

Program: History **Date:** April 28, 2014 **Completed by:** Matt Harris

Assessment contributors: Kristen Epps and Paul Conrad

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? Please indicate the semester and year. | 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? |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|
| To demonstrate an understanding of theoretical works of history and methodology (#1). | No previous published report on this SLO. | Review of aggregate data from all final papers in History 588—Historiography and Theory. Each paper is approximately 25-30 pages with extensive footnotes. Skills evaluated include the | All eight students in the Historiography & Theory Seminar. This is a foundation course for the program. Most students take it their | 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 (full rubric attached): | Final results from the 2014 assessment: --30% were in the Exemplary range --55% were in the Proficient range --15% in the Emerging range (this number skewed a bit because of the | The History faculty is very pleased with student performance on this SLO. Student writing was clear, students understood historiography, and they were able to synthesize a vast amount of literature in a very short space. | --spend more time in class modeling effective papers, both from past students and the scholarly literature --have students identify main themes or arguments by highlighting them in their paper --spend more time discussing and analyzing authors' arguments, teaching students how to identify weaknesses in the argument |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|
| | | following: 1.argument 2. authors' interpretations 3. methodology 4. theory 5. diction 6. writing/ nuance 7. conclusion 8. depth of secondary research 9. coherent chronology 10. change over time 11. relevant literature review 12. cohesion of authors' argument | first year in graduate school. Students are expected to master the skills in this course which will prepare them for the rest of the program. | 4.0-3.5 Exemplary; 3.5-3 Proficient 3-2.5 Emerging 2.5-1 Not Present Proficiency is anything above a 3.0 or higher. The committee expects the following: --20% will be in the Exemplary range -- 70% will be in the Proficiency range --10% will be in the Emerging range | small enrollments in graduate courses) | Some of the papers could use a better organizational framework, as well as a deeper analysis of the authors' argument. Overall, though, students understood Historiography, which is one of the essential learning outcomes in the program. | --devote more time to finding links between books, with an eye towards helping students relate the books to one another by demonstrating how one author builds or challenges on the work of the previous author. --more in-class peer review to establish organization flow and development, especially with introductions and conclusions. --continue to emphasize the RAGE program to assist students |
|--|--|--|---|---|--|---|---|

Comments: Regrettably, this is the last time the MA program will probably do an assessment report. Due to budget cuts, buyouts, and faculty separation, the History program has lost nearly a third of its faculty in the past three months. The History Program can no longer staff its graduate program, much less offer the quality education that students expect and deserve. With Dean and Chair support, the History faculty made a recommendation in April 2014 to NOT accept new applications for fall 2014, thereby allowing the program to idle for a year. If the program can replace the lost positions, faculty will consider reopening the program. If the program cannot replace the positions, faculty will recommend terminating the program to CAPBoard during the AY 2014-15.

While this is regrettable, faculty contend that the History program is better served focusing its limited resources on the undergraduate program, where staffing levels also continue to be a problem. Having said this, MA students have performed very well in the program. In recent years, the program has graduated a number of students, who have found employment in the public schools, earned admittance to PhD programs, and found employment in museums and in archival management.

This past assessment cycle we reviewed SLO #1, which evaluated students' ability to critically appraise historical literature and writing. A significant component of this review consisted of the students' ability to understand the authors' argument, demonstrate how authors' interpretations have changed over time, and most critically demonstrate an understanding of various historical methodologies and theories in those works. With some qualified exceptions, students did very well. All but one of the students met the program's standard of proficiency, and some wrote papers that were exceptional. When you consider that these are works of 25-30 pages and that students have to review 10 monographs and a minimum of five scholarly articles students' ability to analyze and synthesize such a vast body of literature is impressive.

While students performed very well in this complex learning endeavor, there is room for improvement. Most likely the program will offer Historiography and Theory one last time (assuming the program ends) and the committee believes that the shortcomings and weaknesses inherent in this review can and will be addressed in the final course offering. These shortcomings notwithstanding, the committee believes that the students in the program are doing an excellent job understanding theoretical works of history, historical methodology, and historiography, which is the main skill in this learning objective.

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.