is to meet two critical needs. First, the project will provide analytic data on the association's policy development activities. Second, it will develop improved measures of quality that will aid in more accurate and informative institutional descriptions.

All of the above mentioned activities shows that despite the economic or political systems, countries try to create a culture of ongoing quality review, feedback and improvements in education by creating a robust quality assurance processes at the institutional levels.

It is against this background, that this paper tries to analyze the system of quality assurance and teacher's evaluation in one of the US Universities - Colorado State University in Pueblo.

System of Higher Education in the USA

The United States has a highly decentralized system of education in general, including postsecondary education. According to the Constitution, education is delegated to the states. Education in the United States is primarily the domain of the states and local school districts. The federal government does not establish or license school or govern educational institutions, but it passes laws directly and indirectly affecting education. The federal Department of Education is the federal governmental agency implementing the laws of the Congress. In doing so, the department establishes policy, administers and coordinates federal financial assistance for education. Its stated mission is "to ensure equal access to education and to promote educational excellence throughout the nation" (Education in the United States, 2004).

In terms of autonomy/accountability, there is no single organization between the national government and universities and colleges. Though there is no direct constitutional power over HE; the Federal government plays a significant role in spending public funds to promote welfare and in regulating activities to protect citizens' rights guaranteed by the Constitution. Both public and private institutions must comply with the procedural control over student financial aid programs administered by the US Department of Education (Schmidtlein, 1996). The role of a state for public institutions is really huge. According to a Carnegie Commission study (1971) great efforts have been made to protect the autonomy of public sector institutions. Among these efforts Dr. Frank A. Schmidtlein emphasizes "conferring corporate powers on state's highest educational board, appointments or elections of higher education board members for longer periods than for most public offices, providing higher education boards full authority over academic and professional personnel". The independence of institutions, however, created difficulties for states. The more students enrolled and the more research done in the institutions definitely leads to larger shares of money from the states. These concerns are supposed to be dealt with by different associations of institutions and agencies. As Dr. Schmidtlein writes "all 50 states invented "buffer" agencies to reconcile autonomy and accountability tensions. " The form of these "buffers", however, varied greatly among the states. In Colorado, for example, there is a special Department of Higher Education. Its main aim is coordinating policy and state resources for the state's 28 public institutions as well as several hundred proprietary schools and overseeing two key loan programs. The Department seeks to ensure that higher education is accessible and affordable to all Coloradans. The Department helps bring cultural and artistic education opportunities to citizens in each of Colorado's 64 counties. The main divisions of the department include the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE), the Colorado Historical Society, the Colorado Council on the Arts, the College Access Network, CollegeInvest, and the Division of Private Occupational Schools.

The Colorado Commission on Higher Education (CCHE) is an 11-member lay board, appointed by the Governor and confirmed by the Senate that acts as a central policy and coordinating board for Colorado public higher education.

The mission of the Commission is to implement the directives of the General Assembly and

promote and preserve quality, access, accountability, and efficiency with Colorado public higher education. The Commission has determined that “it is the highest priority of the State “to improve academic competencies and provide learning experiences that foster the development of skills and abilities that prepare students for global economy.” The Commission considers a bunch of issues; among them are Academic program review, Program administration, and information, monitoring and accountability systems, and quality initiatives (<http://www.state.co.us/cche/>).

Each institution of higher education signs a Performance Contract with CCHE, which regulates relations of a certain university/a college with the State. It is a very detailed document covering both financial and academic issues. Besides the main body, there is very a substantial Addenduma describing goals of both organizations and the contract itself. The document helps to avoid ambiguities and misunderstandings. It even prescribes the core curriculum (35 – 37 credit hours) for each program. On the one hand, this exact list of courses helps educational institutions in creating the course, but on the other hand, it imposes limitations on the creativity of faculty and, to some extent, *limits their creative freedom* (<http://www.state.co.us/cche/cof/contract/index.html>.)

I attended one of the meetings at the Provost’s office, where Deans and Directors were discussing the Draft Performance Contract. The discussion was very hot but reasonable. For example, it was pointed out that some of the articles (Quality in Undergraduate Education) require massive data reports each semester to be sent to CCHE, which is difficult to review. The participants of the meeting carefully observed every article and offered their recommendations.

Definitions and Terminology

What is quality? Quality is easily recognized; however, when one is trying to define it, it appears that quality has very different meanings for different individuals in different contexts. Notions of “quality” are centuries, even millennia old though the context for determining quality has historically been limited by the purpose of education and the population for whom formal education was provided. The early European universities were established to promulgate religious doctrine and to institutionalize the educated status of the noble class. Formal education, therefore, was an extremely exclusive activity, reserved for a very small and elite portion of the population. Moreover, early academic education was devoted almost exclusively to transmitting content or “knowledge”. The criteria for “quality” were limited and could be assessed with two basic issues: 1) content knowledge of the instructor; 2) knowledge of the same content demonstrated by learners. So, today when we are struggling to uniformly assess quality in education we should not forget that neither the purpose, nor methods nor the population resemble the past. Certainly, modern education has changed greatly from its roots. Educational delivery methods grew more complex and student population more diverse. Education has become more “democratic”, i.e. more available to a broader population.

‘Standards’ and ‘quality’ have always been concepts deliberated in the higher education fold. With reduced budgets, greater demands for accountability and quality assurance, universities (nationally and internationally) are under increasing pressure to deliver.

I consider the ability of individual lecturers to evaluate and assess their own teaching practices, programmes, instructional material, and research activities to be an integral one to the process of quality assurance at the institutional level. Furthermore it is my belief that individuals must ‘self-assess’ before departments are assessed

Traditional definitions state that quality is a measure of the grade of goodness or excellence of a product. In this case the product is Higher Education. There is then the need to define some of the terms used in association with the word quality. The University of Plymouth, Quality Assurance Handbook, 2000-2001, provides some definitions based on the overall University Policy that can be accessed via Information for Staff, Academic validation and Review Handbook 2000-2001 (<http://www.plymouth.ac.uk/plymouth/main.htm>).

- Assurance – the policies and practices used to satisfy the organization that the quality of education provided is being maintained and improved and that the standards set are appropriate and being met.
- Control – specific checks to determine whether an activity has been carried out and has worked as intended.
- Assessment – a structured process incorporating self- and external peer appraisal for evaluating the quality of teaching and the student’s learning experience and depth and breadth of student achievement in the context of subject aims and objectives.

Additionally, there is one more area recommended for monitoring, evaluation and improvement of academic work (audit), but it is not in the range of this research; that’s why it is not mentioned here. The terms and definitions are important to fix because in the literature you can find different explanations. Everywhere quality assurance is described as encompassing all the policies, systems and processes directed at ensuring the continuation and augmentation of the quality of educational provision in HE (Campbell 1999:1). Harman adds that quality assurance refers to systematic management procedures adopted in order that key stakeholders will have confidence about the management of quality and the outcomes achieved (Hartman 1998:1). In Fourie & Strydom (1999:18) quality assurance is described “as systematic, structured and continuous attention to quality in terms of quality maintenance and quality improvement”. But they also argue that there are many abstractions of quality and these will impact on the system of quality assurance applied in specific contexts and situations. The most common methodologies are self-assessment, peer review, observation of practices (Becher 1999:6).

We may find the opinion that the private sector, not the government, will establish “consumer-based” means of judging quality. It means that it may make more sense to have “end-users”, for whom quality is of the utmost importance, for whom it plays a central role in quality assurance processes (Benjamin Franklin University, 2004).

Wallace K Pond mentions another “paradigm shift”. He writes about accreditation of the learner or the instructor rather than the institution and gives real examples from information technology industry (Pond, 2003). He also tries to give definitions of two key concepts in education: quality assurance and accreditation, and comes to the conclusion that whatever the definition of accreditation is it is based on “quality” and/or “standards”. They don’t define either ‘standard’ or ‘quality’. So he also asks this challenging question. His understanding is the following: “quality education is one in which the learner’s expectations for his or her learning are met or exceeded; that he or she has knowledge and/or skills that he or she did not possess before the learning experience took place”(Pond, 2003).

Whatever system of quality evaluation or assurance is used, it is bound to be very demanding on resources. It is important to establish why we need to evaluate quality. In many countries, there is a need to assure the society that the standards of HE programs are competitive and that they are being maintained. That’s why rather often university programs are evaluated and monitored firstly and mostly by employers and taxpayers. The former need to know that graduates whom

they employ have achieved high standards in the programs relevant to their needs. The latter need to be assured that public money given to HE is being well spent.

It is our belief that quality should be assured and monitored in a way mentioned above but in connection with all academic activities as well, i.e.:

- *Programs* should follow all modern requirements; reflect latest research and development in a certain subject. In Russia they should meet the national standards requirement proposed by the Ministry of Education.
- *Teaching/training* should include a variety of different traditional and innovative teaching methodologies. Reasonable proportion of theory and practice is desirable. High professionalism of teaching staff/expertise of the subject taught is a 'must'.
- *Resources* should be accessible for teaching staff to benefit their lectures and practices; it also implies use of IT when/if necessary.
- *Research* should be done by each faculty member, quality rather than quantity being the main emphasis.

Today procedures of assurance are considered at different levels. At the National level there is a framework within which all centers of HE operate. In Russia, for example, the Ministry of Education does assurance; in the United Kingdom this is provided by the Quality Assurance Agency (<http://www.qaa.ac.uk>). In the United States of America it is the responsibility of agencies set by each individual state (in Colorado it is CCHE) along with regional accrediting commissions. At the institutional level each university/college develops procedures and sets up administrative and committee structures to deal with different aspects of assurance and evaluation. It helps the educational institution show itself and the society that the quality of education in this particular place is high. The next level is evaluation of the program, its content and organization.

In my opinion whatever the issue is *the teacher is central* to all above-mentioned. It is the teacher who plays a key role in the development of programs, in delivery of materials, in making research of the problems s/he encounters. The teacher can be considered something like a 'soul' of the institution; that's why the main attention should be paid to a teacher. Briefly, quality depends on a teacher, not visa versa. Quality is shared among university teachers in peer assessment.

Colorado State University –Pueblo

I have a great opportunity to understand and see how quality assurance and staff evaluation is performed in US universities in one of the Colorado educational establishments Colorado State University in Pueblo. Below is the information about this university taken from the web site.

Colorado State University-Pueblo is a comprehensive state university with an enrollment of more than 4,000 students, including nearly 200 international students. Fully accredited and part of the Colorado State University System, CSU-Pueblo provides relevant professional coursework, superior instruction with a small professor-to-student ratio, and state-of-the-art technology for an ever-changing global economy. Invaluable hands-on experiences prepare CSU-Pueblo graduates for the demands of the modern world.



