

Please make any necessary changes to the department's purpose statement, goals, or student learning outcomes. Remember each SLO must be assessed between program review cycles.

History and Politics Program Purpose Statement:

The Department of History and Politics majors are designed to develop student scholarship in the study of history and political science, to nurture historical and political awareness, and to enhance critical and analytical skills. Graduates are prepared for a variety of careers where strong research, organization, and writing skills are needed, as well as for graduate and professional programs in history, political science, and law. The program also prepares graduates for careers in secondary education with a specialization in social studies. Majors at McPherson have the advantage of the college's central Kansas location, with research access to local, state, and federal libraries and archives. The department serves this purpose for students at McPherson College by:

<b>Program Student Learning Outcomes</b>	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Providing wide access to available formal courses in the disciplines of history and politics	Program Review	X	X	Assessment Planning		Program Review-Spring					X		Program Review-Spring
Offering opportunities for independent research and reading in the relevant fields		X	X							X		X	
Encouraging students to study further in related graduate and professional programs		X	X							X			
Supporting and encouraging students with interests in careers related to the disciplines to pursue such careers		X	X						X				
Meeting State Department of Education standards for certification in the area of social studies (applies to candidates for teacher certification only)		X	X						X				

Bachelor of Arts in History Goals:

To prepare graduates for careers and post graduate education in history, museum studies, law, archival work, and related fields.

<b>Program Student Learning Outcomes</b>	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019	2019-2020	2020-2021	2021-2022	2022-2023	2023-2024	2024-2025
Students should be able to demonstrate field specific methodology in written and oral course work.	Program Review	X	X	Assessment Planning	X	Program Review -Spring						X	Program Review -Spring
Students should be able to discuss major problems in history drawing upon substantive knowledge in a field.		X	X				X				X		
Students should be able to analyze and critique theoretical frameworks for understanding historical continuity and change in human communities.		X	X					X		X			
Students should be able to assess and utilize materials in the media and popular culture as historians in the course of their daily lives.		X	X							X			

<b>1. Select Your Department</b>	History
<b>2. Has the program's purpose, SLOs, or program review year changed from the above document?</b>	Yes
Upload the edited Purpose/SLO doc here.	
<b>3. Will/did the department submit a program review this year? If yes, please attach the final review as a pdf document.</b>	No
Upload program review pdf.	
<b>1. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.</b>	
-Artistic exhibition/performance	no
-Assignment/exam paper completed as part of regular coursework and used for program-level assessment	no
-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	yes
-Exam created by department or external agency	no
-Exit exam created by the program	no
-Oral performance (e.g. oral presentation, conference presentation)	no
-Portfolio of student work	no
-Supervisor or employer evaluation of student performance outside the classroom (internship, field experience, practicum, student teaching)	no
Please describe any other direct evidence gathered this year	
<b>2. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered THIS YEAR.</b>	
-Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Employer meetings/discussions/survey interview of student SLO achievement	no
-Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement	no
-Alumni survey that contains self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Student surveys (course evaluation additional questions, program created, from institutional student survey data) contain reports of SLO achievement	no
Please describe any other indirect evidence gathered this year:	Thesis grade
<b>3. Please select how the evidence was evaluated, analyzed, or interpreted.</b>	
-Used a rubric/scoring guide	yes
-Scored exams/quizzes	no
-Used qualitative methods on interview, focus group, open-ended response data	no
-External organization/person analyzed the data (e.g. external accrediting/licensure organizations, standardized exam company)	no
-Compiled survey results	no
Please describe any other methods not listed:	
<b>4. Enter the number of students assessed for each SLO.</b>	5
<b>5. Summarize the results of the assessment activities including the percentage of students that met or exceeded each SLO and a list of student learning strengths and weaknesses.</b>	All 5 students met the SLO. One of the students was very weak (score 1 of 5) on use of prose and weak (score 2 of 5) on logical support of thesis argument.
<b>6. Please upload any supporting documentation (i.e. rubrics, data analysis, charts/tables, department minutes, etc.)</b>	<a href="http://app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=149d275baef92e6dd3aa8c74c6a3443">app.captainform.com/upload_dld.php?fileid=149d275baef92e6dd3aa8c74c6a3443</a>
<b>7. What describes how the program plans to use the results?</b>	
-Assessment procedure changes (SLOs, curriculum map rubrics, evidence collected, sampling, communications with faculty, etc.)	no
-Course changes (course content, pedagogy, courses offered, new course, pre-requisites, requirements)	no
-Personnel or resource allocation changes	no
-Student's out-of-course experience changes (advising, co-curricular experiences, program website, program purpose or SLOs)	no

