

FY2013 DEPARTMENTAL ANNUAL REPORT OF CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

Department of History Fort Hays State University

I. DEPARTMENTAL OVERVIEW

The four most important things that the Department of History provides to the Fort Hays State University community is that it offers BA and MA degrees in history, plays a vital role in preparing prospective secondary social studies teachers seeking history and government licensure, contributes through the internationalization of the curriculum by offering western and non-western courses, and offers key classes in the General Education program. The department has been working hard to expand and diversify what we offer to the academic community. The department has identified some key areas that they could participate in including undergraduate research, service learning, internationalization, and public history.

We also contribute courses to three separate certificate programs. Two of the certificates are in Interdisciplinary Studies: Ethnic Studies and Women's and Gender Studies. The final certificate is housed in the Department of History and is a nine hour certificate in Public History.

The faculty who make up the Department of History have diverse interests and provide our majors with numerous fields of inquiry. For example, Dr. David Bovee specializes in Intellectual history and American Diplomatic history; Professor LaGretia Copp specializes in African, Middle East, and British history; Dr. Norman Caulfield is a recognized expert in the fields of Latin American and Labor history; Dr. David Goodlett's emphasis is Russian and Eastern European history; Dr. Nienkamp's areas of expertise are History of Technology, Science, and Education and he is also the director of the Secondary Education program; Dr. Kimberly Perez is an expert in the History of Science; and Dr. Juti Winchester specializes in Western US, Native American, and Public History. I should note that now that we have all of our positions filled, we have reached a period of stability which has allowed the department to be very productive.

The department also has an active graduate MA program. Our graduates pursue further education at Level 1 research schools, teach at area community colleges, or pursue careers in museums and archives. In spring 2012 the department decided to move our MA online, offering a terminal MA in History and an MA in Public History. This program will replace the MLS, however, we will "teach out" existing MLS students. The department originally planned to have these program fully built by fall 2015; however, course development was on hold for much of the 2012-13 academic year which has put us behind. We are currently working with CTELT to catch up, but I do anticipate that this delay will push back the availability of the program fully online until fall 2016.

It is essential to note that the department provides coursework that supports the University's brand identity, "Forward Thinking. World Ready." The courses that the Department of History offers instills majors and non-majors alike with a global perspective and offers them a historical context for current world events.

Finally, the department offers numerous distance learning opportunities. All of the department's General Education courses are available through online delivery as well as a number of more advanced, upper division courses. We will expand and diversify our online courses over the next three years as we participate in CTELT's course development process.

A. Departmental Mission and Vision Statements

History students will learn what they need to be world citizens as the department continues to focus on the history of diverse populations and the information and technologies that make worldwide communication possible. Students will acquire the skills necessary to understand and interpret historical events and the context in which events occurred. And further, to convey these histories and interpretations to a variety of audiences.

B. Departmental Goals, Objectives, and Strategic Priorities

In order to strengthen the department and the services that we provide students and the university community, the department has identified eight strategic priorities.

1. Continue to provide a world perspective in our courses. The department is integral to the developing a "world ready" student body. We offer one of the three general education courses in the International Studies component of the General Education program. In addition, we offer upper division courses that emphasize both western and non-western history. We have six faculty members out of seven who can teach classes with a European and/or World emphasis. We hope to expand our participation in this area by participating in the university's internationalization initiative.
2. Expand departmental participation in university initiatives like internationalization, undergraduate research, and service learning. We are in a unique position because of the nature of our subject matter and our curriculum to participate more in these university priorities. The department will explore international partnerships and international travel to provide our students with the opportunity to travel abroad. Further, we will look for additional opportunities to combine public history with undergraduate research and service learning. In spring 2012, Dr. Perez was named a Provost's Service-Learning Faculty Fellow for 2012-13; the goal will be to develop a service-learning course that will also emphasize public history and to encourage and mentor others in the department interested in service-learning. Dr. Juti Winchester serves on the Undergraduate Research Committee and in her first year teaching at FHSU has also identified a couple of opportunities to get undergraduates involved in public history research, including a research partnership with the principal investigator of Kansas Archeological Training Program Field School, which was held in Ellis County in June 2013. This project was also sponsored by the Kansas Historical Society and the research will ultimately be published by KHS.
3. Develop and implement a plan for retention of undergraduate history majors. The department was ready to act on this but decided to wait until the new freshman retention course, IDS 101, was implemented so we did not duplicate efforts. The development of the department orientation course was discussed in spring 2013 and we will consider a sample syllabus in fall 2013. The department also discussed, and will continue to discuss, curriculum changes that will