Students can choose from twenty-six undergraduate programs in the College of Science and Mathematics, the Hasan School of Business, the College of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the College of Education, Engineering and Professional Studies. The classes are taught by faculty members, never graduate assistants, so you can be assured of expert instruction and a quality education.

Colorado State University-Pueblo has a strong and steady commitment to excellence through student-centered learning based in high academic expectations and responsive teaching and support services. With its recent name and mission change, the University has rededicated itself to high quality teaching and learning as its first priority. Program offerings have been expanded, new teaching and learning methods—especially those involving applied learning and technology—have been incorporated into all programs, faculty have strengthened their scholarly activities to stay current in their fields of expertise, and effective student academic support services (e.g., advising, learning centers, career planning) are readily available. As a result, CSU-Pueblo offers a comprehensive and up-to-date curriculum that meets the many needs of its students.

The University is committed to expanding access to higher education, especially for Colorado citizens. It has extended its recruitment, admissions, and financial aid resources, as well as its evening and continuing education offerings, to provide more high quality educational opportunities for a broader range of people.

The Board of Governors of the Colorado State University System governs CSU-Pueblo. The Colorado Commission of Higher Education, the central policy and coordinating board for all public institutions, establishes policy on legislative, academic, and fiscal matters. It is an accredited institution. The Commission on Institutions of Higher Education of the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools has accredited Colorado State University-Pueblo.

The university provides affirmative action to ensure that all employees are treated fairly during employment in accordance with the laws of the United States and the State of Colorado. Such action includes, but is not limited to, affirmative efforts with respect to employment, promotion, transfer, recruitment, advertising, layoff, retirement, or termination; rate of pay or other forms of compensation and selection for faculty development activities. (Information is taken from the web site <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/catalog/2004-2005/> and slightly adapted).

Evaluation procedures at CSU-Pueblo

I have studied and analyzed the methods of evaluation in the whole university but more detailed in the College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS) with Dr Russell J. Meyer as the Dean of the College. CHASS is one of the largest colleges at the university. It has 9 Departments but 19 "degree programs" Among them there are some rather traditional (English, Spanish, French, Sociology, Social Work) and those, which are run only in some places (Chicano Studies, Military Science, Music). About 45% of the whole university enrollment studies here. CHASS students have "plenty of chances for professional involvement at CSU-Pueblo. The University Art Program features several student shows each year, as well as the opportunity to meet visiting artists. Music students participate in a variety of concerts, working with nationally recognized artists and musicians. Some students work on the campus newspaper, *Today*, and on [Southern Colorado magazine](#), as well as on a **student-run music radio station** broadcasting to Pueblo and Colorado Springs. Some students write for and edit the [Hungry Eye](#), the **literary magazine**, while others have the opportunity for early professional involvement through a variety of internships and other field experiences (<http://chass.colostate-pueblo.edu>). Professionalism is the main feature of the CHASS faculty; the majority of department chairs have PhDs, a variety of publications and are tenured.

Evaluation and accreditation in the State of Colorado is done traditionally on different levels. The highest is the Colorado Commission on Higher Education. It deals with a lot of educational issues; among them is approval of the new academic programs in state –supported institutions of HE in Colorado, review of academic programs and many more (for details see <http://www.state.co.us/cche/policies>).

On October 6, 2004 the Colorado Commission on Higher Education released draft contracts that spell out new performance and accountability standards for every college and university in the state. It says that the contract marks a new era of reform in HE in Colorado. One of the issues is connected with staff appraisal: "Colleges and universities will be required to establish a pay plan for faculty that emphasizes teaching and research performance and to report publicly to the state how performance is measured and the type of differential pay faculty are rewarded based on performance." It can help not only to reward faculty but also make the quality better if adopted. At the same time the Commission sometimes imposes limitations on the performance of the university (p.4 of this case study).

I have read some materials on-line and found out that there had been widespread dissatisfaction with the quality of personnel evaluation in education (Joint Committee on Standards for Educational Evaluation, 1988). Educators, policy makers and different community groups often attack the near absence of personnel evaluation systems or the superficiality in the systems that do exist (p.157-159). Mertler, Craig A. and Petersen, George J. give detailed analysis of teacher evaluation in the 90-s in the USA (Mertler et al, 1997). They came to the conclusion that highly developed and effective teacher evaluation systems were rare in American education. Teachers were "provided little feedback regarding their class performance and even less assistance in improving areas identified as weaknesses"(p.3). Is anything changed now?

CSU-Pueblo as all the other institutions in the USA evaluates the qualifications and work of their personnel. These evaluations occur at several points during an individual period of service with the institution, including selection/ hiring, promotion, and awarding of tenure. CSU-Pueblo also uses evaluation as a means to provide feedback for improving the performance of personnel. At the university level all the changes in programs are considered and adopted at a special

committee called the Curriculum and Academic Programs Board (“CAP Board”). I was present at one such meeting, when the Department of Music reported about five-year performance. It is one of the CHASS departments. Once every five years each undergoes Program review at this committee, and it is not an easy task. The Dean describes it as a lengthy process: the department prepares a lengthy self-study. An external review (usually from another university) reads that review, talks with faculty, students, and administrators, and then writes an external review. The dean then forms a “program review seminar” with the department chair, the dean, the provost, a member of the CAP Board, and a faculty member from another program. This seminar discusses the program and makes suggestions for improvement. After that, the dean writes a summary report and establishes an “action plan” for the program. All these documents (self-study, external review and dean’s report) are forwarded to the CAP Board. There is then a meeting of the chair and dean with the CAP Board. There were a lot of questions to the Dean and the Chair of the Program. All the documents are substantial, detailed; they provide information on every bit of life and performance of the Department. Then, the CAP Board votes on whether to recommend the program be kept or discontinued. This a very good opportunity for any Department to show its successes, on the one hand, and for other Departments to compare their work and to take into account certain weaknesses, on the other hand. Though some questions asked by the colleagues from the other Departments clearly show that every Department can have its own ‘peculiarities’ not evident to others. I was kindly given the materials on History Program Review part of which I include into the case, i.e. Dean’s Report and Recommendations of the External Review (*see Appendix I*).

If we analyze both the Dean’s Report and the External Review we’ll clearly see that both documents attract attention to the needs of faculty, their development and evaluation. CSU-Pueblo faculty are aware that as educational systems expand and develop to meet the needs of citizens in their state, they are required to demonstrate that they are able to deliver significant improvements in terms of increased access and enhanced quality. Every meeting I visited touched upon the problem of quality and faculty performance in this or that way: the Deans’ meeting at Provost office discussed the Performance Contract, a great part of which is concerned with the issues of faculty; the Chairs’ meeting at CHASS on October 27, 2004. It was devoted mostly to the problem of attrition rate in CHASS. But the majority of the chairs asked a question: Why is retention rate so high? If there are any academic reasons for students to drop out of the university: the syllabus is difficult, the faculty do not their best, etc. What was important, nobody blamed students or anybody else; people were trying to find real reasons and they did. The chairs are genuinely concerned and determined to find solution – even though they may bicker over which solution is best. The whole discussion and the attitude say about professionalism of the faculty, their attitude to students.

Rights duties and responsibilities of each faculty member are fully shown in Chapter 2 “Faculty Personnel Policies” of the Faculty Handbook. It is a detailed document, which describes the official statement of policies, obligations, responsibilities, and privileges pertaining to faculty, i.e. the relation of every faculty with administration. It is a part of every faculty member’s contract of employment. A separate section is devoted to Performance Assessment.

Traditionally the purposes of teacher evaluation are described as two-fold: to provide information for use in personnel management decisions, i.e. hiring, tenure, promotion (Haefele, 1993), and teacher assignments and transfers (Thomas & Carrol, 1977). Also incorporated in these systems is the determination of whether educational personnel meet required expectations (Mertler & al, 1997). This type of evaluation is widely used in Russia as well. We observe and evaluate much those teachers who begin their carrier to see whether they possess the essential

teaching skills. This type of evaluation is traditionally called “summative evaluation. “Summative “evaluation represents a measurement of what has happened. The second purpose of teacher evaluation is concerned with the development and improvement of teacher performance. This form of evaluation provides information concerning the strengths and weaknesses of teachers in order to appropriate plan additional training. In literature this type of evaluation is called “formative”(Stiggins & Duke, 1988). How is process done in CSU-Pueblo? I think it is better developed and covers more areas of importance both for the administration and the faculty; it not formal and is done not for the sake of evaluation. Besides details on types of contracts, duties, responsibilities and privileges – traditional for every university, this document contains such issues as Cumulative Performance Review (CPR). The purpose of CPR is “to support and maintain faculty commitment to excellence in teaching, scholarly/creative activity and service during the carrier development while seeking tenure and promotion and after the award of tenure”(CSU-Pueblo Faculty Handbook-2003).

Evaluation policy and procedures at CHASS

CHASS as one of the CSU-Pueblo divisions follows Faculty Performance Assessment Policy. It is a developed procedure described in a special document that passed by a vote of the faculty of the College. The document includes Standards for each individual department, the College Performance Assessment Policy and Tenure and Promotion Policies. Let’s see what each part shows, what the goals are. The first “Faculty Performance Assessment Policy” regulates the assessment procedure for performance review. Four categories of activity are considered in the assessment process:

- Fulfillment of employment responsibilities
- Teaching
- Scholarly and Creative Activity
- Service

For the last three issues faculty are ranked in the three performance categories. Chairs write separate evaluative paragraphs for each of the three performance categories in their reports based on the evidence supplied in the performance file of each faculty member and the appropriate departmental expectations.

Faculty are ranked according to the following: 50% for Teaching, 30% for Scholarly and Creative Activity, and 20% for Service. This last item – evaluation of Service – is an important “invention” of the US system of HE. Some faculty members can be more useful in service activities than in research; and if it is taken into account, it means we evaluate this particular person properly. I think this item should be considered more carefully by the administration of RSU. A 1-5 ranking system is used for each of the performance area mentioned above:

5. Outstanding Performance (“Superior”)
4. Exceeds Expectations
3. Meets Expectations (“Meritorious”)
2. Below Expectations

1. Unsatisfactory Performance (“Non-Meritorious”)

Each Department then develops specific ranking systems for each of the three performance areas using the criteria relevant to their disciplines (An example of certain Guidelines for APR Evaluations for the Department of English and Foreign Languages is in Appendix II). Rewards, though not very great in the amount, are supposed to be given to the faculty after evaluation. As it is written in the document: “Half of the salary increase will be distributed equally among eligible faculty. The remainder of the increase will be a percentage of the faculty member’s salary according to a formula to be developed by the dean, announced to the faculty and applied equally to all eligible faculty. Faculty who receive a rating below 2.0 are not eligible for salary increase. An here again comes the issue of “what a successful teacher’ is. In order to evaluate faculty we have to have a clear understanding of what a successful teacher is like. The majority of faculty I talked to determined that an important characteristic for quality teachers is good subject matter knowledge. When teachers have good subject matter knowledge they are able to help students understand the core ideas of various topics, create useful cognitive maps, connect each topic with everyday life. Some of the faculty emphasized among the characteristics of a good teacher good interpersonal skills. I quite agree with this opinion, as we all live in a certain community and teaching is a kind of communal activity. Besides, professional development was named as a sign of a quality teacher. Professional development reflects an ongoing effort to improve practice and keep the faculty on-line with the latest achievements. It can include participation in workshops/conferences, special training, advanced degrees, memberships in professional organizations. However, none of the variables mentioned above guarantees that your teaching is excellent. There was a questionnaire among CSU-Pueblo faculty developed by one of the CHASS teachers: “In your opinion, what are some of the characteristics of excellence in teaching?” Many teachers responded but one was very interesting. After enumerating the traditional issues necessary for excellent teaching this professor adds “And then the other 5000 and five tricks of good teaching”. These words explain much. Teaching is an art. So, like art, there is no clear recipe of ingredients that will always produce the same quality of results when they are combined in a specific way.

