

Program Assessment Plan

Program: M.A.
Department: History
College/School: College of Arts and Sciences
Date: December 27, 2017
Primary Assessment Contact: Prof. Luke Yarbrough (History Assessment Coordinator Luke.Yarbrough@slu.edu) and Prof. Charles Parker (History Chair Charles.Parker@slu.edu).

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

#	Program Learning Outcomes What do the program faculty expect all students to know, or be able to do, as a result of completing this program? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Note: These should be measurable, and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</i> 	Assessment Mapping From what specific courses (or other educational/professional experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed to demonstrate achievement of the outcome? Include courses taught at the Madrid campus and/or online as applicable.	Assessment Methods What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <i>Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.</i> Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan.	Use of Assessment Data How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes <i>made in previous years</i> ?
1	Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in the field(s) of study.	For students taking the thesis option, the MA thesis serves as the artifact. For students taking the non-thesis option, the 2-hour comprehensive written examination serves as the artifact.	In both thesis and non-thesis options, the student's MA committee analyzes the artifacts using the History M.A. Assessment Rubric (attached).	In both thesis and non-thesis options, the MA committee will submit an assessment report after the student either submits a copy of the thesis or takes the written exam. The Graduate Studies Committee in the History Department will review all assessment reports in its March meeting and make a

				<p>recommendation to the faculty for changes in the program.</p> <p>The Director of Graduate Studies will report to the faculty in its April meeting.</p>
2	Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
3	Apply knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
4	Articulate arguments or explanations to both a disciplinary or professional audience and to a general audience, in both oral and written forms.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above
5	Evidence scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.	Same as above	Same as above	Same as above

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the above-noted program learning outcomes? (*It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.*)

In Fall 2018/Spring 2019, the Department will assess learning outcomes # 1 and #2; in Fall 2019/Spring 2020, the Department will assess outcomes #3 and #4; in Fall 2020/Spring 2021, the Department will assess learning outcome #5.

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

The Assessment Coordinator and Chair of the History Department drafted the plan in consultation with members of the History Department. History faculty approved the Assessment Plan.

3. On what schedule/cycle will faculty review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan?

The History Department will review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan every two years. The next review will take place in Fall 2019.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any assessment rubrics (as noted above) along with this report.

History Department M.A. Assessment Rubric, Saint Louis University

Student Name:

Faculty Name(s):

	Degree of outcome-achievement demonstrated in artifact*		
<u>Outcome</u>	*Please make succinct notes as appropriate, especially for scores of 2 or 1 (e.g., “minor difficulty articulating argument to a general audience”)		
	3: Exceeds expected achievement of outcome	2: Achieves outcome	1: Does not achieve outcome
1. Assesses relevant literature or scholarly contributions in the field(s) of study.			
2. Applies the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study.			
3. Applies knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts.			
4. Articulates arguments or explanations to both a disciplinary or professional audience and to a general audience, in both oral and written forms.			
5. Evidences scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.			

In the space below, please compose a brief narrative evaluation of the results. Consider answering such questions as the following: What do the results reveal about the effectiveness of our courses and advising in helping students to attain the assessed learning outcomes? What might we do differently? What seems to be working well? What relevant information do the assessment data fail to capture, in your view? How workable/user-friendly did you find the assessment process?

Answer: