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**PART ONE**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| What are the learning objectives? | How, where, and when are they assessed? | What are the expectations? | What are the results? | Committee/ person responsible? How are results shared? |
| Goal 1. History majors will be able to demonstrate knowledge of historical themes of diversity, comparison, and interrelatedness in the global context. This understanding is central to participation in informed discussion in civic life and responsible global citizenship. (CT 1, 3, 5) (RC 1, 4) | All professors teaching HIS 3555 will submit rubric data from student book reviews scored using the four-point Goal 1 rubric. | The goal is that 80% of students will be assessed as having met all expectations, with at least 30% exceeding expectations. | In 2016-2017, members of the CC worked with faculty teaching 3555 to revise a rubric for use with book reviews beginning in 2017-2018. The revised rubric is included as Appendix A. | The Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee compiles the results from the rubrics and report back to the entire department. The department will review assessment data yearly at our back-to-school retreat. |
| Goal 2. History majors will be able to analyze a source document using the historical method. This includes sourcing (questioning author credentials, motivation/bias, and audience),contextualizing, close reading, and comparisonin order to analyze what the document tells us about the past and how it may be read alongside other evidence. (WCR 1-4) (RC 1) | Each year, professors of HIS 2010/2020G and 2090/2091G will submit a set of source analysis papers to the department Wiki. 3600G papers may also be included. The papers will be scored using a four-point Goal 2 rubric. | The goal is that 80% of students will be assessed as having met all expectations (score of 2), with at least 35% exceeding expectations (scores of 3-4). | In the sample taken (n=39), more than 80% met the ranking of satisfactory on all categories on the rubric, while more than 35% exceeded a score of 2 in all categories. | The Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee will compile the results from the rubrics and report back to the entire department. The department will review assessment data yearly at our back-to-school retreat. |
| Goal 3. History majors will be able to produce, analyze, interpret, and evaluate quantitative material as it relates to the study of history. (QR 1-6) | Students in HIS 2560 perform basic calculations and measurements and apply quantitative methods to problem solving. Students also write brief essays (Word Problems) employing the vocabulary and interpretation of calculation skills gained through the Calculation quizzes. The rubric and data are included as appendix C. | On the quizzes, the expectation is that at least half of the students will pass every quiz and that the class average score on each quiz will be 80%.  On the Word Problems, the goal is that 80% of students will be assessed as having met all expectations, with at least 30% exceeding expectations. | We met the assessment standard on the Calculation Quizzes but not the narrative quizzes (except Unit 1).  On three of four criteria, more than 80% met and 30% exceeded. | The Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee will compile the results from the rubrics and report back to the entire department. The department will review assessment data yearly at our back-to-school retreat. |
| Goal 4. History majors will be able to carry out independent research projects from inception to completion. In doing so they will frame appropriate and useful questions about the past. They will undertake primary research, compiling evidence and integrating sources into a reasoned and well-organized argument based on documented primary and secondary sources. (CT 1-6) (WCR 2-5) | Students in HIS 2500 complete research papers which are assessed using a department-created rubric. All faculty members teaching HIS 2500 will submit rubric data from student papers scored using the Goal 4 rubric. | The goal is that 70% of students will be assessed as having met all expectations, with at least 20% exceeding expectations. | In the sample (n=21), 70% met three of the expectations, and more than 20% exceeded in three areas. Student deficiencies were noted in structure, historiography, and citations. | The Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee will compile the results from the rubrics and report back to the entire department. The department will review assessment data yearly at our back-to-school retreat. |
| Goal 5. History majors will present research projects to an audience, highlighting important themes and findings. (SL 3-4) | Students in HIS 2500 and a 3000-level course will present their findings to fellow students, and they are assessed using variations of the Senior Seminar rubric on organization, content knowledge, and delivery. | The goal is that 75% of students will be assessed as having met all expectations, with at least 25% exceeding expectations. | In HIS 2500 (n=12), 3 exceeded, 8 met, and 1 did not meet. 91.6% met, with 25% exceeding expectations. In the 3000-level course (n=9), 2 exceeded, 5 met, and 2 did not meet. 77.77% met, with 22% exceeding expectations. In total (n=21), 85.7% met, with 23.8% exceeding. | The Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee will compile the results from the rubrics and report back to the entire department. The department will review assessment data yearly at our back-to-school retreat. |
| Goal 6. History majors will develop a sense of historical perspective, intellectual curiosity, and knowledge and skills that they can apply in their lives, work, and further courses of study. (RC 1, 4) | Graduates will be surveyed about what they had learned in the major and their future plans through a survey sent out every third year. For 2016-2017 we continue with results from the 2015-2016 survey, but we will survey graduates from 2016, 2017, and 2018 in spring 2018, starting a new three-year cycle. | Students were asked to check which of the following the history major helped them acquire and improve: citation management; critical thinking; database use; public speaking; research skills; visual literacy; writing. Our expectation is that 75% of respondents will cite the major as improving all of these. | 90% of respondents (n=10) cited the major as improving their ability to use databases and their visual literacy. 100% of respondents (n=10) cited the major as improving their citation management; critical thinking; research skills; and writing. Only 60% (n=10) cited the major as improving their public speaking. See Appendix F for selected responses to the survey. | The Curriculum Committee/Assessment Committee will compile the results from the surveys and share data with the chair and entire department. |

**PART TWO**

Describe your program’s assessment accomplishments since your last report was submitted. Discuss ways in which you have responded to the CASA Director’s comments on last year’s report or simply describe what assessment work was initiated, continued, or completed.

In 2015-16 the History Department (under the leadership of its Curriculum Committee) revised the HIS BA curriculum. In 2016-17 the department worked to revise the assessment of the BA (again under the leadership of the Curriculum Committee). The new Assessment plan, as voted on and agreed to by the entire department, consists of the 6 goals listed above. These are aligned to all five EIU undergraduate learning goals. Faculty teaching 1101, 2010/90G, 2020/91G, 2500, 2560, and 4375 will carry out rubric-based assessment or other assessment in those courses. Faculty will be prompted to do assessment at various intervals and will submit completed rubric information and/or other data via the department Wiki. This year (2016-17) the Curriculum Committee oversaw assessment but beginning in 2017-18 we will have a stand-alone assessment committee. Membership on that committee will rotate and everyone will be expected to serve on a regular cycle.

**PART THREE**

Summarize changes and improvements in **curriculum, instruction, and learning** that have resulted from the implementation of your assessment program. How have you used the data? What have you learned? In light of what you have learned through your assessment efforts this year and in past years, what are your plans for the future?

The data from our new Assessment Plan is limited, since we have only piloted this new plan in a couple of courses this past year. Data from HIS 2560 (Goal 3) indicates that the students fared better on the Calculation Quizzes than on the Narrative Quizzes. The “Word Problems” (Narrative Quizzes) were a new higher order thinking application introduced this year in which students wrote brief essay answers to the Word Problem employing the vocabulary and interpretation of calculation skills learned through the Calculation Quizzes. The instructors of record will be considering what course to take here, but they anticipate that, as they integrate each of the three sections of the unit more closely, students’ achievement and mastery will improve. The data from HIS 2500 (Goal 4) strongly suggests that students were fully engaged in the research process and the analysis of their sources, but were less careful about employing proper citation methods. We may address this by requiring these students to meet one-on-one, on a regular basis, with a History Graduate Assistant tutor.

In 2017-18 we plan to introduce a new survey to alumni from 2016-18 to assess goal 6. We will also work to revise the rubrics as needed to create uniformity among them. We will create models of assessment to post on our department Wiki. In Spring 2018 we’ll be offering HIS 4375 for the first time and will incorporate assessment data from that course in next year’s report.

**Appendix A. Revised Book Review Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Book Review** | **4-Highly Competent** | **3-Competent** | **2-Minimally Competent** | **1-No Competency** |
| **Thesis** | Clearly identifies and critically evaluates the author’s central argument, purpose, and approach to the subject | Identifies but not does not critically evaluate the author’s central argument, purpose, and approach to the subject | Identified a few main ideas but not the thesis | No thesis present and no main ideas presented. |
| **Organization** | The review is exceptionally well organized with an introduction, body, and conclusion and follows the thesis throughout | The review is reasonably well organized | The review has a semblance of structure but its coherence is minimized by poor organization | No recognizable organization model is present |
| **Historiographical Context** | Review clearly states the historiographical context of the book; other appropriate works are mentioned; review attempts to address historiographical debate | Does not clearly state historiographical context for the topic or contains errors in contextualization; other appropriate works are not mentioned | Review is missing historiographical context or errors in contextualization overwhelm discussion | No attempt at historiographic contextualization |
| **Development** | A general analysis of the salient features of the book, as opposed to a general summary, and identifies the development of the author’s thesis throughout the book | Demonstrates knowledge of the topic and provides supporting evidence and adequate detail | Minimal analysis, is repetitious, or and lacks development of salient features of the book being reviewed | Lacks any idea development and includes irrelevant information |
| **Style** | Sophisticated sentence structure and paragraph development | Effective Use of Language | Simplistic sentence structure and imprecise use of language | Imprecise use of language renders the review unreadable |
| **Mechanics** | The mechanics of the paper are correct.  It is well written with no grammar or punctuation errors, and little or no use of the passive voice | Few errors | Errors are present that interfere with the presentation of ideas and arguments | Excessive errors in grammar and punctuation |

**Appendix B. Goal 2 Source Analysis Rubric and Data, 2016-2017**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4 | 3 | 2 (satisfactory/meets) | 1 |
| Conformity | well-balanced and thorough fulfillment of all three areas: summary, source, and analysis | (generally) well-balanced fulfillment of all three areas: summary, source, and analysis | fulfillment of all three areas: summary, source, and analysis; may have less attention to source, summary, or analysis | very unbalanced fulfillment of all three areas: summary, source, and analysis; may be missing one or more element |
| Summary | very well-written, concise, and covers all key points of document(s); contains specifics | carefully written, concise, and covers all/most key points of document(s) ); contains specifics | may be too long; may not cover all key points; unclear distinction between what is important and not; may be vague | too short or too long; vague; whole analysis may be summary; unclear distinction of what is important or errors |
| Source | excellent understanding of the context (author, purpose, etc.) and limitations of this source | good understanding of the context (author, purpose, etc.) and limitations of this source | some understanding of the context and limitations of this source; this part may be too long and may overwhelm the analysis | little or limited understanding of the context and limitations of this source; may be too short; important questions left unaddressed |
| Analysis/ Interpretation | sophisticated, informed, and thorough analysis of what a historian learns from this document | informed and generally thorough analysis of what a historian learns from this document | solid attempt to analyze what a historian learns; may miss the mark; comparisons or comments may not apply to time period | little attempt to analyze what a historian learns; analysis may be inaccurate and off-base |
| Historical Knowledge/ Specifics | analysis and summary is informed by strong content knowledge; specific dates and facts work as vehicles for analysis and as evidence | analysis and summary is informed by good content knowledge; specific dates and facts used as vehicles for analysis and as evidence | some attempt to include specific historical content; some facts/dates may be wrong and this may or may not affect the analysis | little or no attempt to use specifics historical knowledge to assist in analysis; major errors in content knowledge may be evident; facts may be listed with no application |
| Style/ Grammar | paper is well written and flows nicely; proper and professional format | generally well written; some grammatical errors or lack of flow | errors are distracting and/or paper is choppy | poorly written; many errors; choppy presentation |

**Source Analysis Data, 2016-2017** (representative samples, n=39, with 2 = meeting bare minimum)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4 | 3 | **2** | 1 | % at 2 or higher | % at 3 or higher |
| Conformity | 5 | 17 | 13 | 4 | 89.7 | 56.4 |
| Summary | 2 | 23 | 13 | 1 | 97.4 | 64.1 |
| Source | 4 | 14 | 16 | 5 | 87.17 | 46.15 |
| Analysis/ Interpretation | 4 | 12 | 20 | 3 | 92.3 | 41.02 |
| Historical Knowledge/ Specifics | 6 | 17 | 14 | 2 | 98.88 | 58.97 |
| Style/ Grammar | 7 | 26 | 5 | 1 | 97.4 | 84.61 |

