SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): M.A.

Department: History

College/School: College of Arts and Sciences

Date: June 2018

Primary Assessment Contact: Charles Parker, Chair, AND Douglas Boin, Assessment Coordinator

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

   > Learning Outcomes 1) Assess relevant literature or scholarly contributions in the field(s) of study and 2) Apply the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

   > The mentor of the student (or another faculty member who has read the student's Thesis) fills out a rubric/worksheet and addresses relevant questions posed at the end. The rubric/worksheet focuses on the MA Thesis of students graduating from the program. This year the Department only had one MA student who graduated and wrote a Thesis. Professor Torrie Hester, the mentor of this student, filled out the rubric and answered the questions with brief paragraphs. After removing all identifying information from the rubric, I loaded it onto the Department's T Drive.

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?
   NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

   > Since the student finished the Thesis late in the Spring Semester and graduated in May, faculty have not yet had the opportunity to analyze the assessment data. The faculty will assess the data at its faculty retreat in August 2018, which is in accord with the Department's Assessment Plan. Please also note that this is the first artifact the Department has collected since the Assessment Plan went into effect.

4. What did you learn from the data? <u>Summarize</u> the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.
   NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

   > While the History faculty will discuss the artifact in August 2018, my own informal reading of Professor Hester's comments suggests that the graduate coursework and personal mentoring enabled the student to meet the Learning Outcomes. Professor Hester also suggested that identifying the reasons for the student's initial struggles would have perhaps pushed the scoring into the exceeds level.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

   > NA. Faculty will consider the data and their implications in the August 2018 Faculty Retreat.

6. Did you follow up ("close the loop") on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? *(For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?)*

> NA. Faculty will consider the data and their implications in the August 2018 Faculty Retreat.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.

History Department M.A. Assessment Rubric, Saint Louis University
Student Name: Student A
Faculty Name(s): Torrie Hester

Outcome	Degree of outcome-achievement demonstrated in artifact* *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.		x	
2. Applies the major practices, theories, or research methodologies in the field(s) of study.		x	
3. Applies knowledge from the field(s) of study to address problems in broader contexts.		x	
4. Articulates arguments or explanations to both a disciplinary or professional audience and to a general audience, in both oral and written forms.		x	
5. Evidences scholarly and/or professional integrity in the field of study.		x	

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:

What do the results reveal about the effectiveness of our courses and advising in helping students to attain the assessed learning outcomes?
Student A met the final requirement for his MA degree when he successfully defended his thesis, "From Camp to Cul-De-Sac: Asylee and Refugee Practices of the U.S. Government and the Society of Jesus," in Spring 2018. In December 2017, I was unsure if Student A would be able to finish. His ability to do so attests to our program's effectiveness in meeting the learning outcomes, all of which were needed to complete the MA Thesis.

What might we do differently?
In part, Student A struggled early in his thesis, because he had yet to build some historical methods. He struggled with Student Learning Outcome #1 and #2, despite the fact he had taken most of his course work and done well. In the future, earlier identification of his weaknesses would be useful. This recommendation is primarily aimed at myself, as I taught Student A in two courses. I have since reflected on what I could have done differently to move his skills forward. Some of Student A's struggles, however, represent normal developmental academic progress.

What seems to be working well?
Student A managed to complete the Thesis in large part because of his coursework in the history department and Women's and Gender Studies. These classes covered content and methodologies that Student A drew on for his thesis, providing a sound foundation for his work. Some of these skills took time "to take", but when they did, they served him well. The personalized advisement and mentoring from SLU faculty represents another key reason for Student A's success. Professors Glover, Burke, Rozbicki, Izzo, and myself all recognized Student A's struggles academically during his thesis writing. We adjusted his assignments to address his specific interests and needs; faculty even tailored his assignments in the middle of the term. Dr. Glover, for example, re calibrated his historiographic assignment from one designed to assess a field to one more specific to his thesis. Doing so helped Student A meet Student Learning Outcome #1, which proved especially timely to progress on his thesis. Both the coursework and individualized work by faculty provided Student A with the skills and support integral to his completion of a thoughtful, demanding piece of scholarship.

How workable/user-friendly did you find the assessment process?
Easy.