

**History and Political Science Department – History Program Learning Outcome #1
Aligns with Written Communication Core Competency
2019-2020**

Learning Outcome:

Complete a substantial historical project autonomously.

Outcome Measure:

Research Paper in HIS 4070: Senior Seminar in History (every fall beginning with fall 2014)

Criteria for Success:

Minimum average of 2.75 (out of 4) for each criteria of rubric

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (highlight one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad and Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

The Longitudinal Data begins in 2013-2014, because we wrote new Program Learning Outcomes in 2013 to align with the Core Competencies. There is a different set of data to match different learning outcomes for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Written Communication Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

| Course | Semester | N | Context and Purpose | Content Development | Genre and Disciplinary Conventions | Sources and Evidence | Control of Syntax and Mechanics | Average Score |
|---------|-----------|----|---------------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| HIS 470 | Fall 2013 | 12 | 3.13 | 2.83 | 3.04 | 2.79 | 3.08 | 2.97 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2014 | 4 | 3.50 | 3.25 | 3.00 | 3.75 | 3.00 | 3.30 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2015 | 8 | 3.63 | 3.25 | 3.25 | 3.13 | 3.63 | 3.38 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2016 | 10 | 3.40 | 3.10 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.10 | 3.20 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2017 | 3 | 4.00 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.73 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2018 | 10 | 3.80 | 3.50 | 3.70 | 4.00 | 3.90 | 3.78 |
| HIS4070 | Fall 2019 | 9 | 3.78 | 3.56 | 3.89 | 3.56 | 3.56 | 3.72 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

We are pleased that student scores in every area continue to well exceed the minimum standard. The average score continues to be very strong (3.72 out of 4) and has consistently maintained that high average for the last three years. Although we saw a slight decrease in the “Sources and Evidence” category, it continues to be a very solid score and reflects our efforts to intentionally focus on that area. After Fall 2013, when our students’ average in that category barely passed the 2.75 minimum, we committed to working with students in every class on identifying reliable sources

of information and properly citing them. The considerable increase in that average shows that those efforts have been successful, and we will continue them.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

We began a new Senior Seminar class in the fall of 2014, and part of that is an intensive focus on improving a research paper (directly related to three of our outcomes and core competencies). We therefore expected to see an improvement in this area beginning with Fall 2014, and that improvement does indeed seem to be happening. With some small fluctuations along the way, average student scores have risen from 2.97 in Fall 2013 to 3.72 in Fall 2019. We have seen particular success in improving the students' abilities in the "Sources and Evidence" category. Our recommendation is that the Senior Seminar continue to place much of its focus on student research papers. We're pleased to see that what we've been doing in that course and throughout our program has been working.

Rubric Used

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition: Written communication is the development and expression of ideas in writing. Written communication involves learning to work in many genres and styles. It can involve working with many different writing technologies, and mixing texts, data, and images. Written communication abilities develop through iterative experiences across the curriculum.

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.

| | Capstone 4 | Milestones 3 2 | | Benchmark 1 |
|--|---|---|--|--|
| Context of and Purpose for Writing <i>Includes considerations of audience, purpose, and the circumstances surrounding the writing task(s).</i> | Demonstrates a thorough understanding of context, audience, and purpose that is responsive to the assigned task(s) and focuses all elements of the work. | Demonstrates adequate consideration of context, audience, and purpose and a clear focus on the assigned task(s) (e.g., the task aligns with audience, purpose, and context). | Demonstrates awareness of context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g., begins to show awareness of audience's perceptions and assumptions). | Demonstrates minimal attention to context, audience, purpose, and to the assigned tasks(s) (e.g. expectation of instructor or self as audience). |
| Content Development | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to illustrate mastery of the subject, conveying the writer's understanding, and shaping the whole work. | Uses appropriate, relevant, and compelling content to explore ideas within the context of the discipline and shape the whole work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop and explore ideas through most of the work. | Uses appropriate and relevant content to develop simple ideas in some parts of the work. |
| Genre and Disciplinary Conventions <i>Formal and informal rules inherent in the expectations for writing in particular forms and/or academic fields (please see glossary).</i> | Demonstrates detailed attention to and successful execution of a wide range of conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task (s) including organization, content, presentation, formatting, and stylistic choices | Demonstrates consistent use of important conventions particular to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s), including organization, content, presentation, and stylistic choices | Follows expectations appropriate to a specific discipline and/or writing task(s) for basic organization, content, and presentation | Attempts to use a consistent system for basic organization and presentation. |
| Sources and Evidence | Demonstrates skillful use of high-quality, credible, relevant sources to develop ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing | Demonstrates consistent use of credible, relevant sources to support ideas that are situated within the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use credible and/or relevant sources to support ideas that are appropriate for the discipline and genre of the writing. | Demonstrates an attempt to use sources to support ideas in the writing. |
| Control of Syntax and Mechanics | Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency, and is virtually error-free. | Uses straightforward language that generally conveys meaning to readers. The language in the portfolio has few errors. | Uses language that generally conveys meaning to readers with clarity, although writing may include some errors. | Uses language that sometimes impedes meaning because of errors in usage. |

