

STUDENT LEARNING ASSESSMENT REPORT

PROGRAM: History

SUBMITTED BY: Dr. Jace Stuckey

DATE: 9/30/3017

BRIEFLY DESCRIBE WHERE AND HOW ARE DATA AND DOCUMENTS USED TO GENERATE THIS REPORT BEING STORED:

Paper copies of the short analytical essays, research papers, and exit surveys from HI 420 are stored in a file in Dr. Jace Stuckey's office. Research papers are also held in electronic files on Dr. Stuckey's computer. Paper copies of the Supervisor Final Evaluation Forms and Summary Reflective Statements from HI 400 are stored in electronic files in the Department.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Program description from the Course Catalog: Please copy and paste the current year's catalog description of this program. This is generally a one-two paragraph description immediately following the name of the program. Please be sure to include the listing of program outcomes as printed.

The study of history aims to improve an understanding of the modern world through a perspective that enables evaluation of both its mature and its underdeveloped conditions. The history program at Marymount focuses primarily on the areas of European and American history. Resources for the study of history in the Washington area are extraordinary, and many students find opportunities to witness firsthand history-making events in this capital city.

The history major — traditionally a preparation for careers in law, business, teaching, research, and many other fields — includes courses essential to the study of the European and American traditions. The requirements of the major are deliberately flexible to accommodate a variety of options within the discipline and with other fields of study.

Internship opportunities in the Washington area are outstanding. The study abroad program offers internship and study programs in numerous locations. The most popular destinations include England, Ireland, and Italy.

History majors are encouraged to consider a minor concentration in another discipline.

List all of the program's learning outcomes: (regardless of whether or not they are being assessed this year)

Learning Outcomes	Year of Last Assessment	Assessed This Year	Year of Next Planned Assessment
1) Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and assess critically primary and secondary sources within their historical contexts.	2014-2015	2016-2017	2018-2019
2) Students will demonstrate the ability to interpret history through research and synthesis of evidentiary sources and application of theory and method.	2014-2015	2016-2017	2018-2019
3) Students will demonstrate the ability to apply historical knowledge effectively through the construction and communication of oral and written arguments in a professional forum.	2014-2015	2016-2017	2018-2019



Describe how the program's outcomes support Marymount's mission, strategic plan, and relevant school plan:

Through the standards set by its revised Learning Outcomes, the History Program requires students to seek knowledge through active inquiry and first-hand research into the available evidence, thereby fostering the intellectual growth and intellectual curiosity prioritized by Marymount's university mission and strategic plan.

In accordance with Marymount's objectives of remaining true to its Catholic identity, developing moral character, and educating the whole person, the History Learning Outcomes challenge students to exercise those habits of independent judgment, critical analysis, and rigorous examination of evidence necessary to participate responsibly in community and public life and make mature, informed life-choices, rather than bowing to momentary impulse, prevailing consensus, time honored dogma, or received authority.

By introducing our students to the theory and methodology of the discipline of history, the History Learning Outcomes enable them to cultivate the wisdom one can derive from knowledge of the fundamental causes of human behavior. Moreover, the Learning Outcomes contribute to diversity and a global perspective by encouraging students to evaluate human behavior in its socio-cultural contexts and take it on its own terms, thereby promoting an understanding of and sensitivity to those people who have different customs and ways of life and see the world from perspectives different from our own.

Finally, by prioritizing the skills of oral and written arguments in a professional forum (through the mechanism of the History Internship), the History Program's Learning Outcomes advance our students' career preparation, engage our students in the larger community, and foster collaborative ties between our program of study at Marymount and such regional institutions as the Smithsonian Institute, the Arlington Historical Society, and the U.S. State Department.

The History Program is integral to the humanistic education that lies at the heart of Marymount's Liberal Arts Core Curriculum and the mission of the School of Arts and Sciences. But its Learning Outcomes also hone skills and provide experience that prepare our graduates for a wide range of professional opportunities, including those for which the greater D.C. area is particularly rich, such as academic history, secondary education, public history, archival and library science, and public service. By highlighting the vocational utility of a liberal arts education in general and the History Program in particular, our Learning Outcomes contribute to the recruitment and retention of Marymount's students and the attractiveness of Marymount as a school of choice.