-Results indicated no action needed because students met expectations	no
-Use is pending (typical reasons: insufficient number of students in population, evidence not evaluated or interpreted yet, faculty discussions continue)	yes
Please describe any other uses not listed:	The assessment affirms current practice. No plans for change.
<b>1. The department will submit a program review NEXT YEAR.</b>	Yes
<b>2. SLO(s) the department will assess NEXT YEAR is/are:</b>	
<b>3. Please select the type of direct evidence of student learning the department plans to use NEXT YEAR.</b>	
-Artistic exhibition/performance	no
-Assignment/exam paper completed as part of regular coursework and used for program-level assessment	no
-Capstone work product (e.g. written paper, presentation, research)	no
-Exam created by department or external agency	no
-Exit exam created by the program	no
-Oral performance (e.g. oral presentation, conference presentation)	no
-Portfolio of student work	no
-Supervisor or employer evaluation of student performance outside the classroom (internship, field experience, practicum, student teaching)	no
Please describe any other direct evidence planned for next year:	
<b>4. Please select the type of indirect evidence of student learning that was gathered NEXT YEAR.</b>	
-Interviews or focus groups that contain self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Employer meetings/discussions/survey interview of student SLO achievement	no
-Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement	no
-Alumni survey that contains self-reports of SLO achievement	no
-Student surveys (course evaluation additional questions, program created, from institutional student survey data) contain reports of SLO achievement	no
Please describe any other indirect evidence planned for next year:	
<b>5. Based on previous assessment data, what percentage of students does the department expect to meet or exceed the SLO(s)?</b>	
<b>6. Is the department interested in learning how to apply for an assessment grant?</b>	No

# Department of History and Politics Thesis Assessment Rubric

Title \_\_\_\_\_

---

Student Name \_\_\_\_\_ Semester/ Year \_\_\_\_\_

[5] Distinguished [4] Above average [3] Proficient [2] Basic [1] Unsatisfactory

## 1. Evidence

- [5] -- Professional quality evidence; primary sources and expansive bibliographic work.
- [4] -- A substantial bibliography that uses refereed and vetted, but not not primary sources.
- [3] -- Bibliography has a limited scope, source quality is sound.
- [2] -- CMS conventions used, but may include moderate quality, unvetted, or tertiary sources.
- [1] -- Bibliography and citations do not meet CMS conventions

## 2. Analysis

- [5] -- The thesis is supported with sound, transparent logic; analysis is compelling and original.
- [4] -- The paper provides explicit logic and organization and is well supported.
- [3] -- The content is relevant to the thesis
- [2] -- The evidence is relevant, but the logical support for the thesis argument is inconsistent.
- [1] -- Thesis support is incomplete or inconsistent, content does not reflect the thesis.

## 3. Thesis

- [5] -- The thesis is explicit, original, creative and interesting.
- [4] -- The thesis is clearly stated and clearly asserts an analytic perspective.
- [3] -- The thesis is clearly stated but is more descriptive than analytic.
- [2] -- The thesis is vague or confusing.
- [1] -- The content of the paper is thematic, but lacks a central point.

## 4. Prose

- [5] -- Complex ideas and evidence are articulated in a clear, simple, and fluid manner.
- [4] -- The prose is concise, and direct; ideas are crisp and unambiguous.
- [3] -- The prose is clear of technical errors.
- [2] -- There are occasional errors or cumbersome sentences, one more draft suggested.
- [1] -- Errors in grammar, word choice obscure the meaning of writer's meaning.

## 5. Oral Presentation

- [5] -- The presentation demonstrates expansive knowledge, and is vibrant and engaging.
- [4] -- The presentation is articulate and professional.
- [3] -- The presentation demonstrates knowledge of the thesis paper and some contextual information.
- [2] -- The presentation provides a summary of the research paper.
- [1] -- The student appears unprepared or ill-informed on their topic.