**Revised Source Analysis Rubric (piloting in 2017-2018)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeds Expectations (4) | Meets Expectations (3) | Minimally Competent (2) | Does Not Meet (1) |
| Close Reading (ability to accurately summarize) | Very-well written summary, covering all key points of document(s) and demonstrating excellent understanding | Competent summary of document(s) contents; acknowledgment of most themes and details | Constructs some meaning from text | Demonstrates no understanding of document’s contents |
| Sourcing: Characteristics of the Document & Author’s Point of View | Excellent understanding of the source (author, purpose, audience, type of document) and limitations of the source | Shows a basic understanding of the characteristics of the source | Illustrates an inconsistent understanding of the source | Demonstrates no understanding of the source |
| Contextualizing & Historical Knowledge | Analysis and summary is informed by strong content knowledge; specific dates and facts astutely used as vehicles for analysis and as evidence | Some attempt to include specific historical content; some facts/dates may be wrong and does not substantially affect analysis | Demonstrates some historical knowledge; text contains factual errors that undermine analysis | Little or no attempt to use specifics historical knowledge to assist in analysis; major errors in content knowledge |
| Analysis | Sophisticated, informed, and thorough analysis of what a historian learns from this document; evidence serves to support analysis | Demonstrates basic understanding of document without errors that undermine analysis | Demonstrates a minimal understanding of the document | No real claims and/ or use of evidence. |
| Organization/ Development | Paper is very well structured and persuasive in the statement of its thesis, with a compelling introduction and conclusion. Depth of understanding of the topic, presents supporting arguments clearly and analytically, and excellent documentation | Demonstrates knowledge of the topic and provides supporting evidence and adequate detail | Presents undeveloped ideas | Lacks idea development and includes irrelevant information |
| Style/ Mechanics | Paper is well written and flows nicely; proper and professional format; free from errors; precise and sentence structure varied. | Paper is written in an appropriate and formal, objective tone with few errors | Errors interfere with the presentation of ideas and arguments; simplistic sentence structure | Excessive errors in grammar and punctuation; slang or inappropriate language |

**Appendix C. Goal 3 Quantitative Reasoning Data**

**Quiz Data from HIS 2560**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Narrative Quizzes | Calculation Quizzes |
| Unit 1 | 85% | 100% |
| Unit 2 | 74% | 96% |
| Unit 3 | 76% | 82% |
| Unit 4 | 70% | 86% |
| Unit 5 | 75% | 88% |

**Statistics/Quantitative Reasoning Word Problem (WP) Analyses Rubric**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeds Expectations (5) | Often Exceeds (4) | Meets Expectations (3) | Minimally Competent (2) | Does Not Meet (1) |
| Descriptive Statistics Terminology – types of data (WP 1) | Student can fully recognize, differentiate, and apply appropriate descriptive statistics terminology (about types of data, atod) | Student can recognize, often differentiate, and apply appropriate descriptive statistics terminology (atod) | Student can recognize, differentiate, and sometimes apply appropriate descriptive statistics terminology (atod) | Student occasionally can recognize, differentiate, and apply appropriate descriptive statistics terminology (atod) | Student is not able to differentiate or apply appropriate descriptive statistics terminology (atod) |
| Descriptive Statistics Terminology – measures of central tendency, normal curves, and skew (WP 2) | Student can recognize, differentiate, and interpret mode, median, and mean, as well as recognize and differentiate between a normal curve and positive and negative skew | Student can recognize and usually differentiate and interpret measures of central tendency, and distinguish types of curve generated by data | Student usually can recognize, differentiate, and interpret measures of central tendency, and distinguish types of curve generated by data | Student occasionally can recognize, differentiate, and interpret measures of central tendency, and sometimes distinguish types of curve generated by data | Student is not able to recognize or differentiate measures of central tendency, nor distinguish types of curve generated by data |
| Measuring Variation: Standard Deviation and related statistical measures (WP 3) | Student can fully recognize and interpret Standard Deviation statistics as well as related statistical measures such as Z-Score | Student can recognize and usually interpret Standard Deviation statistics as well as related statistical measures | Student often can fully recognize and interpret Standard Deviation statistics as well as related statistical measures | Student occasionally can recognize and interpret Standard Deviation statistics as well as related statistical measures | Student can neither recognize nor interpret Standard Deviation statistics nor basically any measure of variation |
| Sampling and Hypothesis Testing (WP 4) | Student can recognize and interpret sampling statistics using sample size, confidence intervals, and t-ratios (between two samples), and can construct and interpret null hypotheses | Student can recognize and interpret most sampling statistics such as sample size, confidence intervals, and t-ratios, and usually can construct and interpret null hypotheses | Student can recognize and interpret many sampling statistics such as sample size, confidence intervals, and t-ratios, and usually can construct and occasionally interpret null hypotheses | Student occasionally can recognize and interpret sampling statistics, and occasionally can construct and interpret null hypotheses | Student cannot distinguish sampling from descriptive statistics, can neither describe nor interpret the various tests between samples nor interpret the meaning of null hypotheses |