**History and Political Science Department – History Program Learning Outcome #2
Aligns with Critical Thinking Core Competency
2019-2020**

Learning Outcome:

Demonstrate the relationship between primary and secondary materials by assessing a historian's work and recognizing the evidence used to construct that historical argument.

Outcome Measure:

Research Paper in HIS 4070: Senior Seminar in History (every fall beginning with fall 2014)

Criteria for Success:

Minimum average of 2.75 (out of 4) for each criteria of rubric

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (highlight one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad and Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

The Longitudinal Data begins in 2013-2014, because we wrote new Program Learning Outcomes in 2013 to align with the Core Competencies. There is a different set of data to match different learning outcomes for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Critical Thinking Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

| Course | Semester | N | Explanation of Issues | Evidence | Influence of Context & Assumptions | Student Position | Conclusions & Related Outcomes | Average Score |
|---------|-----------|----|--------------------------|----------|--|---------------------|--------------------------------------|------------------|
| HIS 470 | Fall 2013 | 12 | 3.26 | 2.83 | 3.00 | 2.83 | 3.08 | 3.00 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2014 | 4 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 2.75 | 3.05 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2015 | 8 | 3.63 | 3.25 | 3.13 | 3.38 | 3.38 | 3.35 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2016 | 10 | 3.30 | 3.00 | 2.80 | 2.90 | 3.00 | 3.00 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2017 | 3 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.33 | 4.00 | 3.33 | 3.60 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2018 | 10 | 3.60 | 3.40 | 3.70 | 3.80 | 3.80 | 3.66 |
| HIS4070 | Fall 2019 | 9 | 3.78 | 3.89 | 3.44 | 3.44 | 3.78 | 3.72 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Student averages in this area continue to be very strong and increased slightly over last year.
Student work in this area was significantly higher than the minimum criteria for success.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Our focus on this area, especially in the categories of “evidence,” “context,” and “student position,” has resulted in a significant improvement in those areas over where we were at 3 years ago, although we saw a slight decrease in some categories this year. We will continue to make this a high priority as we work with students on their research papers.

Rubric Used:

AAC&U Critical Thinking Value Rubric

Rubric Used

CRITICAL THINKING VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition: Critical thinking is a habit of mind characterized by the comprehensive exploration of issues, ideas, artifacts, and events before accepting or formulating an opinion or conclusion. *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

| | Capstone (4) | Milestones (3) | Milestones (2) | Benchmark (1) |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| Explanation of issues | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated clearly and described comprehensively, delivering all relevant information necessary for full understanding. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated, described, and clarified so that understanding is not seriously impeded by omissions. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown. | Issue/problem to be considered critically is stated without clarification or description. |
| Evidence <i>Selecting and using information to investigate a point of view or conclusion</i> | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a comprehensive analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are questioned thoroughly. | Information is taken from source(s) with enough interpretation/evaluation to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are subject to questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) with some interpretation/evaluation, but not enough to develop a coherent analysis or synthesis. Viewpoints of experts are taken as mostly fact, with little questioning. | Information is taken from source(s) without any interpretation/evaluation. Viewpoints of experts are taken as fact, without question. |
| Influence of context and assumptions | Thoroughly (systematically and methodically) analyzes own and others' assumptions and carefully evaluates the relevance of contexts when presenting a position. | Identifies own and others' assumptions and several relevant contexts when presenting a position. | Questions some assumptions. Identifies several relevant contexts when presenting a position. May be more aware of others' assumptions than one's own (or vice versa). | Shows an emerging awareness of present assumptions (sometimes labels assertions as assumptions). Begins to identify some contexts when presenting a position. |
| Student's position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is imaginative, taking into account the complexities of an issue. Limits of position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) are acknowledged. Others' points of view are synthesized within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) takes into account the complexities of an issue. Others' points of view are acknowledged within position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis). | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) acknowledges different sides of an issue. | Specific position (perspective, thesis/hypothesis) is stated, but is simplistic and obvious. |
| Conclusions and related outcomes (implications and consequences) | Conclusions and related outcomes (consequences and implications) are logical and reflect student's informed evaluation and ability to place evidence and perspectives discussed in priority order. | Conclusion is logically tied to a range of information, including opposing viewpoints; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is logically tied to information (because information is chosen to fit the desired conclusion); some related outcomes (consequences and implications) are identified clearly. | Conclusion is inconsistently tied to some of the information discussed; related outcomes (consequences and implications) are oversimplified. |