Provide a brief description of the assessment process used including strengths, challenges and planned improvements and provide evidence of the existence of a culture of continuous improvement based on assessment:

With guidance from the UAC director, we created and adopted a new Student Learning Assessment Plan, featuring revised and simplified Student Learning Outcomes, appropriate rubrics for the measurement of student performance, and the addition of indirect measures. These were then implemented for the 2016-2017 Assessment.

In the 2016-2017 academic year, the History Faculty assessed student learning by evaluating performance on assignments designed to measure all three of the revised Learning Outcomes. We confined assessment of student performance to those students who completed HI 420 Senior Seminar and HI 400 History Internship. These are the only two courses at Marymount restricted to History Majors and designed entirely for the benefit of History Majors, and therefore best suited to assess how well our Majors are achieving the desired Learning Outcomes. (All of our other courses are open to non-Majors and designed to support the Liberal Arts Core Curriculum primarily and the program of study in History only secondarily.)



As the tables below indicate, we assessed Learning Outcomes 1 and 2 with a direct measure consisting of student performance on short analytical essays and the capstone Research Paper in HI 420 Senior Seminar, with an exit survey serving as an indirect measure. We assessed Learning Outcome 3 with a direct measure consisting of student performance on three of the criteria on the Supervisor Final Evaluation Form distributed to internship site supervisors by Marymount's Center for Career Services. We backed up that assessment with each student's Summary Reflective Statement as an indirect measure.

For the 2016-2017 academic year, we acquired data for HI 420 Senior Seminar (offered annually each spring semester) as taught in Spring 2017. We acquired data for HI 400 History Internship in Spring and Summer 2017, as directed by the History Program's Academic Internship Mentor. (There were no students registered in HI 400 in Fall 2016.) The two members of the History Faculty examined the direct and indirect measures from these courses in September 2017 and reached a consensus on our evaluation of student learning over the last academic year. A third member of the Department was initially involved in these efforts, but that faculty member ultimately left the University. This report provides a record of our assessment activity, quantification of the data we collected accordingly, and our analysis of and conclusions regarding that data.

The History Faculty has reached the overall conclusion that our revised assessment procedures have proven to be effective tools for the evaluation of student learning in our program of study at Marymount. We are delighted with student performance on Learning Outcomes for the 2016-2107 academic year. The History Program is fulfilling its objective of teaching History in service to the Liberal Arts Core Curriculum, our undergraduate Majors, and Marymount's mission as a whole.

For the next assessment cycle, we intend to assess student performance on the same Learning Outcomes according to the same methods we used in 2016-2017, unless otherwise advised by the UAC.

Describe how the program implemented its planned improvements from last year:

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and assess critically primary and secondary sources within their historical contexts.	<p>For our next assessment cycle, the History faculty will measure Learning Outcome 1 according to a new rubric (see Appendices Item 1) which assesses Learning Outcome 1 according to more refined criteria, to make our expectations for student learning clearer.</p> <p>With the majority of graduating History Majors exceeding the criteria we have set for Learning Outcome 1, clearly there is a new imperative for the History faculty to raise our standards for success in this program, by changing the criteria and the targets for meeting that criteria.</p>	<p>All of the new rubrics and target rating goals were implemented for this cycle and are reflected in the data and interpretation of the data below.</p> <p>A full-time faculty member left before the 2016/17 academic year and therefore we did not have 4 full-time members of the Department for this cycle. Additionally, a second member left at the end of the academic year leaving only two members to review the assessment of our student learning in 2016-2017.</p>

