PART II: ASSESSMENT

A. Assessment Plan for Bachelor of Arts in History

1. Introduction

The History Department is committed to assessing student learning as a vital part of its expressed mission “to teach students about the past and about the discipline of history as an integral part of a complete liberal arts education.” The Department has described what it wants students to learn in the following Learning Outcomes for our undergraduate students:

Students who earn the Bachelor of Arts degree in history will be able to:
   1. Demonstrate content knowledge of history
   2. Analyze primary and secondary sources for their historical content and interpretations
   3. Demonstrate ability to research according to historical methods
   4. Demonstrate writing skills that reflect persuasive historical arguments based on evidence and proper citation

The Department’s assessment activities reflect its members’ conviction that teaching and learning, like any human activity, can be understood through sustained, rigorous reflection and interpretation of relevant evidence. In order to carry out its teaching mission as effectively as it can, the Department therefore seeks to measure student learning through the activities described below.

2. The Departmental Scale for Measuring Student Learning

In quantifying student learning for purposes of collecting and reporting assessment information, the Department will apply the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Code</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>90-100 percent correct</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>70-89 percent correct</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>60-69 percent correct</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>below 60 percent correct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The percentages of students performing at each level should be reported for purposes of assessment.

The Department defines success for each learning outcome as having at least 85 percent of students demonstrating proficiency or better. That standard is consistent with the success criteria of other programs at the University of West Georgia.

For a fuller description of the four standards of performance for each of the four learning outcomes, see Appendix B.

3. Assessing Student Learning in the Methodology Course

During the first two weeks of the course, students will be required to complete a survey asking them how well they have met each of the Department’s learning outcomes and soliciting suggestions for improvements. The survey appears as an appendix.
One of the assignments in the Methodology course requires students to use a primary source or sources to understand the historical past. The instructor will assess that assignment to gauge students’ ability to (1) analyze primary sources for their historical content and interpretations; (2) demonstrate ability to research according to historical methods; and (3) demonstrate writing skills that reflect persuasive historical arguments based on evidence and proper citation.

4. **Assessing Student Learning in the Senior Seminar Course**

Students in the Senior Seminar course are required to write a research paper from 20 to 25 pages in length. The instructor will assess all Senior Seminar papers to determine the extent to which the papers reflect student achievement of the Learning Outcomes.

Students also are required to write a reflective essay describing what they have learned in their undergraduate education and evaluating what they perceive to be the strengths and weaknesses of the program.

Students also will be required to complete a survey asking them how well they have met each of the Department’s learning outcomes and soliciting suggestions for improvements. The survey appears as an appendix.

The instructor will report the results to the Assessment Coordinator, who will provide them to the Department and record them in the university’s assessment system.

5. **Analyzing Assessment Data**

Each year the Assessment Coordinator, in consultation with the instructors of the Methodology and Senior Seminar courses and the chairs of the Survey Assessment Committees, will prepare an assessment report to the Department that considers student learning as measured through each of the instruments described here. The report will consider how well students are meeting the desired learning outcomes. Where the evidence suggests improvements can be made, the report will make recommendations to improve student learning. Each fall semester, the Department will meet to discuss assessment of student learning in advance of the university’s deadline for reporting assessment data by November 1.

6. **Reporting Assessment Data**

The instructors of Methodology and Senior Seminar shall be responsible for providing assessment data using the four-point scale to the Assessment Coordinator, who shall be responsible for reporting data on program learning outcomes to the central UWG assessment system. The Assessment Coordinator shall be responsible for reporting to the central UWG assessment system the steps decided on each year at the fall assessment meeting to improve student learning as part of “Closing the Loop.”

[Adopted 8/22/13]
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B. Assessment Plan for Master of Arts in History

1. Learning Outcomes Sought

The M.A. in History at West Georgia has for its primary purpose the development of a more sophisticated understanding of the discipline of history for the post-baccalaureate student accepted into our master's program.

Students completing the Master of Arts Degree in History will be able to:

a. Conduct historical research;
   b. Formulate and defend a historical argument in Standard English
   c. Demonstrate knowledge of historiography and its changes over time;
   d. Demonstrate knowledge of the theory and practice of public history [for Public History concentration];
   e. Demonstrate knowledge of a subfield of public history [for Public History concentration];

1. The Departmental Scale for Measuring Student Learning

In quantifying student learning for purposes of collecting and reporting assessment information at the graduate level, the Department will apply the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>90-100 percent correct</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>85-89 percent correct</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>80-84 percent correct</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
<td>below 80 percent correct</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The number and percentages of students performing at each level should be reported for purposes of assessment.

The Department defines success for each learning outcome as having at least 85 percent of students demonstrating proficiency or better. The standard is consistent with the success criteria of other programs as the University of West Georgia.

For a fuller description of the four standards of performance for each of the four learning outcomes, see Appendix C.
2. Methods of Assessing Students’ Achievement

a. Learning Outcome 1 will be assessed in the thesis/project and defense for thesis-track students and in the paper and the exams, both written and oral, for non-thesis-track students. For every student who completes the program, the chair of the student’s committee will consult with the other members of the committee, complete the Historical Research Assessment rubric (Appendix C.1), including identifying one salient strength and weakness in the student’s work, and assign a number from 1-4.

b. Learning Outcome 2 will be assessed in HIST 6694 Historical Writing. The instructor shall evaluate all papers submitted in the course according to the Written Historical Argument rubric (Appendix C.2), state the number and percentages of papers falling into each of the four categories, and identify salient strengths and weaknesses in the papers generally in a written report to the DGS.

c. Learning Outcome 3 will be assessed in HIST 6684 Historiography on the basis of the Historiography Rubric (Appendix C.3). The instructor of the course will evaluate all papers submitted in the course according to the Historiography rubric, state the number and percentages of papers falling into each of the four categories, and identify salient strengths and weaknesses in the papers generally in a written report to the DGS. Learning Outcome 4 will be assessed in HIST 5400 Introduction to Public History. The instructor of that course will evaluate students’ work in the course on the basis of the four-point scale, state the number and percentages of papers falling into each of the four categories, and identify salient strengths and weaknesses in the papers generally in a written report to the DGS.

d. Learning Outcome 5 will be assessed on the basis of the students’ internship portfolios.

e. At the conclusion of a successful defense, the chair of the defense committee will provide the student with the indirect assessment form and ask that it be completed and submitted to the Department Manager. See Appendix C.4.
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C. Assessment Plan for History Courses in the Core Curriculum

In accordance with the University of West Georgia’s general education assessment mandate, the Department of History will assess student learning in every section of HIST 1111, 1112, 2111, and 2112 each fall and spring semester for the purposes of Core Area E program assessment. This assessment does not replace the department’s assessment of its undergraduate and graduate programs, which are not affected by the guidelines for Core Area E program assessment.

The department’s four Core Area E survey courses will be assessed for the following Core Area E learning outcome: “Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.”

The assessment instrument in every section will be a graded essay that is at least three paragraphs long. Instructors will have the freedom to choose their own grading procedure for the assignment (including whether the assignment is assigned a letter grade or is graded on a pass/fail scheme; the weight given to this assignment as a percentage of a student’s final grade; and the criteria according to which the assignment will be graded). They will also have the freedom to select the point in the semester when the assignment is given and whether it is given as an in-class or take-home assignment, as long as the essay is considered a “summative” assignment (that is, it represents a summation of student knowledge gained in the semester – which means that it should not be given during the first few weeks of class). However, unless otherwise directed by the General Education Assessment Committee, the assignment should be given before the final week of the semester in order to allow time for the essay samples to be processed and distributed to the members of the department’s assessment team, who will be expected to assign assessment scores to a sample of the essays within a few days of the time that final grades are reported.

Instructors have the freedom to select their own essay question for the assignment, as long as the assignment is directly related to the Core Area E.1 learning outcome and includes the phrase “political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world [or American] history” or closely equivalent wording.

The assignment should also include this statement: “As part of the general education of every UWG student, this course aims to teach students to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world or American history. The purpose of this assignment, in part, is to
measure the extent to which students in all sections of this course have learned what we have been trying to teach. We will collect and analyze essays from all sections in order to find ways to help future students learn this material more fully.”

After giving this assessment assignment to their students, each instructor will be responsible for delivering any requested assessment samples to the General Education Assessment Director or the General Education Assessment Committee in accordance with instructions received from the General Education Assessment Director.

Immediately after final semester grades are reported, members of the department who have agreed to score assessment essays will meet to assign assessment scores to the essays they receive from the General Education Assessment Director. Each essay will be independently scored on four-point scale by at least two faculty who have experience teaching the course for which the essay is assigned. This means that, at a minimum, there will be two faculty members assigned to score HIST 1111 essays, two assigned to score HIST 1112 essays, two scoring HIST 2111 essays, and two scoring essays for HIST 2112. The faculty will use the attached rubric to assess each essay and will conclude the assessment process by completing the attached Weasel sheet. They will then send these scores and their completed Weasel sheets to the Core Area E work group leader, who will share the information with the Core Area E work group and the department chair. If possible, faculty members should rotate on or off the assessment team each semester in order to assure an equitable workload in the department.