help with student retention. We also initiated a Student Professional Development Committee in 2012-13. The committee implemented a number of programs and changes to help with student engagement, recognition, and retention, including the Clio lecture series, which will focus on bringing in diverse professionals to discuss career options with students; a Student Research Award to award original research; and new internship partnerships with the Buffalo Bill Center of the West and the Truman Presidential Library, as well as identifying opportunities with Forsyth. In the coming year the committee will focus on reorganizing our webpage to make student opportunities clearer, revitalizing the History Club and Phi Alpha Theta, and finding funds for paid internships.

4. The department will develop a recruitment strategy for both the BA and MA programs. However, we will not publicize the new virtual MA until we have the essential courses developed.
5. Growing the Public History concentration. The department has hired a well-qualified public historian who has been tasked with growing the program at an undergraduate and graduate level. She will also continue our partnerships with area public history agencies like the Western History/Special Collections at FHSU, the Ellis County Historical Society, Historic Fort Hays, and the Kansas Room at the Hays Public Library.
6. Growing the MA program. The department committed to putting the MA in History and Public History on-line to increase our number of students. In the next three years we will be recruiting for the program and developing courses for a virtual environment. Again, due to the delay in course development, we will not have the MA fully online until fall 2016 and we will initiate our recruitment program at that time.
7. In order to ensure that the online courses that we offer are meeting department and CTELT standards, we have initiated the Virtual College Course Quality Committee. In the past year, the committee developed a department checklist and has reviewed most of the courses taught by our adjuncts and have identified areas of improvement. The committee will continue to evaluate the courses of adjuncts. The members of this committee will also serve as the department evaluators in the CTELT course development process.
8. Finally, we are not only reaching out to alumni in order to develop a better relationship, but also to use them as models to instruct current students. We have developed a Nominations Committee to identify and nominate alumni for awards. We have also reached out to alumni to give professional development talks to students; the first of which was this spring when we invited alumni Ramon Powers and Jim Leiker to visit and speak to students.

C. Department Productivity and Distinctive Accomplishments

The Department of History continued its strong tradition of preparing future teachers, providing opportunities for history majors to prepare for careers beyond the classroom, and continuing to fulfill its long-standing role within the university's General Education curriculum, especially in the international studies area.

This year, the department had another notable year in terms of scholarship. Dr. David Bovee published two book reviews, served as the chair of a session at a regional conference, and was nominated for the President's Distinguished Scholar; Dr. Norman Caulfield presented at a regional conference and collaborated on an international series; Professor LaGretia Copp successfully defended

her dissertation and chaired a panel at a regional conference; Dr. David Goodlett was nominated for the Pilot Award and is working on a project about 20th century political leaders and how they used language; Dr. Paul Nienkamp participated in a national symposium and continued his research on American Land Grant Institutions; and Dr. Kim Perez published an article in an international journal, presented at two conferences, and continued her research on Lou Henry Hoover's interest in nature and science; and Dr. Juti Winchester chaired a session at a national conference and worked on her book manuscript on Buffalo Bill Cody.

The department continues to participate in the KAMS Program. Additionally, the department is also participating in the Virtual College Graduate Teaching Assistant Program, with two graduate teaching assistants offering sections of Hist. 111, Modern World Civilizations. And the department strengthened its commitment to service-learning as Dr. Perez was named a Provost's Service-Learning Faculty Fellow for 2012-13. We were also one of the first departments to be funded for a Red Balloon Action Plan, conceived and written by Drs. Nienkamp and Winchester, for the project "Ipad for Innovative Teaching, Learning, and Scholarship in History Education and Public History."