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>For both the direct and indirect measures of Learning Outcome 1, we will now set as our target a rating of 85% (rather than 70%) for student performance that meets or exceeds the criteria.</p> <p>Toward the planned improvement of raising the standards for student performance on Learning Outcome 1, we will assess student work according to this new rubric. The new rubric explicitly measures critical thinking in a way that the old rubric did not. It also applies a reduced scale (5, 4.5, 4, 3.5, etc.) which will enable us to measure more accurately the actual range of student performance.</p> <p>The new rubric also raises the bar for that performance numerically. Previously, only a score of 1 was considered “failing to meet criteria,” while a score of 2 or 3 was considered as “meeting the criteria.” Now a score of 2, 1.5, or 1 is considered failing, while a score of 2.5, 3, or 3.5 “meets the criteria.”</p> <p>The application of these new standards will begin with faculty assessment of student work from HI 420 Senior Seminar in Spring 2016. Beginning with Summer 2016, the faculty who will review student work for the assessment of our student learning in the 2016-2017 academic year will include all four full-time members of the History faculty (rather than three members, as in Summer 2015).</p>	
Students will demonstrate the ability to interpret history through research and synthesis of	For our next assessment cycle, the History faculty will measure Learning Outcome 2 according to a new rubric, which assesses Learning Outcome 2	The new rubric and target rating goals were successfully implemented.

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
<p>evidentiary sources and application of theory and method.</p>	<p>according to more refined criteria, to make our expectations for student learning clearer.</p> <p>With the majority of graduating History Majors exceeding the criteria we have set for Learning Outcome 2, there is a new imperative for the History faculty to raise our standards for success in this program, by changing the criteria and the targets for meeting that criteria.</p> <p>For both the direct and indirect measures of Learning Outcome 1, we will now set as our target a rating of 85% (rather than 70%) for student performance that meets or exceeds the criteria.</p> <p>Toward the planned improvement of raising the standard for student performance on Learning Outcome 2, we will assess student work according to this new rubric. The new rubric dramatically raises the faculty's expectations for high-level thinking and writing demonstrated in the HI 420 research paper.</p> <p>As with the new rubric for Learning Outcome 1, the new rubric for Learning Outcome 2 applies a reduced scale (5, 4.5, 4, 3.5, etc.) which will enable us to measure more accurately the actual range of student performance.</p> <p>The new rubric raises the bar for that performance numerically. Previously, only a score of 1 was considered "failing to meet criteria," while a score of 2 or 3 was considered as "meeting the criteria."</p>	

Outcome	Planned Improvement	Update <i>(Indicate when, where, and how planned improvement was completed. If planned improvement was not completed, please provide explanation.)</i>
	<p>Now a score of 2, 1.5, or 1 is considered failing, while a score of 2.5, 3, or 3.5 “meets the criteria.”</p> <p>The application of these news standards will begin with faculty assessment of student work from HI 420 Senior Seminar in Spring 2016. Beginning with Summer 2016, the faculty who will review student work for the assessment of our student learning in the 2016-2017 academic year will include all four full-time members of the History faculty (rather than three members, as in Summer 2015).</p>	
<p>Students will demonstrate the ability to apply historical knowledge effectively through the construction and communication of oral and written arguments in a professional forum.</p>	<p>While the History faculty will apply new rubrics for assessment of Learning Outcomes 1 and 2, we will retain the rubric for Learning Outcome 3, since it is the same one used by the Center for Career Services for assessment of internships.</p> <p>The History faculty will, however, raise the target for student success with Learning Outcome 3 (as with Outcomes 1 and 2) from 70% of students meeting or exceeding the criteria to a student success rather of 85%.</p>	<p>The new target rating of 85% was implemented.</p>

Provide a response to last year’s University Assessment Committee review of the program’s learning assessment report:

The UAC shared several concerns and offered several recommendations for improvement. With guidance from the director of Institutional Assessment, the History Faculty addressed each concern and developed appropriate improvements in its revised Student Learning Assessment Plan.

At that time, we replaced the Student Learning Outcomes listed in the Assessment Report with three revised SLOs which address the UAC’s concerns. The new SLOs state outcomes in terms of what a student will be expected to do, drawing upon the action-verbs of Bloom’s Taxonomy where appropriate. The new SLOs are measurable and defined in discipline-specific terms, and they contribute directly to the university mission. The new SLOs are not “double-barreled” and are appropriately numbered in the new Plan and this Report.



In the Plan and this Report, we have indicated which specific documents have served as assessment items, and we have provided new rubrics for assessment of student performance on these items. The rubrics assure that our data on the direct measures is individualized and quantifiable. These new rubrics have been embedded in the body of this Report. In addition to direct measures, we have added indirect measures of student learning.