The following rubric and accompanying Weasel sheet will be used as guides to assess student learning and score student essays for the Core Area E.1 learning outcome:

**Assessment Rubric for HIST 1111, 1112, 2111, and 2112**

Learning outcome: Students will demonstrate the ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history.

What does it mean to “understand the . . . dimensions” of world / American history?

1) Accurate factual knowledge

2) Understanding that a historical narrative can be focused on political, social, economic, or cultural themes, and the ability to write a brief (3-paragraph+) essay using at least one of these themes

3) Accurate understanding of historical context – ability to relate factual information to a larger context and demonstrate understanding of change and continuity over time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factual knowledge</th>
<th>4: Exemplary (exceeds expectations)</th>
<th>3: Proficient (meets expectations)</th>
<th>2: Developing (does not meet expectations)</th>
<th>1: Unsatisfactory (failing)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accurate factual knowledge, with abundant examples</td>
<td>Accurate factual knowledge, with few significant errors; adequate</td>
<td>Some (minor or moderate) factual errors, but at least a</td>
<td>Major errors in historical factual interpretation; very little factual</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of historical context, cause and effect, and chronological relationships</td>
<td>Evidence of understanding of how one historical time period or culture might be similar</td>
<td>Evidence of understanding of a historical time period or culture and the ways in which historical</td>
<td>Limited understanding of historical context; facts are presented without any</td>
<td>No understanding of historical context, cause and effect, or chronological</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions</td>
<td>Accurate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or cultural history, as demonstrated by examples and analysis that accurately trace themes that fall into one or more of these categories; analysis is insightful and goes beyond mere factual interpretation in ways that demonstrate understanding of some or all of these larger historical dimensions</td>
<td>Accurate understanding of political, social, economic, and/or cultural history, as demonstrated by examples and analysis that accurately trace concepts that relate to one or more of these dimensions</td>
<td>Limited discussion of information or concepts that relate to one or more of these dimensions, but discussion is vague or partly inaccurate and not supported by many historical examples</td>
<td>Essay does not deal clearly or accurately with any of these dimensions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstrating close attention to historical detail; accurate use of historical terms appropriate for a 1000 or 2000-level class (e.g., “Reconstruction,” “early modern era,” “Enlightenment,” “Ming China,” etc.)</td>
<td>Number of facts presented; some (but limited) understanding of historical terms</td>
<td>Rudimentary knowledge of basic historical facts; and/or limited number of facts presented (e.g., essay is vague, with little specificity)</td>
<td>Information that is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Weaknesses and Strengths in Student Learning (Weasel) Sheet
(To be completed by each department assessor after assessing their assigned student essays)

Based on your review of the whole sample of student work, please answer the following three questions.

1. What were the salient weaknesses in students’ ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history?

2. What were the salient strengths in students’ ability to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world and American history?

3. What suggestions do you have to improve student learning?

Sample Essay Assignment
This is an example of one assignment that meets the guidelines for assessment, but individual faculty members may select very different questions than the one listed here.

HIST 2112 Assessment Essay Assignment

What is required: An essay that is at least 3 paragraphs long that summarizes your understanding of a key theme in this course
How to submit the assignment: Submit this essay through CourseDen
Purpose for assignment: As part of the general education of every UWG student, this course aims to teach students to understand the political, social, economic, or cultural dimensions of world or American history. The purpose of this assignment, in part, is to measure the extent to which students in all sections of this course have learned what we have been trying to teach. We
will collect and analyze essays from all sections in order to find ways to help future students learn this material more fully.

**Essay question:** As you reflect back on the things you have learned about the development of the United States from 1865 to the present, what do you think was one of the most important political, social, economic, or cultural developments during this long time period? Explain how and why this development emerged, how it changed (or didn’t change) over time, and how it shaped the development of the United States. Please organize your essay chronologically, but with a clear thesis statement and arguments supported with evidence from specific facts and concepts that you learned in this course. Your essay should be at least three paragraphs long – though feel free to write a longer essay if you would like.

