

## Annual Departmental Plan Report

### Program Information

Program/Department: History  
Department Chair: Dr. Benjamin Lieberman  
Department Assessment Committee Contact: Dr. Christine Dee

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NEASC requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by **May 31** each academic year.*

### Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

**I. List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.**

<b>Program SLO</b>	<b>Expected Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)</b>	<b>When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?</b>
<b>Ability to think critically about the past and its social, political, and ethical significance</b>	<b>Annual</b>	<b>2019</b>
<b>Ability to locate, examine, explain, and utilize information from and about the past</b>	<b>Annual</b>	<b>2019</b>
<b>Ability to propose and evaluate interpretations of events, artifacts, documents, and images</b>	<b>Annual</b>	<b>2019</b>
<b>Perceptive reading</b>	<b>Annual</b>	<b>2019</b>
<b>Effective expression</b>	<b>Annual</b>	<b>2019</b>
<b>Citation, Grammar, Style &amp; Formatting</b>	<b>Annual</b>	<b>2019</b>

**II. PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)**

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

<b>Dept. PLO #</b>	<b>Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)</b>	<b>When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4<sup>th</sup> year, 1<sup>st</sup> year, etc.)</b>	<b>To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)</b>	<b>What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)</b>	<b>Reflection on the results: How was the “loop closed”?</b>
<b>Thinks critically about the past and its social, political, and ethical significance</b>	Assessment of student research papers with a standardized rubric that meets the recommendations of the <i>American Historical Associations</i> “Tuning Project”	4 <sup>th</sup> year in HIST 4500	All	85 percent acceptable or exemplary	This loop was closed through analysis of the assessment based on the criteria established by the American Historical Association’s Tuning Project with Recommended Outcomes. This outcome maps with the AHA’s (AHA=American Historical

					Association) Outcome #1 Build Historical Knowledge
<b>Locates, examines, explains, and utilizes information from and about the past</b>	Assessment of student research papers with a standardized rubric that meets the recommendations of the <i>American Historical Associations</i> "Tuning Project"	4 <sup>th</sup> year HIST 4500	All	85 percent	This criteria maps with the AHA's Outcome #2 <b>Develop Historical Methods</b>
<b>Proposes and evaluates interpretations of events, artifacts, documents, and images</b>	Assessment of student research papers with a standardized rubric that meets the recommendations of the <i>American Historical Associations</i> "Tuning Project"	4 <sup>th</sup> year HIST 4500	All	85 percent	This criteria maps with the AHA's Outcome #3 Recognize the provisional nature of knowledge, the disciplinary preference for complexity, and the comfort with ambiguity that history requires.
<b>Reads primary and secondary sources perceptively with analysis</b>	Assessment of student research papers with a standardized rubric that meets the recommendations	4 <sup>th</sup> year HIST 4500	All	85 percent	<b>This maps with the AHA's Outcome # 4 Apply the</b>

	of the <i>American Historical Associations</i> "Tuning Project"				<b>range of skills it takes to decode the historical record because of its incomplete, complex, and contradictory nature</b>
<b>Expression is effective as demonstrated by a thesis statement and argumentative structure</b>	Assessment of student research papers with a standardized rubric that meets the recommendations of the <i>American Historical Associations</i> "Tuning Project"	4 <sup>th</sup> year HIST 4500	All	85 percent	This outcome maps with the AHA's Outcome #5 Create historical arguments and narratives.
<b>Citation, Grammar, Style &amp; Formatting is appropriate and writing is free of errors.</b>	Assessment of student research papers with a standardized rubric that meets the recommendations of the <i>American Historical Associations</i> "Tuning Project"	4 <sup>th</sup> year HIST 4500	All	85 percent	The historians are developing writing guidelines for use for electives in AY 2019-2020. It is anticipated that the FYE will solve many of these issues.