As per the UAC's Review, we started with three full-time members of the History Faculty during the spring of 2017. However, as of the Summer 2017, one of our faculty members left the University for another job. Nevertheless, we were able to assess the direct and indirect measures of student learning for the 2016-2017 academic year. The assessment analysis and conclusions below are the results of the consensus we reached on this matter. The UAC can also find below the final numbers from our data collection on student performance in the last year and our conclusions resulting from analysis of this data. Stemming from our last report, we revised performance standards, requiring 85% (replacing 70 %) of our students to "meet or exceed" the stated outcomes.

We have also omitted the names of specific faculty members from this Report, except where it could not be helped (at the beginning, in which the location of our assessment data had to be provided). During the previous cycle, multiple members of the History Faculty members consulted with the director of Institutional Assessment, and the faculty reached consensus on a new Assessment Plan, as per the requirements of the UAC in its Review. With respect to both planning and implementation, the History Faculty has addressed each of the UAC's stated concerns about the deficiency of our previous assessments (2013-2014 and 2014-2015) to the best of our ability, to our own satisfaction, and hopefully to the satisfaction of the UAC.

Outcomes Assessment 2016-2017

Learning Outcome 1:

Students will demonstrate the ability to analyze and assess critically primary and secondary sources within their historical contexts.

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<i>Direct measure: Student performance in completion of short analytical papers required in Senior Seminar will provide the data for assessing this outcome. The rubric below indicates how student learning will be measured.</i>	<i>85% of students in Senior Seminar must attain a rating of "meets or exceeds criteria" on all items in the rubric.</i>	<i>In Spring 2017, 9 students completed Senior Seminar. The assessment item was a short analytical essay requiring analysis of primary and secondary sources</i>	<i>1) The History Faculty assessed student performance on the short analytical essay according to the three criteria stated in the rubric below. 2) Of the 9 students assessed, 8 of 9 met or exceeded the criteria for Learning Outcome 1.</i>
<i>Indirect measure: An exit survey given to students in</i>	<i>85% of students in Senior Seminar respond that their program of study in History</i>	<i>In Spring 2017, 9 students completed Senior Seminar.</i>	<i>1) The History Faculty examined student responses to the Senior Seminar exit survey and quantified their responses.</i>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<i>Senior Seminar at the end of the semester.</i>	<i>"meets or exceeds" the objective of providing them with the skills and opportunities to attain Learning Outcome 1</i>	<i>The assessment item was an exit survey</i>	<i>2) According to the exit surveys, 7 of 9 students responded that their program of study in History met or exceeded the objective of providing them with the skills and opportunities to attain Learning Outcome 1 with 2 neutral responses.</i>

1.) NEW RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 1

RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 1 (direct measure)

Criteria	Exceeds Criteria			Meets Criteria			Fails to Meet Criteria		
	5	4.5	4	3.5	3	2.5	2	1.5	1
1) The paper identifies accurately the genre of the source and its intended audience.	<u> 6 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 3 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
2) The paper identifies accurately the goal of the author and the author's thesis and supporting arguments.	<u> 4 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 2 </u>	<u> 3 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
3) The paper identifies the author's methods of argument, including uses of evidence and rhetoric.	<u> 4 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 2 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 2 </u>	<u> 1 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
4) The paper assesses the source in proper historic context and infers the historic circumstances giving rise to its production.	<u> 6 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 3 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
5) The paper adopts only claims supported by evidence and synthesizes evidence from the source to reach appropriate conclusions and offer a logical interpretation of it.	<u> 4 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 2 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> 2 </u>	<u> 1 </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

Eight out of nine students met or exceeded all three criteria for the direct measure of Learning Outcome 1.

This 89% rating exceeds our target of at least a rating of 85%. The History Faculty were satisfied with student performance for Learning Outcome 1 and that 7 of 9 students also consider themselves well trained by the History Program to achieve this outcome, as the indirect measure indicates.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Assessment of Learning Outcome 1 for the 2016-2017 indicates that Marymount’s History Program continues to be strong in training students to examine sources in their historic contexts, assess those sources critically, and communicate their conclusions in a short essay format.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Although students generally scored well on this outcome, the History Faculty have strongly suggested that we begin pairing the curricula of HI 250 with that of HI 420 in a more coherent manner so that students are more engaged with the research and writing process required by the history discipline. Right now, these courses are largely independent of one another with instructors rotating and teaching the courses as they see fit. In doing so, the Department should develop standard syllabi for both classes so that students can begin working earlier on mastering the skills on this outcome.