Further this year, the department Virtual College Course Quality Committee established quality criteria and conducted initial evaluations of eight virtual history courses. The Nominations Committee nominated an alumna for the Alumni Achievement Award. The Student Professional Development Committee awarded the first Outstanding Research Paper Awards and launched the Clio Lecture Series with a series of research and student professional development talks by Dr. Ramon Powers, former director of the Kansas Historical Society, and Dr. Jim Leiker, Associate Professor of History at Johnson County Community College. The department placed three student interns at the Buffalo Bill Center of the West as Metadata Interns. And finally, the department served as a co-sponsor for the Kansas Archeological Training Program Field School in June 2013. The program is conducted by the Kansas Historical Society.

In short, the department is comprised of excellent and dedicated teachers, concerned advisors, and recognized scholars. Faculty members understand their place in the life of the university and have dedicated themselves to making FHSU a unique place for the study of history; the incorporation of new technologies and methodologies makes the students experience history in new ways. This department is truly on the leading edge of historical teaching and scholarship.

II. DEPARTMENTAL PERFORMANCE METRICS

A. Department Performance Indicators

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Freshmen [20 TH DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT]	17	13	18	19	13
Transfer Students [20 TH DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT]	8	9	10	9	11
Undergraduate (first majors/second majors) [20 TH DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT OF FIRST MAJORS, HEADCOUNT OF SECOND MAJORS]	79/4	87/3	83/4	90/2	72/0
Graduate Majors [20 TH DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT]	8	11	11	10	13
MLS Majors [20 TH DAY FALL SEMESTER, HEADCOUNT OF ADVISEES WITH 120-4901]	21	13	20	19	8
Major Retention [20 TH DAY FALL SEMESTER, PERCENT OF FR MAJORS RETURNING TO UNIVERSITY]	72.22%	82.35%	69.23%	77.78%	63.16%
Undergraduate Student Credit Hours [TOTAL UNDERGRAD SCH]	5115	5254	5338	5505	5727
Graduate Student Credit Hours [TOTAL GRAD SCH]	426	402	345	384	276
Tenured or Tenure-track Faculty (Headcount) [FTE OCCUPIED FROM POSITION CONTROL]	6	7	5	4	6
Non Tenure-Track Faculty (Headcount) [FTE OCCUPIED FROM POSITION CONTROL]	1	1	2	3	1
Undergraduate Degrees [UNDERGRAD DEGREES AWARDED]	11	9	10	9	9
Graduate Degrees [GRAD DEGREES AWARDED, NOT MLS]	7	3	5	3	2
Briefly note 2-3 improvements over the last year prompted from the above enrollment indicators. The number of transfer students has increased to a five-year high. The number of graduate majors has increased from 10 to 13 with very little effort to advertise the program due to CTELT Course Development constraints. And the amount of SCH created by the department has increased by 222.					
Number of books, book chapters, and refereed articles published	5	3	5	1	1
Percent of faculty publishing refereed books, chapters, or articles	30%	43%	50%	14%	14%
Number of non-refereed articles and presentations	10	6	6	6	9
Percent of faculty publishing non-refereed articles or presentations	80%	57%	66%	86%	86%

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Number of scholarly performances and other creative activities [TOTAL NUMBER OF CREATIVE PERFORMANCES]	0	0	0	0	0
Percent of faculty in scholarly performances or other creative activities [PERCENT OF FACULTY IN CREATIVE SCHOLARSHIP (FACULTY PERFORMING CREATIVE ACTIVITY/ TOTAL FACULTY)]	0	0	0	0	0
Total number of external grant applications submitted/percent of faculty submitting [TOTAL NUMBER OF EXTERNAL GRANT APPLICATIONS/PERCENT FUNDED]	2	3	1	0	0
Total number of funded external grants/percent of faculty funded [DOLLAR AMOUNT OF EXTERNAL GRANT APPLICATIONS, PERCENT OF FACULTY FUNDED]	0%	1/33%	1/100%	0%	0
Total number students successfully completing an undergraduate research/creative project [TOTAL NUMBER OF UNDERGRAD STUDENTS COMPLETING, CONTRIBUTING TO, OR PRESENTING A CREATIVE OR SCHOLARLY PROJECT]				0%	37
Briefly note 2-3 improvements over the last year prompted from the above scholarly/creative activities indicators. The number of non-refereed articles and presentations has increased. The vast majority of the faculty are engaged in sharing their research and expertise through publication and presentation. Finally, the number of undergraduates completing a research project has increased.					
[NOTE: Each department MUST report at least two direct measures of student learning outcomes and two indirect measures. Examples of direct measures include: first-time pass rate or average scores on standard exit exam, number of students successfully completing reviewed portfolios. Indirect measures would include student satisfaction, alumni and employer data, or any other perception based data.]					
Direct Outcome 1 History 377 Approaches to U.S. History Content Competency Exam		80% course grade average (20 students, grade range 43- 99)	87% course grade average (16 students, grade range 49- 97)	90% course grade average (16 students, grade range 61- 100)	76% course grade average (16 students, grade range 0- 100) Note that three students did not take the competen cy exam. Without their scores the average