Appendix A

Rubric for Assessing History B.A. Learning Outcomes
(October 2017)

**Learning Outcome 1: Demonstrate content knowledge of history.**
- **4 (exceeds expectations):**
  - States basic and more complicated historical content knowledge, including names, dates, events, and processes, with no errors.
- **3 (proficient):**
  - States basic historical content knowledge, including names, dates, events, and processes, among others, with only a few errors.
- **2 (developing):**
  - States some basic historical content knowledge with more than several errors.
  - Remains vague about content knowledge and does not demonstrate mastery of material.
- **1 (does not meet expectations):**
  - Unable to state basic historical content knowledge.

**Learning Outcome 2: Analyze primary and secondary sources for their historical content and interpretations.**
- **4 (exceeds expectations):**
  - Analyzes sources effectively, showing sophisticated critical thinking and empathy; has moved away from just summarizing source.
  - Connects a source’s content to a broader historical context.
  - Reveals many subtexts and implications of a source’s argument.
  - Combines material from multiple sources to build a more complicated analysis.
- **3 (proficient):**
  - Though mostly focuses on analysis, still contains moments of summary unconnected to the analysis.
  - Makes some connections between the source and the broader historical context.
  - Reveals some subtexts and implications of a source’s argument.
  - Combines material from multiple sources at a basic level.
• 2 (developing):
  • Mostly offers a summary of sources, with few moments of analysis.
  • Makes a few connections between the source and the broader historical context.
  • Reveals a few subtexts and implications of a source’s argument.
  • Fails to combine material from multiple sources.

• 1 (does not meet expectations):
  • Fails to analyze sources; offers only summary.
  • Makes no connections between the source and the broader historical context.
  • Fails to reveal subtexts and implications of a source’s argument.
  • Fails to combine material from multiple sources.

Learning Outcome 3: Demonstrate ability to research according to historical methods.
• 4 (exceeds expectations):
  • Identifies and uses an impressive amount of appropriate primary and/or secondary sources; research reflects extensive digging and/or creativity in finding sources; e.g., unpublished sources used.
  • Identifies and uses an extensive amount of useful material within appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.
  • Shows initiative in conducting research.

• 3 (proficient):
  • Identifies and uses some appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.
  • Identifies and uses some useful material within appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.

• 2 (developing):
  • Identifies and uses only a few appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.
  • Identifies and uses only a small amount of useful material within appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.

• 1 (does not meet expectations):
  • Fails to identify and use appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.
  • Fails to identify useful material within appropriate primary and/or secondary sources.

Learning Outcome 4: Demonstrate writing skills that reflect persuasive historical arguments based on evidence and proper citation.
• 4 (exceeds expectations):
  • Makes a clear, specific and insightful thesis statement that makes an historical argument; argument shows particular originality or insight.
  • Sustains the argument and analysis throughout and avoids mere summarizing of material.
  • Supports argument throughout with evidence drawn from primary and/or secondary sources; use of evidence shows a discriminating eye and sophistication.
  • Writes in an organized and structured manner, both in terms of the paper as a whole and within each paragraph.
  • Uses Standard English in a professional manner with no grammatical errors.
  • Uses proper citation format (Chicago, aka Turabian, Style).
  • Meets requirements of academic honesty.
• 3 (proficient):
  • Has a mostly clear and insightful thesis statement that makes an historical argument.
  • Remains mostly focused on the argument and analysis, thus mostly avoiding mere summarizing of material.
  • Mostly supports arguments with evidence drawn from primary and/or secondary sources.
  • Mostly writes in an organized and structured manner, both in terms of the paper as a whole and within each paragraph.
  • Uses Standard English in a professional manner with a few grammatical errors.
  • Uses proper citation format (Chicago, aka Turabian, Style).
  • Meets requirements of academic honesty.

• 2 (developing):
  • Has a simplistic thesis statement that does make a fully persuasive historical argument.
  • Fails to remain focused on the argument and analysis; at times just summarizes material.
  • Fails to fully support argument with evidence drawn from primary and/or secondary sources.
  • Fails to maintain an organized and structured manner to the writing, both in terms of the paper as a whole and within each paragraph.
  • Fails to fully use Standard English in a professional manner and makes continual grammatical errors.
  • Fails to use proper citation format throughout (Chicago, aka Turabian, Style).
  • Meets requirements of academic honesty.

• 1 (does not meet expectations):
  • Fails to provide a clear thesis statement that makes an historical argument.
  • Fails to provide argument and analysis, rather offering a summary of material.
  • Fails to support argument with evidence drawn from primary and/or secondary material.
  • Fails to use Standard English in a professional manner and makes numerous grammatical errors.
  • Fails to use proper citation format (Chicago, aka Turabian, Style).
  • Plagiarizes.

[rev. 10/20/17]

Appendix B Indirect Assessment Questionnaire in Methodology and Senior Seminar

Please indicate a response for each the following questions according to the five-point scale indicated.

1. I have content knowledge of history.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree
2. I am able to analyze primary and secondary sources for their historical content and interpretations.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

3. I am able to research according to historical methods.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

4. I am able to demonstrate writing skills that reflect persuasive historical arguments based on evidence and proper citation.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

5. History professors at UWG advise students effectively.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

6. History professors at UWG teach effectively.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

7. History professors at UWG care about their students.
   5 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

8. What improvements would you recommend in the History program at UWG?

[approved 11/18/16]

1. **Conduct Historical Research (MA Learning Outcome 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Paper clearly states a persuasive thesis making a historical claim worth arguing about. Thesis shows originality or insight. 25-23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper states a thesis making a claim worth arguing about, but it does not offer particular insight, or there are problems with its expression or persuasiveness. 23-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper makes a claim, but it is unconvincing or superficial. 21-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper fails to articulate an argument. It may present a question, but not actually answer it. 19-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Paper effectively analyzes the historiography, showing thoughtfulness and critical thinking. Multiple sources are synthesized and brought into dialogue with one another. 25-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper offers sound analysis, but there may be some weaknesses in the ability to critically examine the sources; insights are not especially probing; some connections drawn among sources. 22-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper offers generally weak analysis that is fairly superficial; treats sources separately, without connecting them; may lose focus. 21-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper offers analysis that suffers from serious weaknesses. 19-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Evidence</td>
<td>Paper effectively mobilizes relevant evidence in a persuasive manner to support its argument. It shows a discriminating eye and sophistication. Citations are flawlessly formatted. 25-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper mobilizes relevant evidence, but there are weaknesses. It may not use the best evidence or fit it into the analysis smoothly. Citations generally meet formatting requirements. 22-21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper uses relevant evidence, but there are weaknesses. Some irrelevant evidence is included. Trivial misquotations exist. Problems fitting evidence into the paper. 21-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Paper has serious weaknesses in use of evidence. Evidence does not support assertions. Evidence is irrelevant. It is misquoted or misrepresented. 19-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Defense

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary (4)</th>
<th>Proficient (3)</th>
<th>Developing (2)</th>
<th>Unacceptable (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Explains work clearly and elegantly; responds to questions very directly and persuasively; shows impressive command of subject matter.</td>
<td>Explains work clearly; responds to questions directly and persuasively; shows solid command of subject matter.</td>
<td>Explains work comprehensively, but with some problems; answers most questions well, but struggles with others; some weaknesses in command over the subject matter.</td>
<td>Unable to explain work effectively; unable to answer questions; shows misunderstanding of the subject.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-23</td>
<td>22-21</td>
<td>21-20</td>
<td>19-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Overall Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100-90</td>
<td>89-85</td>
<td>84-80</td>
<td>79-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Salient Strength:**

**Salient Weakness:**

**Overall Rating (4-1):**

### C.2  Formulate a Historical Argument in Standard English (MA Learning Outcome 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Paper clearly states a persuasive thesis making a historical claim worth arguing about. Thesis shows originality or insight.</td>
<td>Paper states a thesis making a claim worth arguing about, but it does not offer particular insight, or there are problems with its expression or persuasiveness.</td>
<td>Paper makes a claim, but it is unconvincing or superficial.</td>
<td>Paper fails to articulate an argument. It may present a question, but not actually answer it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-23</td>
<td>23-22</td>
<td>21-20</td>
<td>19-0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Analysis       | Paper effectively analyzes the historiography, showing thoughtfulness and critical thinking. Multiple sources are synthesized and brought into dialogue with one another. | Paper offers sound analysis, but there may be some weaknesses in the ability to critically examine the sources; insights are not especially probing; some connections drawn among sources. | Paper offers generally weak analysis that is fairly superficial; treats sources separately, without connecting them; may lose focus. | Paper offers analysis that suffers from serious weaknesses. |
| 25-22          | 22-21                                                                       | 21-20                                                                       | 19-0                                                                        |