Promotion possibilities are open to the faculty. The standards for tenure and promotion are published in the Faculty Handbook, and then developed by each College, School or Department according to their disciplines. The progress to tenure, for example, is evaluated each year and noted in the faculty member’s annual performance review. Traditionally the tenure period lasts up to 5-6 years; during the third year in a tenure line position at the University, the department will arrange a comprehensive review of progress toward tenure and submit the review to the dean. The department monitors the work of the faculty member and advises on his/her work. In the document “Tenure and Promotion Policies and Standards” we may read all requirements for tenure and promotion. One of the important things is that a candidate for tenure “must have achieved a record of *sustained meritorious performance* in each required category (teaching, scholarly or creative activity, and the service) and significant distinction in one during the years considered in the cumulative performance review”(CHASS Standards”).

I have observed a number of classes in different departments and my impressions are more than positive. I can say that the teaching there was very professional (Mass Communication, English, History). Faculty apply different teaching methods, they demonstrate high knowledge of the subject, they are very learner centered in their approach. The faculty try to show how real knowledge can be applied in practice. It’s a pity than I was the only teacher who can share the methods and techniques I have seen in the class, because the tradition of observation is not very

popular/wide-spread in the colleges in the USA. Every teacher I had observed has a lot to share with the colleagues.

Conclusion

It is quite clear that education in the 21st century presents challenges to quality assurance and evaluation that were unimaginable just 20-30 years ago. It is likely that the pressure on universities and colleges to establish and implement quality assurance and evaluation procedures will increase in the next decade. Of course the establishment of worldwide system that will fit all countries, all universities, all disciplines is unlikely. We already see that Bologna Declaration has considerable acceptance in Europe and the greater emphasis on quality will intensify. That's why the experience of different educational institutions in this sphere is very much desirable.

But even the terms "quality assurance" and "evaluation procedures" are difficult to define. Then, why should teachers be evaluated if there is no universally accepted definition of terminology? From my point of view the main idea is to prevent bad teachers from appearing in a classroom, though it may be too a simplistic answer.

In this case study we have analyzed the experience of one of the US universities - Colorado State University-Pueblo. It has long experience with quality assurance and evaluation methods; nevertheless each year something new is being done in this sphere to make it better, more reliable, more workable. CSU-Pueblo opens itself and the process of evaluation to different stakeholders: the community, employers, professional organizations, peer institutions and to students themselves. The once used "us versus them" approach is being changed to "done together" approach. Though there is still much bureaucracy on the side of State Educational Commission on Higher Education.

After numerous talks with the faculty the main conclusion that can be reached is the following: whatever quality and evaluation procedures are adopted they must achieve a delicate balance between the heavy hand of authority and the supportive hand of peers wishing to promote and/or share good practices. Evaluation needs to be participatory and reflective to be meaningful for teachers. Faculty should be more involved in evaluation though sometimes it seems too subjective. Systems should not be overburdened with administrative procedures. Today, quality assurance seems something of an industry in the world. So, balance is needed.

Focus questions:

- What types of assessment are most effective in capturing faculty practice?
- How do we prepare people to effectively evaluate faculty?
- Do we know what aspects to evaluate?
- What are the standards for excellence in teaching?
- Is it important to ask teachers how they would prefer to be evaluated?
- What are the most important issues in staff development (research and publications, new textbooks, conference attendance)?
- What are the most effective methods of faculty appraisal?

References

American Association of State Colleges and Universities (2002). Institutional Rights and Responsibilities.

Benjamin Franklin University (2001). ISO for Distance Education. <http://www.bfranklin.edu/deqa/>

Becher, T 1999. Quality in the professions. *Studies in Higher Education* 24(2):225.
<http://204.179.122.137:80/fulltext...rance%20and%20education&fuzzyTerm=>. P.1-11.

Campbell, K 1999. Quality assurance. <http://www.stir.ac.uk/accountancy/Quality.htm>. P.1.

Carnegi Commission on Higher Education (1971). *Governance of Higher Education: Six Priority problems*. New York: McGraw-Hill, pp.25-27.

Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education (1976). *A Classification of Institution of Higher Education*. Berkeley, Ca: Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education

CHEA 2001 Annual Conference. New Orleans, LA. January 23,
2001:<http://www.chea.org/international/barblan.html>

College of Humanities and Social Sciences (CHASS). <http://chass.colostate-pueblo.edu>

Colorado State University- Pueblo (2003). Handbook.<http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/catalog/2004-05/>

Colorado Commission of Higher Education. <http://www.state.co.us/cche/>

Colorado State University –Pueblo, <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/>

Council of Higher Education Accreditation (2001). *Glossary of Key Terms in Quality Assurance and Accreditation*: http://www.chea.org/international/inter_glossary01.html

Delaney, Anne Mary (1997). *An Interprofessional Program Evaluation Case Study: Utilizing Multiple Measures to Assess What Matters*. Annual Forum of Association for Institutional Research. Orlando, FL.

Fourie, M & Strydom, K 1999. Self-evaluation as a basis for a quality assurance system in higher education. *Bulletin* 5(2):18-20.

Harper, Fred. *Evaluation in Higher Agricultural Education: an example of discipline-based quality control*.

Harman, G 1998. Quality assurance mechanisms and their use as policy instruments: Major international approaches and the Australian experience since 1993. *European Journal of Education* 33(3):331.
<http://204.179.122.137:80/fulltext...rance%20and%20education&fuzzyTerm=>. P.1-17.

Lategan, LOK 1998. Quality assurance and the South African university system: defining the impact of external and internal trends on the South African university system and its quality. *South African Journal of Higher Education* 12(1):61-69.

Quality Assurance Agency. <http://www.qaa.ac.uk>

Papanastasiuo, Elena C (1999). *Teacher Evaluation: Theories and Practice*. Michigan State University.

Sharing Quality Higher Education Across Borders: A Statement on Behalf of Higher Education Institutions Worldwide. <http://www.acenet.edu/programs/international/quality>

Schidtlein, Frank A. (1996). *The US Higher Education System*. University of Maryland at College Park.

Scan, Eileen Mary (1994) *Performance Evaluation for Experienced Teachers: An overview of State Policies*. ERIC Clearinghouse on Teaching and Teacher Education. Washington DC.

The University of Plymouth Quality Assurance Handbook.

<http://www.plymouth.acuk/plymouth/main.htm>

US Department of Education (2003). *Digest of Education Statistics*. Washington DC: National Center for Education Statistics.

United States Network for Education Information (2001) *Accreditation*
Described:<http://www.ed.gov/NLE/USNEI/us/accred-what.html>

Pond Wallace K. (2003). *Distributed Education in the 21st Century: Implications for Quality*. Assurance

Verkleij, CL 1999. Different approaches to defining research quality. *Bulletin* 5(2):2-6.

Acknowledgements

The work has been done due to financial support of the Carnegie Commission and IREX, which administered it. I would also like to express my gratitude to the authorities of CSU-Pueblo, its President Ron Applbaum and Provost Barbara Montgomery. My special thanks are to the Dean of CHASS, Dr. Russell J. Meyer, who organized my stay at CSU-Pueblo, guided me and advised me there; I also would like to express words of appreciation to the Chairs of the CHASS for their valuable help, readiness to answer every question or solve every problem I was facing.

APPENDIX I

History Program Review Report

Prepared by

Russell J. Meyer

Dean, College of Humanities and Social Sciences

This report on the History Program Review is the result of three independent but closely related activities:

- The self-study prepared by the Chair and faculty members of the Department of History, Political Science, Philosophy, and Geography.
- An external review report prepared by Dr. Marc Cooper, Professor of History at Southwest Missouri State University
- A program review seminar co-chaired by Dean Russell Meyer and Department Chair Bea Spade, including the following persons:
 - Barbara Montgomery, Provost
 - Abhay Shah, CAP Board Representative
 - Margaret Barber, Department of English
 - Jay Trask, Bessemer Historical Society

Procedures: The seminar began by addressing a few specific questions about the self-study, but soon developed into a discussion of strengths, weaknesses, and possible improvements for the history program. In following this procedure, the seminar was true to both the general outlines and the original intent of program review seminars, allowing a group of interested and concerned members of the community to come together to assess and recommend ways to strengthen the program. All members of the seminar contributed to the discussion and made meaningful suggestions for the future of history at CSU-Pueblo.

The remainder of this report is divided into discussions of the strengths and weaknesses of the program and recommendations for improvement.

Strengths:

- Relationship to the CSU-Pueblo Strategic Plan:
 - The department serves a large number of general education students, thus contributing significantly to the CSU-Pueblo mission by helping to provide a firm grounding in the liberal arts as well as fulfilling a specific history requirement.
 - Faculty are professionally active and productive, are knowledgeable of their discipline, and thus contribute to excellence for faculty.
 - Faculty require regular writing assignments in all classes and thus help insure better learning among students, thereby contributing to excellence in instruction.
- The department has strong enrollments, with growth both in general education and in majors. The overall student/faculty ratio is 1:26; in the current semester approximately half of the general education courses are enrolled over capacity.
- The program has started discussion of a cooperative venture with the public history program at Colorado State University that will broaden opportunities for students at both institutions.
- Careful attention to grading standards, especially in the historiography and senior seminar courses has helped maintain consistency of expectations among faculty.
- Graduates indicate satisfaction with their training when they enter graduate school, specifically citing what they learned in the historiography course.
- Students score at the national average on the MFAT.
- Availability of internships for students, especially with such organizations as the Bessemer Historical Society.
- The program has begun discussions with for cooperative ventures with the public history program at Colorado State University, making special use of the Bessemer Historical Society archives

Weaknesses:

- The faculty is too small to meet the increasing demands on the program. At least two more positions are needed, one tenure-line and one instructorship.
- A specialist in social science education is needed to help teach and supervise teacher education students
- The curriculum is too narrow, with gaps particularly in Latin American, Middle Eastern, and ancient/medieval history.
- The chair has an excessive advising load.
- There is insufficient administrative assistant help for the program, thus shifting much of that load to the department chair.
- There is insufficient differentiation among courses at various levels, with few prerequisites for upper-level courses.
- Changes in general education requirements, which are beyond the program's control, effect significant changes in enrollment patterns.
- There is insufficient tracking of alumni to determine how well the program has met their needs in the long term.