Learning Outcome 2:

Students will demonstrate the ability to interpret history through research and synthesis of evidentiary sources and application of theory and method.

Assessment Activity

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<i>Direct measure: Student performance in completion of the Research Paper required in Senior Seminar will provide the data for assessing this outcome. The rubric below indicates how student learning will be measured.</i>	<i>85% of students in Senior Seminar must attain a rating of “meets or exceeds criteria” on all items in the rubric.</i>	<i>In Spring 2017, 9 students completed Senior Seminar. The assessment item was a Research Paper requiring research of sources, synthesis of findings, and application of theory and method in the formulation of an original interpretation of history.</i>	<i>1) The History Faculty assessed student performance on the Research Paper according to the six criteria stated in the rubric below. 2) Of the 9 students assessed, 7 met or exceeded the criteria for Learning Outcome 2.</i>
<i>Indirect measure: An exit survey given to students in</i>	<i>85% of students in Senior Seminar respond that their</i>	<i>In Spring 2017, 9 students completed Senior Seminar.</i>	<i>1) The History Faculty examined student responses to the Senior Seminar exit survey and quantified their responses.</i>

Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i>	Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i>	Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i>	Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i>
<i>Senior Seminar at the end of the semester.</i>	<i>program of study in History “meets or exceeds” the objective of providing them with the skills and opportunities to attain Learning Outcome 2.</i>	<i>The assessment item was an exit survey.</i>	<i>2) According to the exit surveys, all 7 students responded that their program of study in History met or exceeded the objective of providing them with the skills and opportunities to attain Learning Outcome 2, while two students had neutral responses.</i>

2.) NEW RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 2

RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 2 (direct measure)

Criteria	Exceeds Criteria			Meets Criteria			Fails to Meet Criteria		
	5	4.5	4	3.5	3	2.5	2	1.5	1
1) The paper’s thesis statement provides an original argument presents concerning the interpretation of the past, and the paper’s introduction and conclusion present the paper’s thesis and main supporting points clearly.	_3_	___	_2_	___	_2_	___	___	_2_	___
2) The paper is tightly structured and coherently organized, with arguments unfolding in a clear sequence—each body paragraph builds the case for the thesis and excludes irrelevant material.	_3_	_1_	_1_	___	_2_	___	_1_	_1_	___
3) The paper demonstrates familiarity with the basic scholarly literature and interpretative debates on its subject—it synthesizes both primary and secondary sources and makes no claims unsupported by evidence from cited sources.	_3_	_1_	_1_	___	_2_	___	_2_	___	___
4) The writing style of the paper is clear and concise, its language flows and engages the reader’s attention, and its word choice and tone are appropriate for the assignment and audience.	_4_	_2_	_2_	_1_	___	___	___	___	___

5) The paper is reasonably free of errors in grammar, punctuation, and syntax, and it applies correctly the Chicago/Turabian format for references in the footnotes/endnotes and bibliography.

6 _3_ _ _ _ _ _ _ _ _

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students *(Use both direct and indirect measure results):*

Seven out of nine students met or exceeded all six criteria for the direct measure of Learning Outcome 2, while two students failed to meet 3 of the 5 criteria. While 100% of the students met 2 of the criteria, there were 78% who met or exceeded all 5 criteria. This rating of 78% exceeds our previous target of at least a rating of 70%, but falls slightly below the new 85% goal. While the History Faculty is pleased with student performance for Learning Outcome 2 and with the students' reflection on their training for this outcome, as per the exit survey, we will continue work toward the target goal of 85%.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Assessment of Learning Outcome 2 for the 2016-2017 indicates that a high percentage of students are well prepared to make an original interpretation of the past by conducting research and integrating evidence around a thesis. Since this is the first cycle with the new rubrics and new target performance standard of 85%, no specific plans for further improvement of our methods of teaching and assessing this outcome are currently under consideration by the History Faculty.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

