**2012-2013 CLASS FACT Assessment Year End Report, June, 2013**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Program Name(s)** | **FACT Faculty Fellow** | **Department Chair** |
| **History B.A. & M.A.** | **Professor Dee E. Andrews** | **Professor Linda Ivey** |

**A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

|  |
| --- |
| **B.A. degree in History**  Students graduating with a B.A. in History from Cal State East Bay will be able to:  1. know basic analytic concepts for assembling, organizing, and interpreting historical evidence, and achieve digital literacy in accessing and presenting historical materials;  2. demonstrate significant knowledge of major events and trends in their area of concentration;  3. write and speak clearly and persuasively about historical themes and topics, and work collaboratively with others in solving historical problems;  4. conduct historical research in primary sources, provide original interpretation of sources, and accurately reference all sources; and  5. comprehend differences and similarities among diverse peoples and cultures over time and develop an historical perspective on social responsibility and sustainability.    **M.A. degree in History**  Students graduating with a M.A. in History from Cal State East Bay will be able to:   1. possess in-depth knowledge of at least two of the following fields, one of which must be outside the U.S.: Ancient and Medieval Europe, Modern Europe, Modern China, Modern Japan, California and the West, Early America, the Civil War, U.S. Women's History, American Intellectual History, Native American History, and/or Latin America; 2. understand major arguments and themes in contemporary historiography, cross-cultural and interdisciplinary approaches to historical study, and humanistic values; 3. demonstrate familiarity with Bay Area research libraries, archives, special collections, and digital sources; 4. possess advanced writing and interpretive skills for analyzing both secondary and primary sources, and demonstrate advanced research abilities; 5. complete a major independent project in history; and 6. observe the standards of academic integrity and attribution of sources, and practice the values of the historical profession, including ethics and standards for work in research libraries, on the Internet, at professional conferences, and at interviews for employment. |

**B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

|  |
| --- |
| **B.A.** = # 1: know basic analytic concepts for assembling, organizing, and interpreting historical evidence, and achieve digital literacy in accessing and presenting historical materials. |
| **M.A.** = # 1 possess in-depth knowledge of at least two of the following fields, one of which must be outside the U.S.: Ancient and Medieval Europe, Modern Europe, Modern China, Modern Japan, California and the West, Early America, the Civil War, U.S. Women's History, American Intellectual History, Native American History, and/or Latin America. |

**C. Summary of Assessment Process**

|  |
| --- |
| ***FOR B.A.:***  The History Department regularly assesses the 4 core courses in the B.A. with *summative entrance and exit questionnaires,* with responses divided into the following *4 categories of analysis*: “I strongly agree, “I agree,” “I somewhat agree,” and “I disagree.” In the new assessment process (see 5-Year Plan posted at CLASS website), we selected the “critical thinking” SLO #1 for two of these courses: *HIST 2010 (Introduction to History)* and *HIST 3010 (Historical Writing).* 7 of the questions on our regular 2010 questionnaire apply to SLO # 1 (including re: digital literacy); and 4 questions on the regular 3010 questionnaire (also including digital literacy).  ***FOR M.A.:***  Faculty in our 3 content-based seminars offered this year – HIST 6100 on Medieval History, HIST 6400 (A) on the Civil War, and HIST 6400 (B) on History and Sustainability – reviewed students’ overall work, major projects, and oral presentations in each of these classes to determine students’ competence in use of historical content, ability to incorporate evidence and historiography into written work, and the same evidence and historiography in oral work. The 3categories of analysis were as follows: “Mastered,” “Proficient,” and “Inadequate.” |

**D. Summary of Assessment Results**

|  |
| --- |
| ***FOR B.A:***  *In HIST* *2010* (*Winter 2013*): In the *entrance* questionnaire, students expressed *strong* confidence in the general purpose of the course (“I understand history as an interpretation of the past based on evidence”), as well as differences between primary and secondary sources; and the *least* confidence in (a) evaluation of historical interpretations, (b) evaluation of the quality of an historical question, and (c) how to ask and investigate historical questions. Correspondingly, in the *exit* questionnaire, they expressed *greatest improvement* in the same areas (from 30% to 94% for (a); 44% to 100% in (b), and 52% to 100% in (c) in the first 2 categories of analysis.) Surprisingly, the area with the least improvement was how to interpret a primary source (from 59% to 88%). The digital competence question, on the other hand, scored improvement from 67% to 94%: an excellent result for History.  *In HIST 3010* (*Winter 2013*): In the *entrance* questionnaire, students expressed general confidence in the purpose of the course (“I understand history as an interpretation of the past based on evidence”), and somewhat more confidence in use of primary sources (79%) and in use of digital information (79%), but not a whole lot in deriving historical arguments from secondary sources (62%). The *exit* questionnaire, showed improvement to 100% in the first 2 categories of analysis in all four questions. *In* *HIST 3010* (*Spring 2013*): In the *entrance* questionnaire, students expressed total confidence in the purpose of the courses, and strong confidence (86%, 86%, and 95%) for the same questions of concern in the Winter: perhaps reflecting their one-quarter greater experience in upper-division history courses in general. The *exit* questionnaire showed improvements to 100% (first 2 categories of analysis) in all four questions.  ***FOR M.A.:***  *In HIST 6100*, nearly all students had mastered content; 2/3rds had mastered writing; and a little under 2/3rds had mastered oral presentations. Only 1 student was ranked as inadequate in the first two categories of analysis, and 2 in the third category (oral). *In HIST 6400 (A)* the focus was on the Civil War era, a field of study mastered by 7, with 2 students deemed proficient, and only one deemed inadequate; 50% mastered the integration of evidence and historiography, while 50% were proficient, and in terms of oral presentation, 6 mastered the skill, 3 were proficient and 1 inadequate. In *HIST 6400 (B)* the focus was on a theme (sustainability) in history, a new approach that about 2/3rds of the class mastered; whereas nearly all mastered the more familiar combining of evidence and historiography; and most did well in class presentations. None produced inadequate work.  The Department will be considering all the results at its assessment meeting in the fall.  The *results of the HIST 2010 and 3010 entrance and exit questionnaires* are encouraging for the Department’s instruction of critical thinking in our Major core. Most surprising is the much greater confidence expressed in use of library and digital sources in these surveys – a sign of the times -- along with the improvements in this area (27 points to 97% confidence in 2010; 21 points to 100% confidence in first section of 3010, and 5 points to 100% confidence in second section of 3010).  For the *exit questionnaires* in particular: In 2010, in addition to the primary source question, students were virtually split between “strongly agreed” and “agreed” (first 2 categories of analysis) on the two evaluative questions: “I can evaluate an historical interpretation” and “I can evaluate the quality of historical questions.” No such splits are evident in 3010, except for question # 1 in one section (“I have an understanding of historical writing as a process of interpretation and revision”) which only slightly improved from the entrance questionnaire, perhaps because of over-confidence in the entrance questionnaire and greater humility in the exit one.  For the M.A. program: It is evident that students need greater experience in and coaching for oral presentations, as well as in thinking more thematically about history.  *RECOMMENDATIONS*: The Assessment Coordinator interprets these results to suggest that the Department is serving its majors well with strong instruction in historical critical thinking. The main areas for attention are the evaluative issues, use of primary sources in 2010, and how exactly we want to define “digital literacy.” We may want to separate questions re: library use and internet use in future forms. For M.A. students, the main area of concern is oral expression and thematic analysis.  The Department will review these findings and recommendations at its assessment meeting in the fall. |

**E. Suggestions and Recommendations for the CLASS FACT Project in the Future**

|  |
| --- |
| Please make your suggestions for the future here. Thanks. |