<b>GPA of 3.0 in major for graduating seniors</b>	Review of GPA	4 <sup>th</sup> year	Graduating seniors	85 percent	We are discontinuing the assessment based on GPA for graduates in response to recent scholarship in History that shows how this metric is ineffective for assessment of student learning. See WW Foundation (2019) and Steven Mintz, "Rethinking Grading" <i>Inside Higher Education</i> March 2, 2016 and Colleen Flaherty, "Grading Smarter not Harder," <i>Inside Higher</i>
---	---------------	----------------------	--------------------	------------	---

May 2019

					<i>Education,</i> January 4, 2019
--	--	--	--	--	--------------------------------------

**History Department Annual Assessment Data  
 HIST 4500 Research Paper Evaluation Rubric  
 Professor Christine Dee  
 Fall 2018 & Spring  
 2019**

**Rating Scale: 1-Not Demonstrated 2-Unacceptable 3-Acceptable 4-Exemplary**

	<b>4.Ability to think critically about the past and its social, political, and ethical significance</b>	<b>5.Ability to locate, examine, explain, and utilize information from and about the past</b>	<b>6.Ability to propose and evaluate interpretations of events, artifacts, documents, and images</b>	<b>7.Perceptive reading</b>	<b>8.Effective expression</b>	<b>9.Citation, Grammar, Style &amp; Formatting</b>
1 Not Demonstrated	0	0	0	0	0	0
2 Unacceptable	1	1	3	3	2	6
3 Acceptable	9	9	8	10	15	5
4 Exemplary	9	9	8	6	2	8
<i>Percentage of students performing at an acceptable or exemplary level (target: 85%)</i>						
Sarefield & Jewell 2015 N=19	<b>79%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>63%</b>	<b>68%</b>	<b>42%</b>	<b>53%</b>
<i>Percentage of students performing at an acceptable or exemplary level (target: 85%)</i>						
Lieberman 2016 N=11	<b>73%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>82%</b>	<b>73%</b>
<i>Percentage of students performing at an acceptable or exemplary level</i>						
Lieberman 2017 N=14	<b>50%</b>	<b>79%</b>	<b>36%</b>	<b>50%</b>	<b>29%</b>	<b>29%</b>
<i>Percentage of students performing at an acceptable or exemplary level</i>						
Dee 2018 N=19	<b>95%</b>	<b>95%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>84%</b>	<b>89%</b>	<b>68%</b>

**III. Summary of Findings:** Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you “closing the loop”?

<p><b>Other than GPA, what data/ evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)</b></p>	<p><b>Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)</b></p>	<p><b>What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?</b></p>
<p>The evaluation of History 4500 Senior Seminar papers according to the rubric, despite a small sample size (N=19) indicates that the course revision of HIST 2021 and 2022 with its emphasis on “Inquiry Based Learning” in History (Woodrow Wilson Foundation 2019, <i>Reimagining American History</i>, 9) has improved all assessment areas of student learning outcomes.</p>	<p>Faculty member teaching the course, program assessment officer, and program members</p>	<p>The single-semester HIST 2000 Historical Methods is replaced by two courses, HIST 2021 Reading Historical Landscapes and HIST 2022 Constructing History. HIST 2021 Emphasizes critical thinking, evaluating interpretations, perceptive reading and effective expression. HIST 2022 emphasizes critical thinking, locating and utilizing information, evaluating interpretations, effective expression and citation and formatting. The additional course provides students with greater preparation for their upper-level courses and their capstone course.</p>



<p><b>Students continue to perform below the benchmark for citations, grammar, style and formatting at 68%. While this is improved from previous years, student writing continues to be a weakness for students at the conclusion of their undergraduate education</b></p>	<p><b>Faculty members within the program teaching introductory, methods, elective and seminar courses.</b></p>	<p><b>Recognizing that the most effective assessment for student learning is short, substantive comments provided to student work with frequent feedback (WW 2019, 11), History faculty are creating writing guidelines, which we will provide to students in electives.</b></p>
		<p>.</p>
		<p>.</p>

**Assessment Plan for Program/Department**

The historians continue to utilize the assessment data, despite the limitations of a statistically small sample. Assessment data for the Senior Seminar course, as well as outcomes in elective courses, indicate that students continue to benefit from attention to perceptive reading, critical thinking, and emphasis on grammar and fundamentals of effective communication. Utilizing assessment data, the historians reformed the one-semester course Historical Methods and replaced it with two courses, Reading Historical Landscapes and Constructing History. This curricular decision allows students to focus on reading within the discipline- including historiographical scholarship and historical evidence and critical thinking about the past

separate from the intellectual activity of engaging in research, practicing methods of historical inquiry and writing within the disciplinary conventions of evidence, citation, and formatting. The curricular change was data-driven and was passed by AUC in December 2016. Initial assessment, as seen in the Exit Survey data for 2018-2019, indicates pronounced improvement in all areas. The lone exception is modest growth in grammatical conventions of writing and formatting. While the historians will continue to address these writing deficiencies, they look forward to sustained support in these efforts with the FYE program and the Foundational status given to Writing I and Writing II in the curriculum. The historians look forward to supporting students that with improved writing skills that will be assessed through the university’s commitment to, and investment in, improving student writing in their first year of college.