<p>| Use of Evidence | Paper effectively mobilizes relevant evidence in a persuasive manner to support its argument. It shows a discriminating eye and sophistication. Citations are flawlessly formatted. | Paper mobilizes relevant evidence, but there are weaknesses. It may not use the best evidence or fit it into the analysis smoothly. Citations generally meet formatting requirements. | Paper uses relevant evidence, but there are weaknesses. Some irrelevant evidence is included. Trivial misquotations exist. Problems fitting evidence into the paper. | Paper has serious weaknesses in use of evidence. Evidence does not support assertions. Evidence is irrelevant. It is misquoted or misrepresented. |
| 25-22          | 22-21                                                                       | 21-20                                                                       | 19-0                                                                        |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>Paper expresses ideas clearly and in a manner appropriate to its audience using Standard English. Writing is free of errors and at times achieves elegance. 25-23</td>
<td>Paper is clearly written, but it includes minor errors in grammar or expression. 22-21</td>
<td>Paper is sometimes unclear. It includes basic errors in grammar or expression. 21-20</td>
<td>Paper is unclear. It has serious errors in grammar or expression that suggest inattention. 19-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td><strong>100-90</strong></td>
<td><strong>89-85</strong></td>
<td><strong>84-80</strong></td>
<td><strong>79-0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.3 Ability to analyze historiography (LO 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument</td>
<td>Paper clearly states a persuasive thesis making a historiographical claim worth arguing about. Thesis shows originality or insight. 34-30</td>
<td>Paper states a thesis making a claim worth arguing about, but it does not offer particular insight, or there are problems with its expression or persuasiveness. 30-29</td>
<td>Paper makes a claim about historiography, but it is unconvincing or superficial. 29-28</td>
<td>Paper does not make a historiographical argument. 27-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis</td>
<td>Paper effectively analyzes the historiography, showing thoughtfulness and critical thinking. Multiple sources are synthesized and brought into dialogue with one another. 33-30</td>
<td>Paper offers sound analysis, but there may be some weaknesses in the ability to critically examine the sources; insights are not especially probing; some connections drawn among sources. 30-28</td>
<td>Paper offers generally weak analysis that is fairly superficial; treats sources separately, without connecting them; may lose focus on historiography. 28-26</td>
<td>Paper does not analyze its sources; offers bare summary; accepts sources uncritically; fails to address historiography. 26-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Evidence</td>
<td>Paper effectively mobilizes relevant evidence in a persuasive manner to support its argument. It shows a discriminating eye and sophistication. Citations are flawlessly formatted. 33-30</td>
<td>Paper mobilizes relevant evidence, but there are weaknesses. It may not use the best evidence or fit it into the analysis smoothly. Citations generally meet formatting requirements. 29-28</td>
<td>Paper uses relevant evidence, but there are weaknesses. Some irrelevant evidence is included. Trivial misquotations exist. Problems fitting evidence into the paper. 27</td>
<td>Paper fails to offer evidence in support of an argument. It misquotes evidence or does not cite it. 26-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Score</td>
<td><strong>100-90</strong></td>
<td><strong>89-85</strong></td>
<td><strong>84-80</strong></td>
<td><strong>79-0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C.4 Knowledge of the theory and practice of public history (LO 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
<td>50-45</td>
<td>44-42.5</td>
<td>42-40</td>
<td>Work does not show knowledge of theory of public history. 39-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>44.5-42.5</td>
<td>42-40</td>
<td>39-0</td>
<td>Work does not show knowledge of practice of public history. 39-0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Proficient</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Unacceptable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100-90</td>
<td>89-85</td>
<td>84-80</td>
<td>79-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

C.5 Practical knowledge of a subfield of public history (LO 5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
<th>Proficient</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100-90</td>
<td>89-85</td>
<td>84-80</td>
<td>79-0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix C6

Indirect Assessment Questionnaire/Exit Survey in the MA

Please indicate a response for each the following questions according to the five-point scale indicated.

9. I am able to conduct historical research.
   6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

10. I am able to formulate and defend a historical argument in Standard English.
    6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

11. I am able to demonstrate knowledge of historiography and its changes over time.
    6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

12. I am able to demonstrate the theory and practice of public history. [public history only]
    6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

13. I am able to demonstrate knowledge of a subfield of public history. [public hist. only]
    6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

14. History professors at UWG teach effectively.
    6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

15. History professors at UWG care about their students.
    6 Strongly Agree  4 Agree  3 Uncertain  2 Disagree  1 Strongly Disagree

16. What improvements would you recommend in the History program at UWG?
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