Faculty have determined that although a high percentage of students completing HI 420 Senior Seminar are meeting the outcome goals, there are some who are clearly not. In order to deal with this, faculty propose to increase library staff presence and tutorials during the semester which have proved useful in other courses and since use of the library is critical for the research process it is a necessary component of any history research oriented course. Additionally, faculty have also suggested that in 420, we begin to standardize more focused assignments such as a topic and thesis proposal as well as annotated bibliographies in order to provide students with a clearer 'scaffolding' approach to writing a research paper so as to better equip them to make an original interpretation of the past by conducting research and integrating evidence around a thesis.

Learning Outcome 3:

Students will demonstrate the ability to apply historical knowledge effectively through the construction and communication of oral and written arguments in a professional forum.

Assessment Activity

<p>Outcome Measures <i>Explain how student learning will be measured and indicate whether it is direct or indirect.</i></p>	<p>Performance Standard <i>Define and explain acceptable level of student performance.</i></p>	<p>Data Collection <i>Discuss the data collected and student population</i></p>	<p>Analysis <i>1) Describe the analysis process. 2) Present the findings of the analysis including the numbers participating and deemed acceptable.</i></p>
<p><i>Direct measure: The direct measure for the outcome is the Supervisor Final Internship Evaluation form that every site supervisor completes for each intern. The form provides a rubric measuring student performance in the HI 400 History Internship on a scale from "Excellent" to "Poor."</i></p> <p><i>Three criteria measure student attainment of Learning Outcome 3, namely "oral communication," "written communication," and "apply academic knowledge to the workplace."</i></p>	<p><i>The acceptable level of student performance will be a rating of "Excellent" or "Good" on the criteria of "oral communication," "written communication," and "apply academic knowledge to the workplace" achieved by 85% of student interns.</i></p>	<p><i>Each intern has a site supervisor who is required as a part of the Center for Career Services internship agreement to submit to the Academic Internship Mentor (AIM) an evaluation form developed by the CCS describing the student's performance in History Internship. This outcome is analyzed by scoring the ratings received by interns on the three criteria put in boldface on the rubric below.</i></p> <p><i>In Spring 2017, 3 students completed the History Internship; 2 History Majors did the internship in Summer 2017. There were no students enrolled in HI 400 in Fall 2017. The results for student performance on Learning Outcome 3 derive from the work of those 5 students.</i></p>	<p><i>1) The History Faculty collected the ratings which each of the 5 interns received from his or her site supervisor on three criteria from among the eight listed on the Supervisor Final Internship Evaluations.</i></p> <p><i>2) According to the Supervisor Final Internship Evaluations for our 5 interns in 2016-2017, all 5 students met or exceeded two of the three criteria for Learning Outcome three, and 3 out of 5 students met or exceeded the third criterion. On oral communication 3 scored excellent and 2 supervisors gave neutral response for the other students. All 5 scored excellent or good on written communication while 4 scored excellent or good on applying academic knowledge to the workplace with one neutral response.</i></p>
<p><i>Indirect measure: The Summary Reflective Statement, a final short essay in which the student reflects on his or her internship and the ways in which Marymount coursework prepared the student for experiential learning, which is submitted at the conclusion of the internship as a course requirement of HI 400 History Internship.</i></p>	<p><i>85% of students in Senior Seminar respond that their program of study in History "meets or exceeds" the objective of providing them with the skills and opportunities to attain Learning Outcome 3.</i></p>	<p><i>In Spring 2017, 5 students completed the History Internship; 2 History Majors did the internship in Summer 2017. There were no students enrolled in HI 400 in Fall 2014. The results for student performance on Learning Outcome 3 derive from the Summary Reflective Statement submitted by those 8 students.</i></p>	<p><i>1) The History Faculty examined the Summary Reflective Statements from 5 interns and quantified their responses.</i></p> <p><i>2) According to their essays, 4 interns strongly agreed or agreed that the Marymount program in history had prepared them to achieve Learning Outcome three; while 1 student was neutral on the question.</i></p>



RUBRIC FOR LEARNING OUTCOME 3 (direct measure)

