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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Curriculum Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What do you expect all students who complete the program to know, or be able to do?</td>
<td>Where is the outcome learned/assessed (courses, internships, student teaching, clinical, etc.)?</td>
<td>How do students demonstrate their performance of the program learning outcomes? How does the program measure student performance? Distinguish your direct measures from indirect measures.</td>
<td>How does the program use assessment results to recognize success and “close the loop” to inform additional program improvement? How/when is this data shared, and with whom?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Historical Expertise.** Students will critically restate, in extensive detail, the basic historical, historiographical, and theoretical narratives in their chosen fields.

Courses on History, Historiography, and Theory
HIST 5000, 5200, 5210, 5250, 5300, 5310, 5350, 5400, 5410, 5450, 5500, 5510, 5550, 5600, 5610, 5650, 5700, 5930, 5980, 6950
(for titles and descriptions see http://www.slu.edu/department-of-history/graduate-program/graduate-student-resources/graduate-courses)

**Major-Field Examination**
Two-hour written examination of historical expertise in the student’s chosen field, followed by oral examination and evaluated by Department faculty.

• Students perform this Outcome… by participating orally and writing term papers in the listed courses in such a way as to demonstrate adequate historical expertise. (D)
• … by completing the major-field examination, on which they are expected to perform precisely this Outcome. (D)
• The DGS tabulates and tracks student grades as well as faculty reports on individual student performance (the latter are also reviewed by individual advisers). (I)

• The DGS, Graduate Committee, Graduate Faculty, and individual advisers base decisions about course and curriculum revisions, student advancement, and student recognition on the assessment data listed at left.
• The DGS reports regularly to the faculty, basing his/her report in part on data pertaining to performance of this Outcome. Faculty have the opportunity to make recommendations to the DGS and Graduate Committee on the basis of this reported data, and to reform their own instruction on the same basis.
• The Department plans to share these data, including aggregated rubrics, more widely with faculty at a planned meeting in the late summer or fall of each academic year (e.g., 18 August 2016).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Historical Research Skills.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will design and carry out original and significant historical research projects based upon original-language archival sources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Courses on Research Skills**  
HIST 6800, 6810, 6820, 6830, 6840, 6900, 6901, 6970, 6990  

**Thesis**  
Students have the opportunity to write and defend a thesis that constitutes an original historical research project based in most cases upon original-language archival sources.

- Students demonstrate performance of this Outcome… by participating orally and writing term papers in the listed courses in such a way as to demonstrate adequate historical research skills. (D)  
- … by completing and defending a thesis. (D)  
- … by presenting their research at professional meetings and conferences. (I)  
- … by competing for research grants on the merits of the projects they design and propose. (I)  
- … by obtaining employment in academic and non-academic fields that value demonstrated research skills. (I)  
- The DGS tracks student publications, grant awards, and job placement. (I)  

- The DGS, Graduate Committee, Graduate Faculty, and individual advisers base decisions about course-, curriculum-, and program-level revisions, student advancement, and student recognition on the assessment data listed at left.  
- The DGS reports regularly to the faculty, basing his/her report in part on data pertaining to performance of this Outcome. Faculty have the opportunity to make recommendations to the DGS and Graduate Committee on the basis of this reported data, and to reform their own instruction on the same basis.  
- The Department plans to share these data, including aggregated rubrics, more widely with faculty at a planned meeting in the late summer or fall of each academic year (e.g., 18 August 2016).
### 3. Academic Citizenship

Students will demonstrate the qualities of a successful academic historian in their interpersonal interactions, service commitments, and professional involvement.

#### Courses on Academic Citizenship
- **HIST 6900, 6901**

Informal participation in Department and University forums such as the American History Forum, Byzantine Studies Forum, Crusades History Forum, Premodern History Forum, Departmental and University Graduate Student Association, and conferences hosted through the Department and the Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, as well as a range of other activities.