**History and Political Science Department – History Program Learning Outcome #3
Aligns with Oral Communication Core Competency
2019-2020**

Learning Outcome:

Present and analyze, in an oral presentation, different perspectives on an event from the past.

Outcome Measure:

Oral Presentation in HIS 4070: Senior Seminar in History (every fall beginning with fall 2014)

Criteria for Success:

Minimum average of 2.75 (out of 4) for each criteria of rubric

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (highlight one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad and Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

The Longitudinal Data begins in 2013-2014, because we wrote new Program Learning Outcomes in 2013 to align with the Core Competencies. There is a different set of data to match different learning outcomes for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Oral Communication Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

| Course | Semester | N | Organization | Language | Delivery | Supporting Material | Central Message | Average Score |
|---------|-----------|----|--------------|----------|----------|---------------------|-----------------|---------------|
| HIS 470 | Fall 2013 | 10 | 3.70 | 3.20 | 3.30 | 3.40 | 3.30 | 3.38 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2014 | 4 | 3.25 | 3.00 | 3.25 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.30 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2015 | 8 | 3.75 | 3.50 | 3.13 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.48 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2016 | 10 | 3.70 | 3.20 | 3.20 | 3.40 | 3.30 | 3.36 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2017 | 3 | 3.67 | 3.00 | 3.33 | 3.33 | 4.00 | 3.47 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2018 | 10 | 4.00 | 3.80 | 3.60 | 3.30 | 3.90 | 3.72 |
| HIS4070 | Fall 2019 | 9 | 3.89 | 3.67 | 3.67 | 3.89 | 4.00 | 3.82 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

We are pleased to see that the many oral presentations our students make throughout our program are succeeding in producing such strong results. The average for 2019 slightly increased from 2018, and continues to be higher than in the years preceding that. Our students are exceeding the minimum average for this outcome by a large margin. We will continue our efforts on this outcome.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

Our students generally do very well with formal oral presentations, and that is probably because they do them in almost every class, as well as at professional conferences. This is one of our

strengths, and we will continue to emphasize it. We will do this in courses throughout the History Program, with the culminating presentation taking place in the Senior Seminar.

Rubric Used:

AAC&U Oral Communication Value Rubric

Rubric Used

ORAL COMMUNICATION VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition: Oral communication is a prepared, purposeful presentation designed to increase knowledge, to foster understanding, or to promote change in the listeners' attitudes, values, beliefs, or behaviors. *Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*

| | Capstone (4) | Milestones (3) | Milestones (3) | Benchmark (1) |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|--|
| Organization | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is intermittently observable within the presentation. | Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not observable within the presentation. |
| Language | Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience. | Language choices are unclear and minimally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is not appropriate to audience. |
| Delivery | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative. | Delivery techniques (posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness) detract from the understandability of the presentation, and speaker appears uncomfortable. |
| Supporting Material | A variety of types of supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. | Insufficient supporting materials (explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from relevant authorities) make reference to information or analysis that minimally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic. |
| Central Message | Central message is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.) | Central message is clear and consistent with the supporting material. | Central message is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable. | Central message can be deduced, but is not explicitly stated in the presentation. |

**History and Political Science Department – History Program Learning Outcome #4
Aligns with Information Literacy Core Competency
2019-2020**

Learning Outcome:

Find appropriate materials online, in a library or in the community and know how to cite them.

Outcome Measure:

Research paper in HIS 470: Senior Seminar in History (every fall beginning with fall 2014)

Criteria for Success:

Minimum average of 2.75 (out of 4) for each criteria of rubric

Aligned with DQP Learning Areas (highlight one or more):

1. Specialized Knowledge
2. Broad and Integrative Knowledge
3. Intellectual Skills/Core Competencies
4. Applied and Collaborative Learning
5. Civic and Global Learning

Longitudinal Data:

The Longitudinal Data begins in 2013-2014, because we wrote new Program Learning Outcomes in 2013 to align with the Core Competencies. There is a different set of data to match different learning outcomes for 2011-2012 and 2012-2013.