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
					was 93% and range was 63-100%
<p>Direct Outcome 2</p> <p>History 378 Approaches to World History Content Competency Exam</p>		89% course grade average (24 students, grade range 80-98)	84% course grade average (17 students, grade range 56-99)	76% course grade average (9 students, grade range 0-95) Note that one student did not take the competency exam. Without their score the average was 85% and the range was 64-95%	84% course grade average (21 students, grade range 0-100) Note that two students did not take the competency exam. Without their scores the average was 93% and the range was 59-100%
<p>Direct Outcome 3</p> <p>HIST 379 Historical Methods Grades on final original research paper</p>		53% Fall 2009(12 students, grade range 0-95—Note: three 0% in range); 69% Spring 2010 (11 students, grade range 0-98—Note: two 0% in range)	84% course grade average Fall 2010 (8 students, grade range 50-97); 70% course grade average Spring 2011 (7 students, grade range 39-90)	Fall 2011: 72% final paper grade average (6 students, grade range 0-95). Note that one student did not turn in a final paper; without that student's score the average is 86% and the range	Fall 2012: 47% final paper grade average (9 students, grade range 0-96%). Note that four students did not turn in a final paper; without those students' scores the average is 85.6% and the range

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
				is 76-95; Spring 2012: 64% course grade average (8 students, grade range 0-95). Note that one student did not turn in a final paper; without that student's score the average is 73% and the range is 50-95.	is 69-96% Spring 2013: 48% course grade average (8 students, grade range 0-87). Note that three students did not turn in a final paper; without those students' scores the average is 76% and the range is 55-87.
Direct Outcome 4 HIST 675 Seminar in History Grades on final original research paper		Fall 2009: 7 grades of A, 1 grade of D, and 1 grade of U (9 students grade range 0-99); Spring 2010: 4 grades of A, 3 grades of B, 1 grade of C, and one grade of I (9 students grade range of 72-95)	Fall 2010: 2 grades of A, 3 grades of B, 1 grade of U (grade range 0-94); Spring 2011: 2 grades of A, 6 grades of B, 1 grade of D (grade range 60-95)	Fall 2011: 86% final paper grade average (12 students, grade range 30-97). Spring 2012: 81% course grade average (11 students, grade range 70-90).	Fall 2012: 92% final paper grade average (5 students, grade range 83-98). Spring 2013: 72% course grade average (6 students, grade range 0-95). Note that one student did not submit a final paper. Without