- **Students demonstrate performance of this Outcome…**
  - by completing the requirements of HIST 6900 and 6901 (optional for M.A. students) in a satisfactory manner, as judged by the instructor. (D)
  - … by participating actively, as organizers, presenters, discussants, and audience members, in the forums listed at left, in the view of faculty who oversee and attend the same forums and events and, in many cases, write letters of reference for Ph.D. students. (D)
  - … by obtaining employment in academic and non-academic fields that value demonstrated academic citizenship. (I)

- **The DGS, Graduate Committee, Graduate Faculty, and individual advisers base decisions about course-, curriculum-, and program-level revisions, student advancement, and student recognition on the assessment data listed at left.**
- **The DGS reports regularly to the faculty, basing his/her report in part on data pertaining to performance of this Outcome. Faculty have the opportunity to make recommendations to the DGS and Graduate Committee on the basis of this reported data, and to reform their own instruction on the same basis.**
- **The Department plans to share these data, including aggregated rubrics, more widely with faculty at a planned meeting in the late summer or fall of each academic year (18 August 2016).**

---

**1.** It is not recommended to try and assess (in depth) all of the program learning outcomes every semester. It is best practice to plan out when each outcome will be assessed and focus on 1 or 2 each semester/academic year. Describe the responsibilities, timeline, and the process for implementing this assessment plan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall 2016</td>
<td>DGS with Grad.</td>
<td>• Hold trial annual meeting that includes assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Appoint Assessment Coordinator (three-year term). <strong>The Assessment Coordinator is responsible for</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Committee overseeing concrete action items listed in the remainder of this Plan.
• Discuss student attainment of Learning Outcome 1 and determine whether changes are necessary.
• If changes are deemed necessary, plan for implementation of changes in 2017–18.

| Spring 2017 | DGS with Grad. Committee | • Prepare implementation of changes to program relevant to Learning Outcome 1, if deemed necessary. |
| Fall 2017   | DGS with Grad. Committee  | • Implement changes to program relevant to Learning Outcome 1, if deemed necessary.  
• Hold annual meeting that includes assessment.  
• Discuss student attainment of Learning Outcome 2 and determine whether changes are necessary.  
• If changes are deemed necessary, plan for implementation of changes in 2018–19. |
| Spring 2018 | DGS with Grad. Committee  | • Prepare implementation of changes to program relevant to Learning Outcome 2, if deemed necessary. |
| Fall 2018   | DGS with Grad. Committee  | • Implement changes to program relevant to Learning Outcome 2, if deemed necessary.  
• Hold annual meeting that includes assessment.  
• Discuss current three-year assessment plan and revise if necessary.  
• Discuss student attainment of Learning Outcome 3 and determine whether changes are necessary.  
• If changes are deemed necessary, plan for implementation of changes in 2018–19. |
| Spring 2019 | DGS with Grad. Committee  | • Prepare implementation of changes to program relevant to Learning Outcome 3, if deemed necessary. |
| Fall 2019   | DGS with Grad. Committee  | • Implement changes to program relevant to Learning Outcome 3, if deemed necessary.  
• Appoint new Assessment Coordinator (three-year term)  
• Hold annual meeting that includes assessment.  
• Discuss current three-year assessment plan and revise if necessary.  
• If changes are deemed necessary, plan for implementation of changes in 2018–19. |
| Spring 2020 | DGS with Grad. Committee  | • Finalize next four-year assessment plan and submit for faculty approval. |

2. Please explain how these assessment efforts are coordinated with Madrid (courses and/or program)?

Madrid faculty are not directly involved with the M.A. program under normal circumstances.
3. The program assessment plan should be developed and approved by all faculty in the department. In addition, the program assessment plan should be developed to include student input and external sources (e.g., national standards, advisory boards, employers, alumni, etc.). Describe the process through which your academic unit created this assessment plan. Include the following:

   a. Timeline regarding when or how often this plan will be reviewed and revised. (This could be aligned with program review.)

      *The plan will be reviewed and revised every four years, as detailed above.*

   b. How students were included in the process and/or how student input was gathered and incorporated into the assessment plan.

      *The plan was shared with the graduate-student representative to the department, ????, and his/her feedback was incorporated. Specifically, ????.*

   c. What external sources were consulted in the development of this assessment plan?


   d. Assessment of the manageability of the plan in relation to departmental resources and personnel

      *The plan proposed here is in line with procedures already in place in the Department. It is therefore expected that it will be manageable in relation to current resources and personnel.*