

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program Name (no acronyms): Master of Arts in History	Department: Department of History
Degree or Certificate Level: Graduate	College/School: College of Arts and Science
Date (Month/Year): October 1, 2021	Assessment Contact: Thomas Finan, Chair
In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? 2020-21	
In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2021	

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle? (Please list the full, complete learning outcome statements and not just numbers, e.g., Outcomes 1 and 2.)

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? Please describe and identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Students completing the Master of Arts have the option of completing a thesis or an examination based upon a seminar paper produced by the student. Three faculty members of the department review the thesis or serve as the examination committee.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and **include them in/with this report document** (do not just refer to the assessment plan).

The three-person dissertation committee completes the MA Assessment Rubric. The report is then submitted to the Director of Graduate Studies for review by the Graduate Studies Committee.

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

The number of students completing the Master of Arts degree is small. Students who complete the Master of Arts in the course of finishing the Doctor of Philosophy do not actually earn the Master of Arts until the completion of their doctoral comprehensive exams. This year we had a higher number of students undertaking the Master of Arts as a terminal degree. We should have a body of data in two years to assess.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

While our assessment of the Master of Arts is limited, we believe that the department has capacity to increase the number of terminal Master of Arts students to meet the needs of local educators.

6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

The results were discussed at the first Graduate Studies Committee meeting, with the results presented to the Department as a whole at the October Department meeting.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Course content• Teaching techniques• Improvements in technology• Prerequisites | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Course sequence• New courses• Deletion of courses• Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings |
| Changes to the Assessment Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Student learning outcomes• Artifacts of student learning• Evaluation process | <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)• Data collection methods• Frequency of data collection |

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of these findings.

The Master of Arts degree is often completed as part of the process of completing a Doctor of Philosophy. We have several students who complete the Master of Arts independently. These students are often secondary school instructors. The time to degree for those students is often longer than the students who complete the degree as part of the Doctor of Philosophy. Presently we do not have an extended time to degree for part time students, which is a policy that will be considered in Spring 2022.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes

A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

The Department of History has experienced some significant challenges over the last two years when it comes to assessment. The present chair, Thomas Finan, assumed that role in the Summer of 2019 and was immediately faced with the death of a senior colleague in the department. As with other departments the global pandemic posed meeting challenges and basic questions about the delivery of our courses in an online setting over the next two years. The most significant impact on the assessment process, though, was the death of one of our senior colleagues, Dr. Phil Gavitt, who had been serving as our Assessment Coordinator from 2018. Dr. Gavitt was diagnosed with brain cancer in 2019 and died in 2020, and while he was able to continue working into 2020, we did not realize the extent to which the assessment work was not completed because of the onset of the pandemic. Moving forward the department will perform the annual assessment process as noted in our materials, with the responsibility of the process falling on our Undergraduate and Graduate Studies Committees as opposed to a single "Assessment Coordinator."

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools (e.g., rubrics) with this report as separate attachments or copied and pasted into this Word document. Please do not just refer to the assessment plan; the report should serve as a stand-alone document.

History Department M.A. Assessment Rubric, SaintLouis University

Student Name

Faculty Name(s):

	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”)		
Outcome	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:

What do the results reveal about the effectiveness of our courses and advising in helping students to attain the learning outcomes?

What might we do differently?

What seems to be working well?

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