

Program: History **Date:** May 25, 2012 **Completed by:** Kristen Epps (with committee input)

Please complete this form for each undergraduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S.) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2012. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO?	D. Who was assessed?	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements are planned based on this assessment?
Grasp of historiography (i.e. the history of historical scholarship); this is the goal of HIST300, a required course for both majors and minors (in both B.A. and B.S. programs)	No previous published SLO	Portfolio review of historiography essays from two instructors' courses (Epps and Montoya)	Sixteen students across grading range (A-D) from the Fall 2011 semester (8 from Epps) and Spring 2012 semester (8 from Montoya)	By their third and fourth years, the average history major or minor is expected to reach "Proficiency" (3-3.5 on a 4-point scale) per the SLO rubric ; some students will reach "Exemplary" (3.5-4 on a 4-point scale)	Faculty met and compiled a list of areas to strengthen over the next year; most students were "Emerging," or were between "Emerging" and "Proficient"	The main conclusions were that most students understood the concept of the assignment (which involves almost a complete rethinking of their previous training), but they struggled with 1) explaining the author's arguments, and 2) assessing change over time (<i>*see comments section*</i>)	<u>Faculty will:</u> 1) provide more guidance on forming thesis statements; 2) reduce the number of required texts (from 10 books to 7 books) to allow students more room for analysis; 3) control choice of topics; and 4) improve scaffolding of assignments <u>Students will focus on:</u> 1) strengthening sense of chronology/change over time; 2) authorial voice; 3) improving transitions and flow; 4) footnote citations; 5) providing more critique; and 5) demonstrating the nuances of each author's argument and methodology

Comments: ***History students must meet the same expectations for the historiography course regardless of the degree program (B.A. or B.S.), or if they are a major or a minor. Professors do not distinguish between degree programs in their syllabi, assignments, etc.*** The strengths we saw in this portfolio review included the following: for students, they understood the terms of the assignment and had a good grasp of what constitutes a “scholarly” historical work (a major component of writing a historiography essay). They also had readable prose and understood their goal (even if they were not always able to implement it, in practical terms). For faculty, our strengths are that we understand the unique challenges of this course and work to provide very clear guidelines. While we are always available for students, when teaching HIST300 we are especially dedicated to working one-on-one with students to discuss challenges they face in their research. We also approach this class with enthusiasm to counter any fears that students may have, since this course takes them outside of their comfort zone (i.e. they are learning the real work of historians, and not just the narrative/stories about the past).

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
No stated SLO available	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Comments: Because this is our first year assessing this SLO, there are no comments regarding a previous assessment cycle.

History Program
Colorado State University-Pueblo
Skills in Historiographic Research Rubric

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) assessed with this instrument: Students should be able to understand authors' arguments, analyze and interpret those arguments, and provide critiques of the authors' methodology, theoretical frameworks, evidence, etc. They should be able to write complex prose with appropriate transitions, correct grammar, and a clear organization. Student papers should follow the Turabian manual or the *Chicago Manual of Style* (16th ed.) and include accurate, complete footnote citations with a comprehensive bibliography.

Student work assessed: Historiography Papers

	<i>Exemplary (4 – 3.5)</i>	<i>Proficient (3.5 – 3)</i>	<i>Emerging (3 – 2.5)</i>	<i>Not Present (2.5 – 1)</i>
Presence of a clear and compelling thesis that makes a claim	Claim is explicit, and refers to scholarship and/or theory	Claim is explicit and reasoned	Claim is implied and/or unsophisticated	There is no thesis
Reference to relevant evidence and reasoning	Detailed and specific; includes rationale for conclusion. Explains why and how conclusion reached	Adequate information about evidence and sources	Limited information about evidence and sources	
Use of disciplinary tools to interpret/analyze the secondary literature	Critically engages authors' concepts and/or methods; engages theoretical or conceptual debates	Provides interpretive analysis with some narration	Uses narration without applying cogent interpretation or analysis	
Clear and engaging writing style	Vivid, compelling language and artful organization of the authors' arguments	Consistently clear language and sequencing of authors' arguments	Sometimes vague, confusing or hard to follow	
Appropriate and correct use of the Turabian style manual (or <i>Chicago Manual</i>) for references	Correct usage throughout paper	Proficient use	Multiple mistakes	There are no citations, or citations are not in correct style (i.e. are in MLA instead of Turabian)

Inclusion of bibliography in correct style (either Turabian or Chicago)	Correct format and content	Proficient use	Multiple mistakes, or some consulted sources are missing	
Appropriate use of research techniques	Uses relevant secondary material; Selected material reflects an understanding of relevant literature	Uses a selection of relevant secondary material, but has not taken advantage of different types of search tools	Omits some significant secondary material or ignores some material contrary to thesis	