Recommendations:

- Working with the dean's office, begin establishing a plan to hire two new full-time faculty as soon as possible, one tenure line, the other an instructor. Determine specific areas of specialization, taking into account gaps in the curriculum and the particular need to have a specialist in social science education. Additionally, following the recommendation of the external reviewer, this plan should consider possibilities for released-time opportunities to allow faculty to pursue specific research agendas.
- In considering new positions and current faculty expertise, determine how best to broaden the curriculum to include other areas of student interest and demand, with special attention to Latin American history.
- Working with the dean's office, other CHASS programs, and teacher education, establish a social science advisory committee to help determine appropriate social science curricula for students in K-12 education.
- Determine ways to make clearer distinctions between lower- and upper-level courses either through specific prerequisites or, at least, the requirement of junior standing for upper-level courses.
- Determine whether re-sequencing of courses will help the program more efficiently and effectively offer its curriculum. In particular, investigate whether some courses can be offered once every three semesters rather than annually.
- Continue an on-going examination of curriculum at other institutions to insure that our curriculum meets disciplinary standards.
- Distribute advisees among all faculty to help lighten the chairs' advising load.
- Working with the alumni office, develop a method of tracking alumni satisfaction.

Dean's Action Plan for History

The elements of the action plan are incorporated in the Recommendations section of the Dean's report on the History Program Review. Specifically, these elements include the following:

Curriculum Review

- Determine the specific curricular needs of the department in order to identify special areas of expertise needed in new faculty (Fall 2004).
- Develop a list of peer history programs against which to measure the history curriculum (Fall 2004).
- Establish pre-requisites for upper-level courses consonant with those in history programs at other institutions (Fall 2004).
- Re-sequence courses as appropriate to allow for more efficient offering of required and elective courses for history majors and minors (Spring 2005).
- Working with the dean's office, other CHASS programs, and teacher education, establish a social science advisory committee to help determine appropriate social science curricula for students in K-12 education (Spring 2005).
- Determine which assessment methods could be used to supplement what is learned from the MFAT, including portfolio review and student and alumni satisfaction surveys. (Spring 2005).

Faculty

- Develop a plan to hire two new faculty members, one tenure-line and one lecturer. One of these new faculty members should begin not later than Fall 2005, and the second should begin not later than Fall 2006 (Fall 2004).
- Develop a plan to allow reassigned time for faculty to pursue specific research agendas (Fall 2004).

Other

- Distribute advisees among all faculty to help lighten the chairs' advising load (Spring 2004).
- Establish a specific working arrangement with the CSU public history program (Spring 2005).
- Working with the alumni office, develop a method of tracking alumni and determining alumni satisfaction (Spring 2005).

External Review of History Programs Colorado State University, Pueblo¹

Marc Cooper, External Reviewer
Professor of History, Southwest Missouri State University

December 16, 2003

¹ This review is based on the following sources:

- Catalog 2003/2004,
- History faculty résumés,
- Program Review Self-Study: July 1998- to June 2003
- Interviews with Chair, faculty, students, Dean , and Provost, December 4-5, 2003.

I. Summary

The History/Political Science/Philosophy/Geography department is part of the College of Humanities and Social Sciences at Colorado State University, Pueblo. The department houses the following history programs:

- Bachelor of Arts;
- Bachelor of Science;
- Bachelor of Science: Secondary Education Track.
- History Minor

In AY 2002-03 these programs attracted 95 majors up from 76 in AY 1998-99. Preliminary reports indicate that the programs currently support 101 majors of which the Chair reports about a fourth are enrolled in the education track. Four regular faculty, several adjuncts, and education faculty support these programs.

Two major recent changes affecting these programs include

- The current catalog requires 3 credit hours of history survey courses to complete a section of the General Education program;
- The department has added a Bachelor of Science degree program independent of the education track.

Challenges facing the department include:

- Offering about 500 sections per semester in the survey courses to support General Education;
- Advising large numbers of students in several different programs;
- Improving the diversity of upper-division courses supporting the majors;
- Improving the education track curriculum.

II. Mission, Goals, Outcomes, and Assessment

Colorado State University, Pueblo is a regional, comprehensive university focusing on career-oriented education grounded in the liberal arts. The history program is central to the University's mission by offering General Education courses in history for all students as part of their liberal arts grounding and a baccalaureate degree leading to certification to teach social studies. The program also offers a traditional liberal arts major in history.

The history program goals are student oriented and consistent with the goals of other history arts programs. They are linked to outcomes which are assessed through nationally normed testing (MFAT), a portfolio, a required methodology course, an alumni survey, and a research paper developed during the capstone senior seminar. Taken as a whole, the assessment program is sufficiently well organized to determine the extent to which the history program is meeting its goals.

However, the stated goals are only for the arts program in history. There are no education program goals stated in the catalog. While both programs should share a subset of goals, the education program should have several unique goals such as:

- To prepare students to teach social studies in middle and secondary schools (in catalog but not explicitly as a goal);
- To prepare students to teach in those fields normally offered by Colorado secondary and middle schools;
- To prepare students for the Praxis II social studies content licensure examination.

To assess these goals the department might construct a social studies advisory council consisting of local social studies teachers and appropriate public school administrators (perhaps the Pueblo R-12 social studies coordinator). Additionally, the department might consider a separate alumni survey of social studies teachers, and add Praxis II scores to student portfolios.

The new Bachelor of Science program should also have a set of goals to differentiate it from the Arts program.

III. Performance Benchmarks

During the last five years the program has been buffeted by changing General Education requirements. When a history course has been a required part of General Education, currently the case, the department has typically handled about 100 annual student FTEs or about 1500 credit hours per semester in lower division courses. This represents 500 students taking one 3 credit hour course, or 13 sections of 40 students each. The four regular faculty members including the department chair are able to offer no more than 14 sections, and that number does not take into account reassigned time for service and grant activities.

As the number of majors increased from 76 to 95 during the self-study period, upper division FTEs increased from 19.4 to about 25. This represents 125 students taking one 3 credit hour course, or 7 sections at an average of 20 students per section. Taken together this suggests that the program should be supported by 20 sections per semester, 13 at the survey level and 7 at the upper division level.

Another way of looking at the same issue is to calculate the number of sections by using the average lecture section size. This has varied from a low 23 students in AY 2001-02 when General Education did not specifically require a history course to 27 students per section in AY 1999-00 when General Education did require a history course. In AY 1999-00, 21 sections would have been needed, while in AY 2001-02 with an average section size of 23 students, 22 sections would have been required. In other words, class size has increased or decreased over the last five years as General Education requirements changed and the number of majors rose and fell. This is clearly indicated in the Performance Ratio Analysis, FTE students per FTE faculty. The norm in history programs is about 21, that is 21 students taking 15 hours each producing 315 credit hours per FTE faculty member. In AY 1999-00 the program reached a high of 24, but by AY 2001-02, without the General Education requirement, the ratio fell to 20.

The current academic year has seen an increase in majors to 101, while a state mandate in General Education makes history once again a required part of the undergraduate curriculum. Since the state mandate is not likely to change soon considering the national emphasis on traditional history, while the number of majors is likely to increase thanks to the swelling popularity of the social studies major and the inclusion of a Bachelor of Science degree in the program, we can expect the number of lower division FTE students to hold stable at about 100, while the number of FTE upper division students is likely to be 26.5 or higher during the next few years.

These calculations are supported by interview data with the history faculty. They report higher numbers of students in their lower division sections, lower persistence rates than they previously experienced, and larger numbers of students in upper division core courses. Persistence rates in lower division courses are important since all students must pass a history course to graduate. Those who do not pass, and the number of drops and failures appears to be significant from interview data, must retake their history course, displacing students away from new students.

The increase in both lower and upper division teaching loads are likely to push the average section size over 30 in the current academic year and hence the ratio of FTE faculty to FTE students well over 24. That is, one FTE faculty teaching 4 3-credit hour sections of 30 students each yields 120 students at 3 credit hours each or 360 credit hours. One FTE student takes 15 credit hours, hence 360 student credit hours per faculty FTE produces a ratio of 24. The University ratio is 17; hence by comparison with both the college and the rest of CSU-P, the history program is understaffed.

If the department can stabilize average section size at 28 (at 4th week census), then an FTE faculty member teaching 4 sections would produce 312 student credit hours or 20.8 FTE students, just about the national norm for history programs. Hence, the program load of 126 FTE students will require 6 or 7 FTE faculty per semester. Currently the department has 3.5 FTE regular faculty members. Hence the department is probably understaffed by 3 FTE faculty members, though it would be prudent to relegate at

least 1 FTE faculty position to adjunct staff. Another way to look at staffing is the ratio of majors per FTE regular faculty. The national norm for history departments is about 18 majors to 1 FTE. This ratio indicates a need for 5.5 FTE faculty members. Again, suggesting that the department is understaffed by 2 FTE regular positions.

IV. Curriculum

The curriculum consists of a core of survey courses in world and American history together with a historiography course and a senior seminar. Students choose 15 more elective hours from upper division courses in history. Drs. Loats and Rees alternate in teaching the historiography course, while the senior seminar is offered by Drs. Sandoval and Spade with Loats to join in the AY 2004-05.

Most history departments have a core much like CSU-P's and distribution requirements. The department has discussed distribution requirements in the past and rejected them. There are several reasons to refrain from imposing distribution requirements on majors. The first issue is that distribution requirements set the need for particular upper division courses against the need for survey sections. When the pressure to offer survey sections is very great, majors suffer because of a lack of choice such that some upper division courses end up with enormous enrollments. The second issue is that distribution requirements are an impediment to making progress in the major. That is, the department must offer a course in each required area every semester in order for students to make progress within their degree programs. When the department cannot offer at least one course in each slot, students find it difficult to progress in the major. Finally, some students might not choose the history major at all out of an aversion to a required area, thereby lessening the number of majors.