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
					that score the average is 87% and the grade range is 80-95%
Indirect Indicator 1 Senior Exit Interview		Data amassed from Fall 2008 to Spring 2010 reveals a 90.7% undergraduate student satisfaction with the department and program	Data amassed from Fall 2008 to Spring 2011 reveals a 91.4% undergraduate student satisfaction with the department and program	Data amassed from Fall 2011 to Spring 2012 reveals a 95% undergraduate student satisfaction with the department and program	Data amassed from Fall 2011 to Spring 2012 reveals a 93% undergraduate student satisfaction with the department and program
Indirect Indicator 2 Graduate Student Exit Interview					Data amassed from Fall 2011 to Spring 2012 reveals a 93% on-campus graduate student satisfaction with the department and program
Dept senior students' Level of Academic Challenge [FHSU LAC SCORE, DEPT LAC SCORE]	54.65 56.35	55.9 56.54	56.4 51.83	56.2 62.61	58.5 67.05
Dept senior students' Active and Collaborative Learning [FHSU ACL SCORE, DEPT ACL SCORE]	45.34 47.02	46.1 40.82	43.9 38.62	44.5 46.53	45.1 60.32
Dept senior students' Student-Faculty Interaction [FHSU SFI SCORE, DEPT SFI SCORE, N, %]	45.34 36.19	41.0 30.95	38.5 37.16	38.4 55.83	38.6 56.67
Dept senior students' Enriching Educational Experiences [FHSU EEE SCORE, DEPT EEE SCORE, N, %]	34.72 35.26	34.0 32.03	32.9 29.32	32.7 39.78	34.0 48.61

Key Performance Indicator	FY2009	FY2010	FY2011	FY2012	FY2013
Dept senior students' Supportive Campus Environment [FHSU SCE SCORE, DEPT SCE SCORE, N, %]	59.57 48.81	60.3 39.68	60.8 55.56	59.8 62.15	61.9 65.28
Number of NSSE participants [NUMBER OF DEPT SR STUDENTS, PERCENT]	10 27.8%	7 31.8%	9 33.3%	8 30.77%	3 12.5%
<p>Briefly note 2-3 improvements over the last year prompted from the above student learning/engagement indicators.</p> <p>Over the last year both undergraduate and on-campus graduate students have a 93% satisfaction rate with the department and the programs. It is important to note that when compared to the FHSU average for ALL categories, the department is above the university average. Of particular note: The department Level of Academic Challenge is 6.41 points above the university average level. The department senior students' Student-Faculty Interaction is 17.73 points above the FHSU average. The department senior students' Enriching Educational Experiences is 7.08 points above the FHSU average. And finally, while the department senior students' Supportive Campus Environment is only 2.35 points above the FHSU average, it is has steadily increased from 38.89% to 62.15%, which is a huge achievement for the department.</p> <p>[NOTE: Departments may pick up to three key performance indicators they currently measure but are not captured above. These measures could be used to track departmental results on specific yearly goals. Examples might include: number of SRPs attended, number of new freshmen contacted. (These will vary by department based on goals.)]</p>					
Outcome/Indicator 1 Number of VC MA Applications Received					12 applications between 6/2012 and 6/2013
Outcome/Indicator 2					
Outcome/Indicator 3 [SPECIFIC PERFORMANCE MEASURE 3]					
<p>Briefly note 2-3 improvements over the last year prompted from the above indicators.</p> <p>Since approving the virtual MA degree we have received 12 applications into the program.</p>					

B. Department Quality Initiatives and Results

FY2013 Quality Initiatives	Results
Quality of VC courses by Adjuncts	In fall 2012 a departmental committee was formed to monitor the quality of Virtual College courses that are being developed and are already being taught. The purpose will be to ensure that all adjuncts, as well as on-campus faculty, are following the Online Teaching Best Practices outlined by the department of history. The committee developed a department quality rubric and checked 8 adjunct courses. Instead of sending individual evaluations for each adjunct, the committee decided to send them a general improvement plan, along with our Best Practices for On-line Courses and 600 level courses.

Retention of Majors	While the undergraduate retention rate for the Department of History has gone up over the last year, major retention continues to be a focus. In the next year we will make an effort to provide more activities for our majors. Professor LaGretia Copp took over Phi Alpha Theta and the History Club in an effort to reinvigorate it. The group did a number of activities including co-sponsoring the Clio lecture, fundraising, selling a department t-shirt, and planning a group history trip. The Student Professional Development Committee organized the Clio Series to connect students and alumni and inform them of career opportunities. The committee also instituted the Outstanding Research Paper Award.
---------------------	--

FY2014 Quality Initiatives	Responsible Party, Resources, and Plan
Course Development for Virtual MA and Quality Control of 600-level courses online	The Virtual College Quality Committee consists of three faculty members and is chaired by Dr. