



| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Program Name | Date Completed |
| History | May 28, 2026 |
| Report Completed By | Report Contributors |
| Jonathan Rees | |
| Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals | |
| Our goal is to acquaint students with the history of the entire world and teach them how to write and think about the world better than they did when they took their first class in our department. | |

Table I Closing the Loop

Report on at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during AY 2025-2026 that was implemented to improve student learning, in response to prior assessment cycles or other data.

| |
|--|
| A. Describe issues or SLOs addressed in the AY 2025-2026 cycle. Paste SLOs verbatim below. |
| Demonstrate effective writing skills (evaluated every year). This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Knowledge of historical content • Historical research skills • Demonstrating historical thinking |
| B. In which prior academic year and semester was this SLO last assessed to generate data that informed the change(s) this year? |
| We covered writing last year, as we do every year. |
| C. What were the recommendations for change in the previous cycle? |
| “The faculty appear reluctant to adopt rubrics or to make common assessments across the courses. I can appreciate that, as common assessments can impinge on academic freedom. I would respectfully suggest that the history department create a common but flexible rubric that can be applied to upper division writing assignments.” “Consider how you can evaluate student’s engaging with concepts of historical thinking and change over time that isn’t tied to writing” |



D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?

The History Department remains reluctant to adopt rubrics in order to evaluate writing because it does not want to impose a false sense of precision on a skill that is impossible to measure in a precise manner. We have, however, continued to develop new methods of creating qualitative feedback that will improve student learning over time. For example, we now have both an entrance and an exit survey (administered during our Intro for majors course and our senior seminar). Although very few students have taken both, it has been useful. We also created a LinkedIn group for our majors and graduates so that we can gain some information about our graduates' employment record. Our regular ongoing yearly discussion about student writing got eaten alive this past year by an ongoing department-level discussion about artificial intelligence, but that discussion has proved very helpful.

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

It is too soon to tell.

Enter Comments on Table I Closing the Loop Below

| |
|--|
| |
|--|



| | |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Program Name | Date Completed |
| History | May 28, 2026 |
| Report Completed By | Report Contributors |
| Jonathan Rees | |

Table II Annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in AY 2025-26

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

| |
|---|
| A. Program SLO(s) assessed in this cycle. Copy the SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan. |
| Creativity & Problem-Solving (This year’s SLO from rotation) This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brainstorming novel and imaginative ideas that may depart from conventional thinking • Generating innovative solutions and approaches to capitalize on opportunities or overcome challenges • Assessing the feasibility, effectiveness, and potential consequences of possible solutions |
| B. Semester and year this SLO was previously reported on before this cycle. |
| Creativity and problem-solving was new as of our Spring 2025 SLO revision. |
| C. Describe the assessment method for this SLO(s). |
| This is the first time the new SLO has come up. |
| D. Described student group(s) assessed. Provide the number of students or number of artifacts assessed. |
| All History majors (approximately 45) and other students in upper and lower-level history classes. |
| E. Explain the expected proficiency level and proportion of students who should reach this level. |
| We are teaching skills that are difficult to classify and therefore do not think in those terms. |



F. Provide Assessment results and number of students who met defined proficiency level.

Our traditional assessment measurement for writing is the number of seniors who receive a “C” or better in their Senior seminar class. This academic year, that figure was six out of seven. That is lower than our target of 90%, but it was a small sample size.

G. Describe what the results or trends indicate about student performance.

We continue to look for other non-numerical ways to evaluate student performance across multiple SLOs.

H. Describe program level changes/improvements planned for next AY (2026-2027?) which are informed by this assessment.

We have assigned one professor (Judy Gaughan) the duty of training STS teachers to teach both skills covered here as part of her regular courseload. As part of the program review process, we learned that our students didn’t want to be stuck on a single subject when completing their seminar papers. Both seminar instructors agreed to open up their topics moving forward.

Enter Comments on Table II AY 2026 Assessment Below