Information Literacy Value Rubric - Average Student Scores:

| Course | Semester | N | Determine Extent of Information Needed | Access Needed Information | Evaluate Information & Sources | Use Information for a Purpose | Access/Use Ethically & Legally | Aver age |
|---------|-----------|----|---|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|
| HIS 470 | Fall 2013 | 12 | 2.96 | 2.91 | 2.77 | 3.08 | 2.87 | 2.92 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2014 | 4 | 3.25 | 3.75 | 3.50 | 3.25 | 4.00 | 3.55 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2015 | 8 | 3.75 | 3.13 | 3.13 | 3.63 | 3.38 | 3.40 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2016 | 10 | 3.40 | 2.90 | 2.80 | 2.80 | 3.20 | 3.02 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2017 | 6 | 3.67 | 4.00 | 3.50 | 3.50 | 3.67 | 3.67 |
| HIS 470 | Fall 2018 | 10 | 3.90 | 3.50 | 3.60 | 3.60 | 3.90 | 3.70 |
| HIS4070 | Fall 2019 | 9 | 3.78 | 3.89 | 3.78 | 3.78 | 3.89 | 3.72 |

Conclusions Drawn from Data:

Student averages were very strong in Fall 2019. This reflects our strong emphasis on the crucial skill of information literacy and the high-quality research expected of history majors. We are pleased that these averages stayed far above the minimum criteria for the third year in a row.

Changes to be Made Based on Data:

The strong averages in all categories of information literacy reflects the emphasis on this throughout our History Program, including the intensive work on revising a research paper in the Senior Seminar. We will continue to emphasize the importance of information literacy and develop the necessary skills throughout our program.

Rubric Used: AAC&U Information Literacy Value Rubric

Rubric Used

INFORMATION LITERACY VALUE RUBRIC

for more information, please contact value@aacu.org



Definition: The ability to know when there is a need for information, to be able to identify, locate, evaluate, and effectively and responsibly use and share that information for the problem at hand. - The National Forum on Information Literacy (*Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (cell one) level performance.*)

| | Capstone (4) | Milestones (3) | Milestones (3) | Benchmark (1) |
|---|---|--|--|--|
| Determine the Extent of Information Needed | Effectively defines the scope of the research question or thesis. Effectively determines key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected directly relate to concepts or answer research question. | Defines the scope of the research question or thesis completely. Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected relate to concepts or answer research question. | Defines the scope of the research question or thesis incompletely (parts are missing, remains too broad or too narrow, etc.). Can determine key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected partially relate to concepts or answer research question. | Has difficulty defining the scope of the research question or thesis. Has difficulty determining key concepts. Types of information (sources) selected do not relate to concepts or answer research question. |
| Access the Needed Information | Accesses information using effective, well-designed search strategies and most appropriate information sources. | Accesses information using variety of search strategies and some relevant information sources. Demonstrates ability to refine search. | Accesses information using simple search strategies, retrieves information from limited and similar sources. | Accesses information randomly, retrieves information that lacks relevance and quality. |
| Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically* *Corrected Dimension 3: Evaluate Information and its Sources Critically in July 2013 | Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources after considering the importance (to the researched topic) of the multiple criteria used (such as relevance to the research question, currency, authority, audience, and bias or point of view.) | Chooses a variety of information sources appropriate to the scope and discipline of the research question. Selects sources using multiple criteria (such as relevance to the research question, currency, and authority.) | Chooses a variety of information sources. Selects sources using basic criteria (such as relevance to the research question and currency.) | Chooses a few information sources. Selects sources using limited criteria (such as relevance to the research question.) |
| Use Information Effectively to Accomplish a Specific Purpose | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources to fully achieve a specific purpose, with clarity and depth | Communicates, organizes and synthesizes information from sources. Intended purpose is achieved. | Communicates and organizes information from sources. The information is not yet synthesized, so the intended purpose is not fully achieved. | Communicates information from sources. The information is fragmented and/or used inappropriately (misquoted, taken out of context, or incorrectly paraphrased, etc.), so the intended purpose is not achieved. |
| Access and Use Information Ethically and Legally | Students use correctly all of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrate a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly three of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly two of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. | Students use correctly one of the following information use strategies (use of citations and references; choice of paraphrasing, summary, or quoting; using information in ways that are true to original context; distinguishing between common knowledge and ideas requiring attribution) and demonstrates a full understanding of the ethical and legal restrictions on the use of published, confidential, and/or proprietary information. |