

Program: History Date: May 22, 2013 Completed by: Matt Harris

Assessment contributors: Carol Loats and Jonathan Rees

Please complete this form for each graduate program (e.g., MA/MS) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2013. 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? Please fully describe the student group.	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?
"Be able to demonstrate skills in historical research and analysis and to defend their conclusions in well-written papers." (#3)	No previous published report on this SLO	Review of aggregate data from all final papers in History 592— a Research capstone course taught by Fawn Amber Montoya. Each paper is approximately 25-30 pages	All ten students in the Research Seminar. Each student is nearing completion in the program. Most have one semester	It is expected that each student will demonstrate a proficiency of research and writing commensurate with graduate-level work. Proficiency is determined by the following rubric:	Faculty met to discuss the data and compiled a list of areas to strengthen in the future; all students were in the proficient range. One student (or 10%) was in the "A"	Students did very well with primary research. The writing was clear and the citations were good. However, a number of the papers lacked a strong argument. Moreover, at least half of the	--spend more time in seminar discussing arguments; model effective papers --have students identify arguments in their paper by highlighting or bolding them --spend more time discussing the difference between an argument and a statement of purpose, in both class and private consultations.

		<p>with extensive footnotes.</p> <p>Skills evaluated include the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. argument 2. evidence 3. citation 4. bib. 5. diction 6. writing nuance 7. conclusion 8. depth of primary research 9. coherent timeline 10. demonstrate change over time 	<p>remaining before finishing the MA.</p>	<p>4.0 outstanding; 3.0 above average; 2.0 acceptable; 1.0 deficient.</p> <p>Proficiency is anything above a 2.0 or a "B" grade or better.</p> <p>The committee expects the following:</p> <p>--15% will be in the 4.0 or "A" range</p> <p>--40% will be in the 3.0 or high "B" range</p> <p>--45% will be in the 2.0 or "B" range</p>	<p>range; five students (or 40%) were in the high "B" range; the remaining students (50%) were in the "B" range.</p>	<p>papers lacked a strong conclusion. The introductions need to book-end the conclusions. Finally, about half of the papers need improvement on critical analysis. Too often students would "dump" information without pausing to explain what it means.</p>	<p>--spend more time on document analysis. Faculty will develop exercises separate from the paper to accomplish this.</p> <p>--more in-class peer review to establish organization flow and development, especially with introductions and conclusions.</p> <p>--more emphasis on the RAGE program to assist students</p>
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	---

Comments: The committee feels very confident that the problems we have identified can be fixed along the lines outlined above. Many of our students present their work at conferences, and many have substantial experience writing journal-length articles. Thus, the challenges we note are easily fixable. Most of our students write really well, and a fair number of them are sophisticated writers. The improvements we have identified will make them even better writers, scholars, and practitioners.

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?
N/A	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 MA Program
Colorado State University-Pueblo
Skills in Research and Literacy Rubric

Intended learning outcome assessed with this instrument: students should be able to write complex prose with correct grammar. They should be able to draft original works of research consistent with Master's level work. Student papers should follow a citation format in Turabian or the *Chicago Manual of Style*.

Student work assessed: Graduate Seminar Papers (History 592)
Proficiency is anything above a 2.0

	Outstanding 4.0	Above average 3.0	Acceptable 2.0	Deficient 1.0
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 but does not always make references to scholarship and/or theory	Claim is explicit but appears as statement of purpose rather than argument	Claim is implied and/or unsophisticated
Reference to relevant evidence and reasoning	Detailed and specific; includes rationale for conclusion. Explains why and how conclusion reached	Good use of evidence and sources. Provides rationale for conclusion	Adequate information about evidence and sources	Limited information about evidence and sources
Analysis and evaluation of evidence	Clear organization and provides strong interpretive analysis	Provides good interpretive analysis with some narration	Adequate interpretive analysis with mostly narration	Uses narration without applying cogent interpretation or analysis
Clear and engaging writing style	Vivid, compelling language and artful organization supporting analysis	Consistently clear language and sequencing of organization and analysis	Adequate language with some infelicitous language; organization and analysis generally good	Sometimes vague, confusing or hard to follow; organization and analysis poor
Correct use of the Turabian style manual for references	Correct usage throughout paper	Proficient use	Adequate use with some mistakes	Multiple mistakes
Appropriate use of research techniques	Uses relevant primary and secondary material. Selected material reflects an understanding of relevant literature	Uses a selection of relevant primary and secondary material, but has not taken advantage of different types of search tools	Uses a selection of relevant primary and secondary material, but is missing some important sources	Omits significant primary and secondary material or ignores some material contrary to thesis