

Annual Assessment Report

Department: History
Academic Year: 2021-22
Date of Submission: September 15, 2022
Department Chair: Heather Keaney

I. Response to the previous year PRC’s recommendations

Item:	Response:
Item:	Response
Item:	Response:
Item:	Response:
<p>Notes: In September 2021, the department submitted its Annual Assessment for the 2020-21 AY. It was recorded the innovations by individual faculty and the department’s proposed changes to the SLOs for HIS 010 in support of a new JRD GE. The department did not do any formal assessment during the 2020-21 AY due to Covid. We pushed back the slated item for assessment in our 6 year Action Plan from 2020-21 to 2021-22 .</p>	

II A. Program Learning Outcome (PLO) assessment

If your department participated in the ILO assessment you may use this section to report on your student learning in relation to the assessed ILO. The assessment data can be requested from the Dean of Curriculum and Educational Effectiveness.

Program Learning Outcome	During the 2021-22 academic year, the history department assessed the following program learning outcome: Students will be able to construct sound arguments.
Who is in Charge /Involved?	Alister Chapman, Marianne Robins, and Heather Keaney played a role in the assessment. Heather compiled the results and wrote this report.
<u>Direct Assessment Methods</u>	The department carried out its assessment through evaluation of all the major research papers produced in HIS 198 Senior Research Seminar (fall 2021). A total of 5 papers, all written by history senior majors, were assessed using a revised department Research Paper Rubric. Alister and Marianne discussed the desired outcomes and Marianne

	<p>developed the rubric. Alister administered it to his students in HIS 198. Each paper was read and scored by two department faculty members. Papers were evaluated/scored in the categories of Thesis, analysis of primary sources, use of secondary sources, and argumentation/logic. For each category, a 4-point scale was used corresponding to the following levels of competence: 1=really needy paper; 2= needs help paper; 3=good paper; 4=superior paper. The two faculty scores were then averaged for each student to calculate overall results. The rubric is provided at the end of this report.</p>
Indirect Assessment Methods	
Major Findings	<p>1. The overall averages for student proficiency in the categories were: Thesis = 3.1; use of primary sources= 3.04; use of secondary sources = 3.1 and argumentation/logic = 3.2. Averaging the four areas the average for each student was: 2.94; 3.05; 3.6; 2.85; 3.15.</p> <p>2. Students were given the opportunity to revise their papers and 3 of the 5 took advantage of that. They were the students who ranged 1st, 2nd, and 5th in the final assessment.</p> <p>3. Students were consistently docked under argumentation for not adequately addressing “counter argument” (despite Alister addressing this specifically in the course.</p> <p>4. Faculty involved in the assessment agreed the rubric was ambitious!</p>
Closing the Loop Activities	<p>1. In follow-up discussion of these results, the issue of addressing counter-arguments was shared with faculty and they were urged to address this skill more directly in other upper div HIS course assignments.</p>
Collaboration and Communication:	

or/and

II B. Key Questions

Key Question	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How can we help students choose feasible topics earlier in the process so that more time can be given to research and development of argument? 2. What is our expectation for primary source use?
---------------------	---

Who is in Charge/Involved?	All full-time department members.
<u>Direct Assessment Methods</u>	
<u>Indirect Assessment Methods</u>	
Major Findings	
Recommendations	
<p>Collaboration and Communication: 1. There is an ongoing department discussion regarding offering a 1-unit course in spring for students to do the initial work of choosing a topic. All in the department agree that the bar set for HIS 198 papers is very high for an undergraduate one semester course. 2. The access to English language sources is pushing students towards modern and American topics. This is unduly narrow, does not reflect the students' course work, puts an unfair burden on the one Americanist historian in the department to supervise students' research.</p>	

III. Follow-ups

Program Learning Outcome or Key Question	
Who was involved in implementation?	
What was decided or	

addressed?	
How were the recommendations implemented?	
Collaboration and Communication	

IV. Other assessment or Key Questions related projects

Project	
Who is in Charge /Involved?	
Major Findings	
Action	
Collaboration and Communication	

V. Adjustments to the Multi-year Assessment Plan (optional)

Proposed adjustment	Rationale	Timing

VI. Appendices

A. Rubric for paper assessment