**Quantitative Analysis Data, 2016-2017** (representative samples, n=17\*, with 3 = meeting expectations)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **5** | **4** | **3** | **2** | **1** | **% at 3 or higher** | **% at 4 or higher** |
| Descriptive Statistics Terminology – types of data (WP 1) | 2 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 92.31 | 53.84 |
| Descriptive Statistics Terminology – measures of central tendency, normal curves, and skew (WP 2) | 2 | 5 | 4 | 4 | 2 | 64.7 | 46.66 |
| Measuring Variation: Standard Deviation and related statistical measures (WP 3) | 3 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 90.91 | 63.63 |
| Sampling and Hypothesis Testing (WP 4) | 4 | 5 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 86.67 | 60.0 |

*\* If a student did not complete a problem they were not assessed, and that is why the N fluctuates.*

**Appendix D. Goal 4 Research Paper Rubric and Data**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Exceeds Expectations (4) | Meets Expectations (3) | Minimally Competent (2) | Does Not Meet (1) |
| Thesis/ Argument | a strong and well developed thesis provides a clear direction for the paper | a discernible and generally well-developed thesis provides generally clear direction for the paper | thesis is present but may be weak or vague; does not offer a clear direction | there is no discernible thesis or its meaning is indecipherable |
| Evidence | well-chosen and well-integrated use of secondary and primary evidence supports thesis; evidence is well explained and used to demonstrate argument | some primary source evidence is well chosen and integrated; some evidence may not be clearly explained or related or may be illogically placed in paper; evidence may be presented but not always fully explained | primary source evidence is not well chosen or may contradict thesis on occasion; necessary evidence may be missing; some evidence is not tied to argument | there is not sufficient evidence to satisfactorily defend thesis; much needed evidence is missing; evidence is rarely if ever tied to argument |
| Analysis | paper is a clear analysis and not a “re-telling” of secondary material; paper has some original insight | some analysis is attempted and some original insight provided | some analysis may be attempted but not enough is offered | paper is almost entirely summary with little if any analysis |
| Historiography | paper clearly states the historiographical context for the topic; appropriate secondary works are cited; paper attempts to address historiographical debate | paper clearly states the historiographical context for the topic; appropriate secondary works are cited | paper does not clearly state historiographical context for the topic or contains errors in interpretation; not all appropriate secondary works are cited | Paper is missing historiographical context or errors in interpretation overwhelm discussion |
| Citations | citations for both secondary and primary sources are always present; citations are in proper Chicago format | citations for both secondary and primary sources are almost always present; citations are generally in proper Chicago format | citations are usually present; citations are not always in proper Chicago format; paper may need more cited evidence | citations are done haphazardly/ missing; little if any attempt to format correctly  **note: Plagiarism earns an F.** |
| Structure | consists of at least several key points all of which support thesis; clear sense of culmination; topic sentences are used well to anchor paragraphs to argument | several key points lend support; may lack a sense of overall culmination or build-up; topic sentences are generally used to the right effect | paper is not fully/evenly developed; lacks sense of build-up to conclusion; may jump around chronologically; topic sentences are not used to the right effect | paper is generally disorganized and overall argument/structure is not clear |
| Style/ Grammar | paper is well written and flows; few if any errors; proper essay format; clear attention to good writing and to multiple drafts | generally well written; some grammatical errors or lack of flow; it is obvious that multiple drafts were completed | errors are distracting and/or paper is choppy; not enough attention to good writing | errors overwhelm the reader; errors stand uncorrected from the rough draft |

**Research Paper Data, 2016-2017 (representative sample, n= 21)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 4 | **3** (meets) | 2 | 1 | % at 3 or higher (meets) | % at 4 or higher (exceeds) |
| Thesis/ Argument | 4 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 66.66 | 19.04 |
| Evidence | 4 | 13 | 3 | 1 | 80.95 | 19.04 |
| Analysis | 6 | 9 | 6 | 0 | 71.42 | 28.57 |
| Historiography | 6 | 6 | 8 | 1 | 57.14 | 28.57 |
| Citations | 1 | 11 | 9 | 0 | 57.14 | .05 |
| Structure | 4 | 9 | 7 | 1 | 61.9 | 19.04 |
| Style/ Grammar | 6 | 10 | 4 | 1 | 76.19 | 28.57 |