However, history education students need to be trained to teach in the areas generally covered in middle and secondary school. For such students, distribution requirements are essential, and appropriate requirements need to be set up in coordination with a Social Studies Advisory Council. Distribution requirements for pre-service teachers might look something like this:

World History survey.....	9 hours (lower division)
U.S. History survey.....	6 hours (lower division)
U.S. History	6 hours (upper division)
European/Ancient History	6 hours (upper division)
Non-Western History	3 hours (upper division)
Historiography	3 hours (upper division)
Seminar	3 hours (upper division)
 Total	 36 hours

It might also be useful to replace the seminar for pre-service teachers with a third upper division course in U.S. history. This would strengthen the ability of history majors to teach U.S. history, a course nearly all social studies teachers offer.

The National Council for the Social Studies offers a set of generally accepted standards for content programs leading to certification in the social studies.² While the department is not reviewed by the NCSS, its standards are still useful quality indicators.

1. 40% of the degree program must be in social studies content areas including history, geography, civics and government, economics, and psychology. This standard is met by the CSU-P program.
2. The major must be no less than 30% of the degree program. This standard is met by the CSU-P program.
3. Course work must include history, geography, political science, economics, and psychology courses. Because a general psychology course is not required at CSU-P, this standard is not met. There are psychology courses within the professional education core, but secondary social studies

² See <http://www.socialstudies.org/standards/teachers/vol2/qualified.shtml>

teachers need a broader introduction to psychology than they will find in the *Human Development* and *Educational Psychology*.

4. Within the standards for teaching the social studies methods course is the following: “Be taught by instructors whose professional experience and education through the graduate level is appropriate both to the content and goals of social studies and to the level of licensure.” ED 443 “Teaching Social Studies in High School” is currently offered by an instructor teaching out of field. Dr. John Ryan’s primary field is reading rather than social studies education. To improve the education program, the methods course should be taught by an instructor with social studies certification, teaching experience, training in social studies teaching methods, and involvement in local high school social studies programs.
5. The education core at 39 credit hours should probably be trimmed. Many fully accredited education programs, including some in NCATE accredited schools, have compressed the core into less than 30 credit hours of course work. The University of Delaware’s nationally recognized teacher education program consists of a 25 credit hour professional education core including student teaching. Trimming the professional education core would help improve the department’s graduation rate.

Upper division courses are concentrated in the history of the United States, Modern Europe, and the Southwestern U.S. and Mexico. Beyond these areas, there are courses in East Asian history and a comparative course on Old World empires. To round out these offerings, the department should consider adding courses in ancient and medieval history, as well as area courses in Latin American, African, and the Middle Eastern history.

Faculty report that the survey courses required in the General Education program are “writing intensive.” Syllabi indicate that all faculty members require students to submit written work, but neither the amount of student writing nor the manner in which students complete that writing appear to justify the term “writing intensive.” Writing intensive courses should include regular writing assignments marked by a draft revision process.

Students complain that there is not enough variety in upper division offerings and that many courses listed in the catalog are not offered often enough to satisfy the demand. This is a challenge for small departments, exacerbated by the continuing pressure to teach more survey courses for General Education students.

The Department is interested in developing a graduate program in collaboration with Colorado State University, Ft. Collins. This may become possible with the addition of two more regular faculty positions. With the addition of a social studies specialist, it may be possible to develop a graduate program for in-service teachers, and external funding is available for such projects.

V. Faculty

The department includes four regular history faculty members. Each has a PhD, at least one recent publication, and several are involved in extensive grant activity. Most faculty members have had at least one course reassigned to other activities in recent years. Beatrice Spade, as department chair, has two courses reassigned for administrative duties and sponsors the History Club. Carol Loats is very active in shared faculty governance. David Sandoval actively pursues a research and publication agenda in Borderlands history, and teaches in the Chicano Studies program. Jonathan Rees published two books this year, and is active in the externally supported Bessemer Historical Society and sponsors the regional History Day contest.

Faculty report an interest in using computer technology to enhance classroom teaching. They are stymied by lack of classroom resources.

Students and faculty agree that the faculty is the major strength of the program.

Interviews with both regular and adjunct faculty indicate that there is a high degree of trust in the current Chair. Faculty defer to her knowledge of programs and curricular matters. However, she handles all advising for more than 100 current majors, has no direct staff support, consequently she spends a good deal of her time answering the telephone, talking to students, and performing other duties normally performed by a secretary. Advising should be a shared responsibility of the program faculty rather than a duty of the Chair.

All faculty members should have a sustained research project in order to keep the curriculum current and interesting. The University should expand opportunities for reassigned time, and expect, in return, published articles, books, and funded grant projects.

The Department currently supports two adjunct faculty in History, Carrie Spencer and Frederick Matusiak. Both have good credentials and enjoy teaching within the department. Matusiak has a PhD in ancient history and the ability to teach the popular military history course which is a part of the ROTC curriculum. Spencer is very close to having the credentials to teach the social studies methods course and is an experienced survey course instructor.

If two more regular faculty slots were to be created the Department should consider a social studies education specialist who could also teach survey courses and a specialist in either Latin American history or ancient history. In hiring, the Department should seek candidates who demonstrate strong teaching ability and research potential.

VI. Facilities

Faculty offices are of acceptable size. Only one office has natural lighting. Furnishings are old and in need of replacement. The chair's office is too small for the tasks assigned to her and so far away from staff support that the chair acts as the department receptionist. Desktop computing facilities are very good as is the network infrastructure to which they are connected. Classrooms are poorly maintained, and the classroom technology in place is antiquated. Library resources are barely adequate to support the major.

Considering the growth of the program and the importance of the program in the General Education system, it appears that investment in History facilities, particularly classrooms, will improve the general persistence rate of new freshmen.

VII. Conclusion

The History Program at CSU-P maintains high standards, has a strong, dedicated faculty, excellent leadership, and a growing body of majors. Faculty teaching loads are currently greater than both CSU-P and national norms. Because it is small, maintaining a traditional liberal arts major and an education program is challenging within a framework in which all students are required to take a history survey course. Should classroom resources improve, faculty members are prepared to take advantage of new equipment immediately. The program is strong, it is central to the University's mission, and has considerable growth potential. It should be supported beyond current levels.

VIII. Recommendations

1. Create two (2) new regular positions in History.
2. One of the new positions should be in social studies education.
3. Create a Social Studies Advisory Council.
4. Develop and fund a collaborative project with local schools through a Teaching American History project.
5. Construct social studies education goals and an assessment program based on NCSS standards.
6. Create distribution requirements in the education program.
7. Create a collaborative MA program with CSU-Ft. Collins.
8. Distribute advising to all regular faculty members.
9. Expand faculty access to reassigned time for scholarly activity, including both research and grant writing.

10. Improve the maintenance of existing classrooms.
11. Add computers and digital projection equipment to all classrooms.
12. Program faculty should retreat to an off campus facility prior to the beginning of each academic year to discuss long-term planning.
13. The Chair requires a larger office with better access to secretarial support.

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY--PUEBLO

PROGRAM REVIEW SELF-STUDY

PROGRAM NAME: BA History

REVIEW PERIOD: July 1998 to June 2003

DEPARTMENT: History/Political Science/Philosophy/Geography

Introduction (if applicable)

I. Mission, goals, and objectives of the program.

Mission

The program in history is intended to provide a domain of study for students who desire knowledge for personal enrichment and for students who desire to apply knowledge toward career objectives. Students are expected to develop and refine knowledge of other cultures and the historical and political development of the modern world. Students should expect to engage in methodical research and develop the ability to prepare rationally cogent papers and the ability to understand historical movements, methods of historical analysis, and the connections between each.

Goals: The History Major

The major in history seeks to

- provide students with a general knowledge of history and historical methodology;
- prepare students, through training in communication skills and in research methods, to gain knowledge of a given area of history;
- prepare students to continue personal study and learning about specific subject areas in the discipline on an independent basis;
- prepare students to engage in critical thinking;
- introduce students to the theoretical frameworks that serve as the foundation of historical scholarship.

Objectives

To assure that students obtain those goals, the following assessment tools are used:

- Examinations and various written exercises are used in each class to assure that the student understands material in the subject areas. MFAT exams have been given to students in the senior seminar every other year to compare our students to the national average. In addition, a portfolio review of majors is conducted annually to assure program goals are being met. A student survey is given at least every two years to rate student satisfaction with the program and an alumni survey is given every five years to ascertain how students perceive their education in the history program after graduation. .
- Critical thinking skills are emphasized in all classes, and research methodology used in the field is emphasized in all upper level courses, especially in the core courses “historiography” and senior “seminar.”
- The senior seminar in history requires students to demonstrate that they possess the skills necessary to carry out research in their given area and are competent to pursue personal learning on an independent basis.

Students Served by the Program

- History is a required area in the general education curriculum. Therefore the program is responsible for providing all students with training in this discipline. In fall 2002, there were 1126 entering freshman and 309 transfer students. The program currently provides 28 sections annually to meet this need. All sections offered to date have been filled at the start of the class.
- History also cooperates with the Teacher Education Program to provide classes for students planning to teach at the elementary and secondary levels. In fall 2002, there were 245 students enrolled in the liberal arts program, the program that prepares students for elementary teaching.
- There are currently 101 majors in the program. About a fourth of the majors are preparing to teach at the secondary level; others are preparing for law school or graduate school; still others are using it as a liberal studies experience before entering business or government service.
- A minor is also offered for students in other programs. There are currently 12 minors listed in the program.
- The history program provides courses for the ROTC program, the Women’s Studies program, and the Chicano Studies program. There are approximately 15 students enrolled in each of these three programs.

Options in the Program

- Majors pursue a BA degree unless they are in the teacher education track, which offers a BS degree. Beginning in the 2004-2005 academic year, all majors will be offered the option of pursuing either a BA or BS degree.

II. Relevant Data, Statistics and Benchmarks

*Provide analysis (where “**Analysis:**” appears below) to explain the significance of data provided in the following tables especially regarding decision making that will impact the program’s future.*

NOTE: Figures shown in the following tables are from the University Fact Book available for viewing at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/ir/factbook/index.asp> or just click on the *Faculty &*

Staff Portal of the CSU-Pueblo website and then click on the *Institutional Research and Analysis* link in the @USC section.

- *Source* indicates Institutional Research webpage data Table(s)
- College % = program percentage of overall college total
- Blank cell = zero
- DNA = Data Not Available
- TBP = To be published
- N/A = Not Applicable

A. Degrees Granted

Bachelor's degrees by major: number of degrees (including ConEd) granted during the entire year (summer, fall and spring). Source: A.9

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	8	10	15	18	17
College %	2.07	2.66	3.94	4.42	4.53

NOTE: CCHE policy states that baccalaureate degrees must graduate ten (10) students in the most recently reported year or a total of 20 students in the last three years. Masters degree programs must graduate three (3) students in the most recently reported year or a total of five (5) in the past three years.

Analysis (optional):

There has been a 125% increase in the number of majors graduating between 1998/99 and 2001/02.

