

Program Name	Date Completed
History	
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jonathan Rees	
Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals	
To teach writing, critical thinking and historical content.	

Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2024-2025 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessments or other data.

A. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2024-2025 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below.
<p>“Demonstrate effective writing skills.”</p> <p>“Apply the concepts of historical thinking, for example, in evaluating change over time.”</p>
B. In which academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s)?
<p>Writing skills were evaluated in 2023-24 because we handle that one every year.</p>
C. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle? (See Column H in the previous cycle’s report.)
<p>The main suggestion was that we add additional methods for evaluating success beyond grade in the seminar. One reviewer also recommended using rubrics to evaluate the papers.</p>
D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?
<p>Yes. By changing the structure of the program curriculum, more opportunities have arisen. Most notably, we have begun to give students an entrance and exit survey in our Intro and Senior Seminar classes. Obviously, it will take three or four years for the first students to go through the program having taken both courses, but even the initial Intro survey has offered insights.</p>



Academic Program Assessment

AY 2024-2025 [Due 6/1/25]

With respect to rubrics, we are resistant. Writing expectations are subjective on a professor-to-professor basis, but they are not arbitrary. By continuing group discussions about program-level goals, we can work towards collective improvement without stepping on any faculty member's individual prerogatives.

E. How did the change(s) impact student learning? If the change was not effective, what are the next steps or new recommendations?

Currently unknown. However, it is worth noting that the pass rate in seminar, our original criterion, remains high, but since we switched to only offering seminar once a year the number of students who took it in Fall 2024 was statistically insignificant. Hence, the need for more evaluation criteria.

Enter Table I Closing the Loop Comments Below

Program Name	Date Completed
History	
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jonathan Rees	

Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in AY 2024-25

1. Include information to share assessment processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Copy this table for each assessed outcome.

A. Program SLO assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan.
Writing
B. Semester and year this SLO was reported on prior to this cycle.
2024-25.
C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO.
An ongoing discussion between the faculty.
D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed.
All students in all classes.
E. Expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level.
We aren't evaluating this on a quantitative basis. After all, we're in the humanities.
F. Assessment results and number of students who met proficiency level.
n/a
G. Describe what results indicate about student performance.
<p>This year's assessment discussion focused on two subjects: the difference between gen ed and upper-level courses, and AI. With respect to the first of these things, we all noted a huge jump in quality amongst our majors as opposed to non-majors. Sadly, this is probably self-selection since people who can write already write are more likely to major in history. That said, it highlights to me the need to divide the yearly writing discussion amongst those two groups so that we can get a better idea of what we can do to make our major even better writers than they are now.</p> <p>With respect to AI, nobody has figured out the solution to that problem yet. We all agree that using it is functionally plagiarism, but that discussion needs to continue. I'm putting</p>



Academic Program Assessment

AY 2024-2025 [Due 6/1/25]

a discussion about a program-level policy on AI for the first meeting in the fall because of the shared concerns exposed because of these ongoing discussions.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for AY 2025-2025 informed by this assessment.

The history assessment plan calls for an ongoing departmental conversation about student success all year long. Many times, getting that information from faculty was like pulling teeth since we have so much else to do. My plan is to make this a regular topic of program meetings so that we can learn more from each other throughout the year.

Enter Table II AY 2025 Assessment Comments Below

Program Name	Date Completed
History	
Report Completed By	Report Contributors
Jonathan Rees	
Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals	
To teach writing, critical thinking and historical content.	

Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2024-2025 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessments or other data.

F. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2024-2025 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below.
"Apply the concepts of historical thinking, for example, in evaluating change over time."
G. In which academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s)?
We haven't done this at all in at least the last seven years.
H. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle? (See Column H in the previous cycle's report.)
There were no recommendations tied directly to this particularly SLO, although the one about rubrics might apply.
I. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?
No, because there were none for this SLO. However, in the course of the year I realized that SLO is unworkable. It is too closely associated with writing in order to report on it distinctly.

J. How did the change(s) impact student learning? If the change was not effective, what are the next steps or new recommendations?

We are working on new secondary SLOs to accompany the evaluation of writing every year. They have been approved at the program level, but not finalized and written into a new program assessment plan quite yet. That will be completed this Fall. Here are the approved SLOs:

Learning and Adaptability:

- Demonstrating a growth mindset by embracing new perspectives, tools, and strategies with openness and agility
- Considering individual strengths and areas for improvement per feedback and self-reflection
- Seeking out and engaging in formal and informal professional learning opportunities

Professionalism and Responsibility:

- Exhibiting behavior that adheres to ethical standards, respectfulness, integrity, and competence in the context of one's role or occupation
- Establishing priorities, managing time, and reliably carrying out responsibilities

Motivation & Initiative:

- Independently assessing situations and taking action without external prompting while recognizing the importance of maintaining the integrity of established protocols, especially in professions where altering orders haphazardly can have serious consequence
- Displaying goal-oriented behavior and striving for excellence and advancement
- Making connections, building relationships, and exchanging ideas (networking)

Each of these are borrowed from QA Commons Essential Employment Qualities Certification process which the History Program completed last fall, and they will be ongoing subjects for discussion in our new assessment plan moving forward.

Enter Table I Closing the Loop Comments Below