The historians continue to analyze data taken from Senior Exit Surveys and have administered similar surveys to Reading Historical Landscapes and Constructing History courses.

Please see the attachment (History Assessment Plan 2019) for more details on the History Assessment Plan.

## University Data

### I. SSC Data

Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.

Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
The Historians have focused on increasing the number of minors—see section on trend data.	Publicizing the minor to students	We have seen good numbers for the minor and will continue with this intervention.

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?\*

<b>Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)</b>	<b>Rationale for selection</b>	<b>Planned or Implemented Intervention</b>	<b>Current score/ Target Score</b>	<b>This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)</b>
<b>Because data in institutional reports does not extend past 2012 at present, we will not use SSC data this year</b>				yes

\*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

**II. Trend Data**

Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement. Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

<b>Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)</b>	<b>Implemented Intervention</b>	<b>Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)</b>
<b>The Historians have focused on increasing the number of minors.</b>	<b>Publicizing the minor to students</b>	<b>The number of minors increased from 87 in AY 2016 to the number of 97 in Ay 2018-2019</b>

b. What will be the focus next year?\*

<b>Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)</b>	<b>Rationale for selection</b>	<b>Planned or Implemented Intervention</b>	<b>Current score/ Target Score</b>	<b>This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)</b>
<b>The Historians will continue to focus on increasing the minor</b>	<b>Increasing number of students who gain skills and knowledge from history</b>	<b>Publicize the minor to students and build connections to other departments and majors</b>	<b>Continue to increase beyond the current numbers</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>The Historians will maintain or seek to increase the number of simulations or role-playing exercises</b>	<b>Exit surveys and other student feedback indicate student interest in and learning from simulations and role-playing</b>	<b>Continue to incorporate simulations and role-playing exercises in class and introduce, as appropriate</b>	<b>Maintain and expand beyond current number of 6</b>	<b>No—based on more recent surveys and feedback</b>

\*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

**Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report**

*Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)*

**I. Programs that fall under Program Review:**

- i. Date of most recent Review: Spring 2018
- ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

We have developing a new action plan based on this recent program review. Please see the attachment Action Plan.

<b>Specific area where improvement is needed</b>	<b>Evidence to support the recommended change</b>	<b>Person(s) responsible for implementing the change</b>	<b>Timeline for implementation</b>	<b>Resources needed</b>	<b>Assessment Plan</b>	<b>Progress Made this Year</b>

- iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

We are developing our new action plan.

**II. Programs with external Accreditation:**

- i. Accreditor:
- ii. Date of last review:
- iii. Date of next review and type of review:
- iv. List key performance indicators:

<b>List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.</b>	<b>Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar</b>	<b>Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.</b>
--	---	--

	pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	

### UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Date of Review: \_\_\_\_\_

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</i>	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
<i>Expected Timing of Assessment</i>	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
<i>Assessment Tool Quality</i>	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
<i>PLO Assessment</i>	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assessed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but	Criteria for student success not provided.	

			not clearly stated or is not appropriate.		
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	
<b>Assessment Plan for Program/Department</b>					
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Highly Developed (3)</b>	<b>Developed (2)</b>	<b>Emerging (1)</b>	<b>Initial (0)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<i>Department or Program Assessment Plan</i>	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
<i>Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan</i>	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	
<b>University Data</b>					
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Highly Developed (3)</b>	<b>Developed (2)</b>	<b>Emerging (1)</b>	<b>Initial (0)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<i>SSC Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one SSC data	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

			point. No plan implemented.		
<i>SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<b>Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report</b>					
<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Highly Developed (3)</b>	<b>Developed (2)</b>	<b>Emerging (1)</b>	<b>Initial (0)</b>	<b>Score</b>
<i>Only for those under Program Review Annual Reflection on Program Review</i>	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for	



				progress discussed.	
<i>Only for those under External Accreditation Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i>	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

**NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.**