B. Majors and Other Students

Majors by class: fall declared first majors with class breakdown. Source: A.4 & B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	76	74	70	89	95
College %	5.08	5.01	5.17	5.99	6.30
Fresh.	16	15	8	16	19
Soph.	16	17	13	18	22
Junior	15	18	21	19	21
Senior	24	16	24	33	30
Degree +	5	8	4	3	(3)
Grad	0	0	0	0	0

Analysis (optional):

The data indicates that the number of majors in the history program normally increases at the upper level. Transfer students are responsible for much of this increase; some increase comes from students who simply decide they liked their college history courses and changed majors; and some of the increase at the senior level is caused by students who do not graduate in a timely manner.

Student Annual FTE: annual FTE including semester breakdown including percentage of FTE generated by majors (% FTE M). Source: A.1, A.3 & B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	112.6	112.5	120.5	109.7	102.1
College %	6.76	6.43	7.21	6.95	6.67
Summer	DNA	DNA	8.9	8.2	5.1
Fall	DNA	DNA	52.4	47.7	44.3
Spring	DNA	DNA	57.1	49.7	45.9
Interim	DNA	DNA	2.1	4.1	6.8
% FTE M	17.90	16.50	20.99	25.31	34.14

NOTE: annual FTE = annual student credit hours divided by 30

Analysis (optional):

Changes in general education requirements over the five-year period under review have had the greatest impact on total student FTE. From 1998-2000, students were required to complete a course in the area of “historical consciousness;” from 2000/1-2002/3 students were only required to take two courses in social sciences. Those changes are reflected in the 2001/2 and 2002/3 FTE. Beginning in fall 2003, general education requires all students to complete a course in “history.” The fall 2003 FTE of 123.9 and the spring 2004 FTE of 127.3 reflects the impact of these changes in general education. For the program as a whole, these University-wide changes will dictate the need for additional faculty.

Enrollment (FTE): program lower division (LD), upper division (UD) and graduate (GRAD) students. Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
LD	92.20	98.37	101.20	84.40	70.90
UD	19.40	13.93	18.60	25.33	30.67
GRAD	1.00	0.20	0.70	0	0.53

NOTE: fall FTE = fall student credit hours divided by 15

Analysis (optional):

In 1999, the dip in upper division enrollment appears linked to the decline in instructional hours (i.e. classes) at the upper level. With the 2000/1 changes in general education mentioned above, lower division enrollment dropped and we were able to cope with the growth in the upper level courses. With the new general education requirements of 2003/4, we are going to be faced with heavy pressures to meet our University obligations and to continue to provide sufficient courses at the upper level to meet the needs of the growing number of majors.

C. Faculty and Teaching

Faculty assignments by FTE: full-time (FT), part-time (PT), summer and total (Program).
Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
AY FT	11.00*	9.00*	9.50*	9.50*	11.1*
PT	1.54*	3.40*	3.90*	1.90*	(3.6)*
Summer	1.30*	0.70*	1.34*	1.00*	
Program	15.18*	13.10*	14.74*	12.40*	7.5*
College %	16.46	14.97	16.99	14.41	17.61

NOTE: Deans and faculty portions of sponsored release are excluded

* departmental totals

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
AY FT	5	3	4.5	5	4
PT	0.4	1.1	0.6	0.2	1.1
Summer	0.5	0.5	0.13	0.3	0.66
Program Total	5.9	4.6	5.23	5.5	5.76
College %	6.39	5.25	6.02	6.38	6.55

*Program totals

Analysis (optional):

Only by offering little or no release time for faculty research and development have we been able to keep the faculty assignments slightly under 6.0. With our new general education obligations this number will go above 6.0.

Instructional hours scheduled: credit hours. Source: B.6 & B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	525*	545*	554*	497*	402*
College %	8.20%	8.71%	8.33%	7.85%	14%
Lecture					
Lab					

* Social Sciences, etc. totals

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	165	160	173	187	166
College %	5.24%	5.11%	5.43%	6.35%	5.85%
Lecture	152	126	138	138	137
Lab	0	0	0	0	0

history program

Analysis (optional):

Average lecture class size: headcount. Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Students	22	27	26	23	21.38

Analysis (optional):

D. Costs

Program Costs: direct and indirect costs with total (Program). Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Faculty	591,514*	646,353*	632,446*	561,825*	579,425*
Spt. Staff	24,179*	26,316*	30,377*	32,627*	21,323*
Opns.	13,995*	15,202*	9,503*	7,127*	4,947*
Crs. Fees					
Program	629,687*	687,871*	672,326*	601,589*	605,694*
College %	14.20	14.99	15.35	13.74	14.28

* departmental totals

Program Costs:

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Faculty	234,759	196,750	222,796	252,243	268,089

program

Analysis (optional):

E. Performance Ratio Analysis

Faculty capacity utilization: FTE students per FTE faculty. Source: B.7

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	21.09*	23.56*	21.62*	20.38*	17.96
College	17.86	19.66	18.83	17.98	17.09
University	16.84	17.25	16.96	16.84	16.53

*Social Sciences, etc. totals

Faculty capacity utilization:

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	19	24	23	20	18
College	18	20	19	18	17
University	17	17	17	17	17

program

Analysis (optional):

Program faculty capacity utilization has consistently exceeded the college and the university averages.

Faculty teaching utilization: teaching credit hours scheduled per FTE faculty. Source: B.9

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	40*	42*	38*	40*	32*
College	34	36	37	34	32
University	31	30	31	31	30

*Social Sciences, etc. totals

Faculty teaching utilization:

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	28	35	33	34	29
College	34	36	37	34	32

program

Analysis (optional):

Degree efficiency: degrees per major (Program and College) and program degrees per FTE (Degr./FTE). Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	0.11	0.14	0.21	0.20	0.18
College	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.27	0.24
Degr./FTE	0.07	0.09	0.12	0.16	0.17

Analysis (optional):

While degree efficiency has improved somewhat since 1998-99, this is still an area for improvement.

Cost per faculty: headcount average. Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	48,326*	52,509*	45,612*	48,515*	47,468
College	48,071	52,449	50,481	50,871	48,271

* departmental totals

Analysis (optional):

Departmental costs have been below the college average for the last three-year period of the report.

Cost per FTE student: FTE average. Source: B.College

	1998-99	1999-00	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Program	2,291*	2,229*	2,110*	2,380*	2,643
College	2,691	2,668	2,681	2,830	2,824

* departmental totals

Analysis (optional):

Cost per student FTE have been consistently lower than the college average.

Relative cost effectiveness: instructional cost index per FTE student. Source: B.10

	Latest annual cost	Latest index rating	4-year average cost	4-year average index	Relative overall rating
Program	5,932*	1.73*	2,253*	0.69*	low
College	2,824	.82	2,730	0.73	low
University	3,438	1.00	3,252	1.00	

*Social Sciences, etc. totals

Analysis (optional):

While the program costs are not broken out for this data, it is clear that the cost for the area of social sciences is low.

F. General Education and Service courses for non-majors

Describe the impacts that General Education and Service courses for non-majors have on your program. Provide data if readily available.

Frequent changes in the general education requirements at the university level have required the history program to make commensurate adjustments in the size of its staffing. Our general response has been to add or subtract adjunct faculty positions as demand rises or falls. As a result, the program has had less control over the quality of the general education history courses than we would like. When we were able to use lecturers in 1998, we had two excellent teachers, both with the PhD degree, on our staff. As financial considerations at the University level forced the program to rely on part-time adjuncts instead of lecturers beginning in 2000, adjuncts with MA rather than PhD degrees became the norm, and it has been difficult to assure the quality of teaching when we hire an individual for the first time. We were fortunate in that one of the former lecturers agreed to stay on as a part-time adjunct.

G. Placement records of graduates as possible (positions, graduate school, etc.)
Describe the program's placement record. Provide data if readily available.

The major change we have seen in the program in terms of placement is the increasing number of graduates going into secondary teaching. In 1999, one graduate entered secondary teaching. In 2002-03, five of the seventeen graduating students entered this field. Of the other graduates of that year, six students entered or are planning to enter graduate school or law school; four entered businesses, and three did not report what they were doing after graduation.

We have not yet established a good method of tracking our students after graduation. While we can point to many individual success stories, we don't have sufficient data to draw overall conclusions about their employment after graduation. We usually know what students' plans are at graduation, but have not attempted to track them after that except through an alumni survey that goes out every five years.

H. Graduation Rates: TBD

I. SAT/ACT scores of majors: TBD

III. Noteworthy Accomplishments and Distinctions

Summarize noteworthy accomplishments and distinctions including but not limited to

- *faculty teaching, research, service, scholarship, creative activities, publication, awards, etc.*

Faculty members in the history program have a respectable record of publishing and research considering their teaching and service obligations. All ranked faculty members have one or more publications during the time under review, all have given papers at various conferences, and all have been active in bringing history to a popular audience. Faculty have all been intensely aware of their teaching responsibilities; individual faculty members have engaged in activities to improve writing in the classroom, to improve the use of technology in the classroom, to improve critical thinking among students, and to improve advising. Students rank all faculty members in the program at high levels, almost always at or above the college average. All ranked faculty members are active in service activities both on campus and in their communities. Dr. Sandoval, for instance, recently appeared in a Rocky Mountain PBS television special featuring the historical aspects of the Santa Fe Trail. Drs. Loats and Rees deserve much credit for organizing the regional History Day contest for middle and high school students in Southeastern Colorado held annually on campus. (See attached resumes.)

- *student honors, service, scholarship and fellowships, graduate, professional school admissions, etc*

The history program has maintained a branch of Phi Alpha Theta, the national history honorary on campus since 1997. Approximately ten percent of the majors are accepted for membership. In 2002, students here hosted the regional conference, and three of the students giving papers placed first in their category. Two of the students are planning to present papers at the National Conference this year.

The PastMasters' History Club has undertaken many fund-raising activities, has arranged trips to historical sites, and has arranged for a number of speakers to appear on campus. In the last two years, the club arranged several trips on historical trains; a railway historian accompanied the students providing historical accounts of the trains and the region. They have made several out-of-state trips in the last five years with Taos being the most popular destination. In addition there have been trips to local historical sites like Bent's Fort, etc. The club usually arranges annually for four regional specialists in history to give lectures open to the public; these have ranged from "Early Prostitution in Pueblo" and "The 3rd Cavalry Frontier Soldiers' Equipment" to personal accounts of the life of Jews during the Holocaust. Their next speaker will discuss homesteading in the "dry" south of Manzanola by blacks in 1916. Students in the club have also been active in supporting the regional History Day activities that take place on campus.

- *program and curriculum*

The history program has not sought nor has it received recognition for its curriculum. However, we have made revisions to the curriculum in response to student needs. In 2000, the program established a BS degree for students seeking certification for secondary teaching in the social sciences. The program is currently in the process of adding a BS track for majors planning to enter business or government and strengthening the language requirements for those planning to go on to graduate school. In addition, several new courses have been added to the curriculum to provide students with a slightly wider choice of classes. Several classes have been added at the upper level in both U.S. and European history, partly in response to student performance on the MFAT tests and partly in response to students who have asked for greater variety

among upper level classes. One class, “Military History” was added in 2002 as a direct response to the reopening of the ROTC program on campus.

IV. Progress Since Last Review

Identify significant actions taken as a result of the last program review.

The outside reviewer in 1998 reported that the history program needed to hire two tenure track faculty members in history—one in US history and one an economic historian with an emphasis in labor history. One full-time tenure track faculty member has been hired as a result of the review. He combines the two areas suggested in the report, i.e. he teaches the history of the United States and is a labor historian. Unfortunately, since his arrival we have lost two full-time lecturer positions. It appears we moved one step forward and a half a step backward.

The second recommendation that the Chicano Study program be separated from the Department as it was placing additional demands on the history faculty has been implemented. History classes are still cross-listed with the Chicano Studies program, but our faculty members no longer need to concern themselves with the administration of the program.

A third recommendation was that a full time ranked faculty member should be hired in geography to provide support for the history program. This recommendation has not been implemented, and it is an area that still needs to be addressed.

The self-report also identified program accountability as an area for improvement. We have continued to give the MFAT on a two-year basis, we ask for student evaluations of the program every other year, we do a portfolio review annually, and we implemented an alumni survey for the first time. This fall, the program will also implement a written exit questionnaire for graduating majors in an effort to improve tracking students after graduation. There has been general improvement in the area of accountability measures.

Library holdings were another area of concern. While library holdings have changed in nature, they probably have not improved overall because of budget pressures and expenses associated with new technological conversions. One difficulty in the new electronic world for historians is the fact that on-line journal articles are usually available for a limited time of 3-5 years. The Department has forwarded money to the library for the last two years in an attempt to save our subscriptions to basic journals in our fields. Interlibrary loan remains a linchpin for both faculty and student research. This program is run efficiently and has been a godsend to us all.

A recommendation was made to improve the facilities and aesthetic qualities of the Psychology Building that houses the history faculty and provides classroom space for most of our classes. Little has been done in this area, and we desperately need to have classrooms updated of accommodate new technology.

One reviewer noted that the history program lacked “image” on campus and recommended that the program take steps to improve visibility on campus. Members of the program have not yet made this a priority. Faculty members have lacked the time, and, perhaps, the imagination to cope with the “image” problem.

Another reviewer noted the tremendous weight of the work-load borne by the faculty in history. This situation remains static. The Dean is certainly aware of this problem, but attempts to alleviate the problem have been undermined by the drastic budget cuts in higher education in the state of Colorado. The work-load issue is not likely to improve over the next several years in light of the new general education requirements without the infusion of large amounts of money to support the program.

V. **Self-Evaluation** (listed questions should form the basis for but not limit the self-evaluation)

A. Program

- *How were appropriate faculty involved in the development and systematic review of your program?*

All decisions involving development and changes in the history program are made at meetings by the ranked faculty members of the program. Documents pertinent to program issues are circulated for input from all ranked faculty.

- *How well did your program meet its goals and objectives?*

In terms of content knowledge, the MFAT indicates that our students are at or slightly below the national average. Based on reports from our students who have continued on to graduate school, the program has prepared them well in the areas of critical thinking and the ability to pursue independent research. They report being ahead of most of their fellow students in understanding the elements required for historical thinking and research. Students who enter secondary education also report being well-prepared for the classes they are asked to teach. (Admittedly, one of our graduates was asked to teach music classes the first year, and there was not much we could do about that.)

- *How well did your program align with and support general education, specialty studies, professional studies, etc.*

The program is currently critical to the support of the general education program, is essential for the teacher education program, is of considerable significance to the ROTC training program, Women's Studies, Chicano Studies, and the pre-law program, and is pivotal in providing training to history majors.

- *Describe the student demand for your program and the market demand for your graduates?*

Student demand is rising. There are currently 101 majors, a 33% increase since 1998/9 and total student FTE is 123.9, an increase of 10% since 1998/9. Market demand for students in the teacher education track seems high; other areas remain static.

- *What kinds of "good practices" (advising, students required to work in teams, etc) did your program incorporate?*

Our two core courses for the history major, historiography and the senior seminar, prepare students to do independent work as historians. In most classes, there is some type of group work as well as independent work.

B. Curriculum

- *How did you assure that current and appropriate knowledge bases and research findings were incorporated in your program?*

Faculty members keep current in their field and thus introduce appropriate material to their students. Syllabi are used as one of the measuring devices in this area.

- *What teaching methods were used in delivering your program? How did each method contribute to attaining course objectives?*

Lecture, discussion, student presentations, and web sites (including blackboard) were used in teaching in the program. The diversity of delivery methods allowed students to gain skills in communication, historical content, critical thinking, and the fundamentals of historical thinking and research.

C. Faculty

- *Describe the faculty composition (number, rank, degrees, etc) and its ability to help achieve program goals and objectives and to meet student needs*

There are currently four ranked faculty members in our program, all with the PhD and all with tenure. Two adjuncts, each teaching three sections or courses, supplement the core of ranked faculty. One adjunct has a PhD; the other has an MA. This faculty has been able to meet the basic needs of its University commitment and provide adequate training for its majors. It has been, however, limited in its ability to provide a broader upper level curriculum for its majors and for others interested in history. With the addition of new University-wide obligations, the faculty is feeling the strain of maintaining its various obligations. The consensus among the history faculty is that we cannot be expected to meet all the demands placed on the program without additional faculty.

- *Describe the faculty currency (qualifications, abilities, etc) along with any developmental or other such unfulfilled needs noted during the period*

Members of the history program faculty continue to be engaged in their field. Their biggest need is to receive release time for research and staying current in the field. When we receive release time it is typically for service activities such as serving as chair or program co-coordinator. Because all of our courses are writing intensive we have normally placed a cap of 40 students per course at the lower level, 25 at the upper level, and 15 for historiography and seminar. This places us at a disadvantage vis-à-vis other programs that are able to provide release time to their faculty for research and development by offering very large classes.

D. Instructional Resources

- *Describe adequacy of funding (internal and external), facilities, equipment, technology, library materials, and other resources necessary to support a high quality program?*

Instructional resources are limited; we make do. However, we seriously need improved classrooms to take advantage of technical advances. There is one computer lab and two high tech classrooms in our building. The two tech classrooms are in serious need of upgrading; ten other classrooms need to be converted for Internet access. The library needs a serious infusion of money (we have had to take money from a very miniscule department budget to save journal subscriptions and last year had no money allotted for new books). Faculty members often dig into their own pockets to help fund activities we deem critical such as History Day. No funds for travel were available to faculty members last year.

E. Learning Outcomes and Assessment

- *List the major intended student learning outcomes of the program*

We expect all students in history classes to develop communication skills (especially written communication skills) and critical thinking skills as well as develop a basic understanding of the way historians approach and understand historical problems. In

addition, we expect our majors to be aware of the fundamentals of historical inquiry and research.

- *What strategies or assessments were used during the review period to assess student growth relative to each outcome?*

Communication skills, critical thinking skills, and historical mindedness are assessed by examination in the individual classroom. Students in the teacher education track must pass the PLACE test which assesses both content area knowledge and writing and critical thinking skills. Majors take the MFAT exam, an exam that is not terribly satisfactory, but does measure some content knowledge. A portfolio review of the work of majors in historiography and seminar is used to assess students writing skills, critical thinking skills, and their knowledge of historical inquiry and research. Each year, often in the summer, ranked faculty members review the portfolios of recently graduated seniors to assure that there is consistency among the faculty in terms of standards and expectations for history majors.

- *How were you successful in implementing these in your program?*

There has been marked improvement in PLACE scores over the period of time covered. The scores went from 48.1 in the year 2000 to 56.3 (above the state average) in 2003. MFAT scores remained static. Requirements of our curriculum do not closely match the areas tested in MFAT so we are not certain how useful this test is in assessing the overall content knowledge of our students. We have been in contact with MFAT administrators encouraging them to develop a greater emphasis on world history. Portfolio review suggests that students are achieving the intended learning outcomes of the program.

- *What were the results of these assessments?*

See above.

F. Student Satisfaction (include summaries of each year's student assessment data)

The following questionnaire has been given to graduating seniors every two years since 1997. The following includes student responses from 1999 though 2003. The entire document including answers to question seven and eight appear as part to the "Assessment" attachment.

1. The History Program is academically demanding for most students.

	a. strongly disagree	b. agree	c. disagree	d. strongly agree
1999 (9 respondents)	3	5	0	0
2001 (5 respondents)	3	2	0	0
2003 (26 respondents)	17	9	0	0

2. The overall scholarly and professional competency of the faculty was:

	a. excellent	b. good	c. poor
1999	6	3	0
2001	3½	1½	0
2003	20	6	0

3. The examinations given in the program were generally:

	a. excellent	b. good	c. poor
1999	2	7	0
2001	3	2	0
2003	11	15	0

4. The teaching methods used in the program were generally:

	a. excellent	b. good	c. poor
1999	4½	1½	0
2001	2	3	0
2003	11	15	0

5. Curricular and career advising was appropriate.

	a. strongly disagree	b. agree	c. disagree	d. strongly agree
1999	3	4	1	1
2001	2	2	0	1
2003	7	18	1	0

6. I would advise a friend to major in the program?

	a. strongly disagree	b. agree	c. disagree	d. strongly agree
1999	4	4	0	1
2001	2	2	0	1
2003	14	12	0	0

7. What are some of the things you liked about the History Program?

8. How can the History Program improve?

- *How do you assess student satisfaction? What has resulted from the effort?*

The main vehicle for assessing student satisfaction is the questionnaire shown above. The major request is for a greater diversity of classes. In response, several additional classes have been added to the curriculum. Two courses in European history have been added and another is scheduled for addition next year; three new courses have been added in American history and one more is slated for next year; one course in military history has been added. In addition, we have started to offer classes in the summer that are not normally available on our regular rotation schedule.

Students also call for greater use of technology in the classroom. Less improvement has been made in this area because of the lack of facilities. However, two tenure track professors and one of the adjuncts try to schedule their classes in one of the two high tech classrooms in our building so that they can make use of the equipment. Senior seminar is being taught every other year in a classroom lab with tech facilities for research.

VI. Major Program Strengths and Weaknesses Identified by Assessment and Program Review

Students rate the faculty high in their teaching performance and believe that the program is demanding and is meeting their needs. Alumni from the period under the review report high satisfaction with the program. (See the attached alumni survey for the history program under “Assessment”.)