Supervisor Final Internship Evaluation Form:

Criteria	Excellent	Good	Neutral	Fair	Poor
Attendance and Punctuality	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Follows Directions	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Adheres to Deadlines	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Takes Initiative without Supervision	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Oral Communication	<u> 3 </u>	_____	<u> 2 </u>	_____	_____
Written Communication	<u> 3 </u>	<u> 2 </u>	_____	_____	_____
Ability to Accept Criticism	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Apply Academic Knowledge To the Workplace	<u> 3 </u>	<u> 1 </u>	<u> 1 </u>	_____	_____
Overall Professionalism Rating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
Overall Performance Rating	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____

Interpretation of Results

Extent this learning outcome has been achieved by students (Use both direct and indirect measure results):

For the direct measure of Learning Outcome 3, all 5 students completing the History Internship in 2016-2017 met or exceeded two of the three criteria written communication and application of academic knowledge to the workplace) from the direct measure, for a rating of 100%. Three of five met or exceeded the third criterion (oral communication) with two neutral responses, for a rating of 60%. All 5 interns exceeded the program goal for 85% of our students to score excellent or good ratings from their site supervisors on two of the three criteria for Learning Outcome 3. With the new goal being raised from 70-85%, the students did fall below on oral communication. However, that score resulted from 'neutral' responses from supervisors.



For the indirect measure, 4 out of 5 students reflected that the History Program had met or exceeded the objective of preparing them for application of their academic knowledge to oral and written communication in a professional forum, with one neutral response.

With a positive response from supervisors about our students, and an 80% positive response from our students about the History Program, the History Faculty is satisfied that our Majors' performance has secured handily our program standard for Learning Outcome 3. However, we will continue to work to meet the new rating goal of 85% in all outcomes.

Program strengths and opportunities for improvement relative to assessment of outcome:

Assessment of Learning Outcome 3 for the 2016-2017 indicates that the History Program has properly trained and prepared our Majors with the academic skills and knowledge they need for successful oral and written communication in a professional forum.

Discuss planned curricular or program improvements for this year based on assessment of outcome:

For AY2017-2018 the School of Arts and Sciences increased the requirement for hours given to assignments and/or student interaction away from the internship site. For the history internship, HI400, this requirement was implemented beginning in summer 2017 with a series of writing assignments including a weekly journal discussing their duties and what they learned, as well as a final 2-3 pages reflective paper on their internship. Interns must also meet with the history internship coordinator regularly to discuss their internship. Finally, the coordinator contacts the intern's on-site supervisor for updates. The writing assignments are designed to measure the skills heretofore only evaluated with the supervisor's final report after the internship had finished.

Curriculum Map

These will be sent for review and feedback to the Liberal Arts Core Committee.

UNDERGRADUATE CURRICULUM MAP

Degree Program: History

Year: 2016-17

Program Outcomes:

Program Outcome	Critical Thinking	Inquiry	Information Literacy	Written Communication
1) Students will be able to comprehend historical events through identification of their causes and consequences and analysis of primary and secondary evidentiary sources by means of close reading of texts within historical context.	x		x	x

Program Outcome	Critical Thinking	Inquiry	Information Literacy	Written Communication
2) Students will be able to research and integrate evidence from primary and secondary sources by synthesizing data into a general interpretation of past events in a logically structured, interpretive paper that applies knowledge of historical theory and method.	x	x	x	x
3) Students will be able to communicate effectively in oral and written forms and apply problem solving and analytical skills to attain professional goals.		x	x	x

Curriculum Map:

For each course, indicate which competencies are included using the following key. Please refer to the director of assessment in Planning and Institutional Effectiveness if you need more detailed explanation of the four core competencies.

Level of instruction: I – Introduced, R-reinforced and opportunity to practice, M-mastery at the senior or exit level

Assessment: PR-project, P-paper, E-exam, O-oral presentation, I-internship, OT-other (explain briefly)

Required Course	Critical Thinking		Inquiry		Information Literacy		Written Communication	
	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess	Level	Assess
HI 400 Internship	M	I	M	I	M	I	M	I
HI 420 Senior Seminar	M	P,O	M	P,O	M	P,O	M	P,O