The major weaknesses in the program include reliance on adjunct faculty, lack of high tech classrooms, lack of a high profile “image” on campus, and lack of appropriate resources for library acquisitions, travel, release time for faculty, and general development of the program.

VII. Alignment with CSU-Pueblo Strategic Plan.

Considering everything discussed above, describe how well your program aligns with the CSU Strategic Plan in relation to the 5 key criteria for decision making and prioritization described below.

- **Quality:** program quality is the overarching goal for all decisions. The university will support and enhance high quality programs as demonstrated by reference to internal and external qualitative measures. All programs must demonstrate continuous quality improvement.

Quality of the faculty is high. Quality of instruction is high—for instance, writing is required in all of our courses as it is considered an integral part of the discipline of history. Student satisfaction is high and the number of majors is growing. PLACE test scores had improved over the period under review from below the state average to above the state average.

- **Centrality to Mission:** resources will be directed to those programs that are central to the mission of the University.

The program is a critical part of the current general education program. All students must take a course in history. The program is vital to the teacher education program, both for the secondary program in social science and the liberal arts program for elementary teachers. We provide a minor to supplement other majors and provide support for programs like the ROTC program.

- Need and Demand: programs must demonstrate need and demand by reference to measures such as mission, enrollment, placement, and employment projections.

Need for additional support arises from two areas. First and most critical is the growing need to provide classes in history for all students on campus. The full time student equivalency number this year is at 3,309, while the total student enrollment is at 4,173. Because students are expected to take general education courses in their first two years, this means we can expect to cope with over a thousand students a year. This semester we are offering 13 general education sections of history with an enrollment of 541 students. It is unlikely that the demand for general education courses in history will decline in the foreseeable future and may increase if enrollment grows. The second area of growth is with our majors. The increase from 76 majors at the beginning of the five-year review period to 101 majors this semester represents a 33% increase. The program must continue to provide sufficient upper level classes for its majors. We have already had to increase the number of sections of historiography (from two to three per year) and seminar needs to grow from one section a year to two. These demands will require an equivalent of six full-time faculty members plus an occasional adjunct. If we also take over the methodology course required of student preparing to receive their licenses as secondary social science teachers, additional help will be needed.

- Cost: decisions will take into consideration program costs and will seek to balance costs with program quality, centrality to mission and need. Cost considerations include one-time and on-going costs. In addition, this cost analysis will consider alternative uses of funding for programs.

The data above clearly shows that the History program is an efficient program that delivers course content at a very modest cost. In order to keep the quality of the program high, adjunct positions should be replaced by full-time positions. An ideal solution would be the addition of two tenure track positions. These additions, supplemented with the sparing use of adjuncts, would help to keep the quality of the program high and might allow ranked faculty members release time for research and professional development which will go a long way toward the prevention of burn out. The program has made some attempt to find private sources to fund an endowed chair in history, but so far has not been successful in this effort. All members of the program believe that the addition of a sufficient number of historians to sustain the quality of the program and improve it is absolutely essential.

Classroom upgrades will necessarily need to rely on outside grants. Because history faculty are already stretched in their responsibilities, their ability to generate grant applications on their own is limited. However, they would be willing to help in such an application process.

Library resources, full-time geographers, travel money, and other areas requiring development will be dependent on funding from a state that now ranks 35th in the nation for school funding.

- External Mandates: the University must respond to specific requirements of various government agencies such as CCHE and federal or state legislation.

The history program has submitted classes for approval for the state-wide general education transfer program.

VIII. Proposed Program Improvements. Consider two major issues.

Improvement Initiative #1 Title: Increase full-time faculty/improve conditions of adjunct faculty

Primary proponent for accomplishing initiative's objectives: Chair/Dean/Provost

Description of initiative including desired outcome:

The addition of two tenure track faculty members, plus the improvement of salaries of adjunct faculty members.

Resources required (internal and external to CSU-Pueblo):

Two full-time tenure-track faculty members--\$80,000 plus benefits

Increase in adjunct salaries—Increase from \$500 per credit hour to \$700 per credit hour

Timeline for resource allocation(s):

The needs of the program require an immediate implementation of at least part of the proposal. It is my understanding that the Dean does not foresee funds being available for at least three years for the addition of full-time personnel. This will place a considerable strain on a program that is facing enormous new burdens in providing courses for the general education curriculum. All tenured faculty members in history feel that the program must see some considerable infusion of money merely to sustain the current obligations placed upon its faculty. This is a writing intensive program. No one wants to abandon an area critical to the discipline.

Timeline to achieve objectives (including intermediate evaluation points):

Increase in adjunct salaries—2004

Addition of ranked faculty member—2005

Addition of ranked faculty member—2006

Reporting system envisioned to inform CSU-Pueblo CAPB of initiative's progress:

The chair of the program is unaware that the CAP Board is informed of such matters.

Improvement Initiative #2 Title: Strengthening Cooperative Ties to CSU-Ft Collins

Primary proponent for accomplishing initiative's objectives:

Program faculty of both Colorado State University institutions plus Deans and Provosts.

Description of initiative including desired outcome:

The initiative is designed to formulate an agreement between the two institutions in regard to graduate programs in history. The plan may include the utilization of the CF&I archives for research projects.

Resources required (internal and external to CSU-Pueblo):

Talks have just been scheduled, so we are not yet clear about resource requirements at this time.

Timeline for resource allocation(s):

Timeline to achieve objectives (including intermediate evaluation points):

2004--Facilitate the entry of our students into the CSU-Ft. Collins graduate program. Facilitate research opportunities for CSU graduate students at the CF&I archives.

Reporting system envisioned to inform CSU-Pueblo CAPB of initiative's progress:

All new programs will be reported to the CAP Board.

Appendix II

Guidelines for APR Evaluations Department of English and Foreign Languages (Updated April 2002)

Full time ranked faculty are evaluated on a 5-point scale in each of the three areas (Teaching, Research and Scholarly or Creative Activities [RSCA], and Service) according to the following guidelines. Overall ratings combine ratings in the three areas according to this formula: Teaching, 50%; RSCA, 30%; Service, 20%. Ratings are determined by the department chair; faculty members will have an opportunity to dispute the ratings assigned, and their written comments will be forwarded to the dean with the Annual Performance Review reports. Final determination of ratings and merit awards is made by the dean. These guidelines may be revised at any time by a two-thirds vote of the department ranked faculty, subject to approval by the dean and provost.

Guidelines for Evaluating Teaching

Teaching is evaluated by reference to the following benchmarks. Fractional evaluations falling between these benchmarks are possible and likely.

- 5: *Outstanding Performance*: Truly unusual achievement, such as winning the Provost's Award for Teaching or a similar distinction within the last three years; successful grant application for teaching activities; evidence of scholarly research that impacts teaching; multiple accomplishments among those listed under 4, below.
- 4: *Exceeds Expectations*: Combinations of the following: outstanding student evaluations, numerical and/or written; significant innovations in teaching; documented development of new courses or major improvements to established courses; leadership in teaching areas, including professional development workshops and writing about teaching; participation in conferences and workshops on teaching; special efforts to meet department teaching and advising needs; providing exceptional learning opportunities such as field trips and study-abroad programs; exceptional contributions to advising in field; demonstration of currency in teaching fields via appropriate scholarly work.

- 3: *Meets Expectations*: This is the normal level, representing standard accomplishment in teaching. Evidence includes teacher ratings at or near the school norms, satisfactory peer review(s) of teaching, and cooperation in meeting department needs for course delivery and advising.
- 2: *Below Expectations*: This level recognizes significant problems in teaching performance, as indicated for example by student evaluations consistently well below school norms, recurrent valid student complaints, negative peer reviews of teaching, or resistance to cooperating with department needs for course delivery and advising. A rating at this level or below must be followed by the design and implementation of a teaching improvement plan developed in collaboration with and approved by the department chair or the chair=s designate (e.g., Spanish Program Coordinator; Director of Writing).
- 1: *Unsatisfactory Performance*: A rating at this level indicates failure to fulfill basic teaching responsibilities.

Guidelines for Evaluating Research and Scholarly or Creative Activities

RSCA will be evaluated on a point system according to the following benchmarks. The following benchmarks are representative examples: actual points awarded will depend on the scope and quality of the work.

Multiple achievements at any level will raise the rating awarded but not necessarily by adding the point levels together; fractional ratings are likely. No rating will be higher than 5. Unless otherwise specified, credit is given for work actually published or presented. Faculty earning more than 5 points in a given year may bank achievements for use in future years, but in no case will work more than five years old be counted.

5 points:

Scholarly or creative book. Counted up to five years.

Textbook; book-length translation; book-length critical edition; book in field for general or popular market.
Counted up to three years.

Co-authored textbook or critical edition. Counted up to three years.

4 points:

Article in refereed journal (including e-journals). Counted up to three years.

Chapter in edited, refereed collection. Counted up to three years.

Extended creative publication in refereed periodical (longer story; multiple poems). Counted up to three years.

Edited collection for refereed press.

Successful research grant proposal with substantial external funding.

Article-length translation in refereed journal.

3 points:

Major textbook revision.

Book-length work reissued.

Editor-chosen (non- refereed) article, book chapter, or creative publication.

Major review essay.

2 points:

Briefer creative publication (e.g., a single poem) in refereed or edited periodical.

Organizing (or co-organizing) of discipline-related conference.

Edited book-length proceedings.

Invited public or academic lecture related to discipline.

Book review in edited journal.

Paper presented regional or national conference.

Editing (or co-editing) of discipline-related journal (including e-journals).

Work completed and first submitted for publication in the given year.

1 point:

Review for publisher of book in field.

External research grant proposal submitted.

Invited public reading of creative work.

Paper published in conference proceedings.

Review of article for refereed journal related to discipline.

Review for publisher of textbook related to discipline.

Demonstrated achievement on work in progress, new in the given year.

Guidelines for Evaluating Service

Service will be evaluated according to the following benchmarks. Fractional ratings falling between these benchmarks are possible and likely. Community service must be related to the faculty member=s professional expertise.

- 5: *Outstanding Performance*: Truly unusual achievement in service to the university, college, department, profession, or community, for example in leadership roles in special projects, program direction, multiple chairships or committees and boards, Provost=s Award for Service, successful external grant application for service activities, etc.
- 4: *Exceeds Expectations*: Less extensive achievements of the kinds listed under 5, above.
- 3: *Meets Expectations*: This is the standard level, representing cooperative participation in service activities, membership on committees and boards, college and university advising and recruiting, etc.
- 2: *Below Expectations*: This rating reflects a tendency to avoid or neglect service duties of the types mentioned above, as evidenced by low levels of participation. A rating at this level or below must be followed by the design and implementation of a service improvement plan developed in collaboration with and approved by the department chair.
- 1: *Unsatisfactory Performance*: A rating at this level indicates refusal to cooperate in service activities by repeated refusal to comply with requests for participation.

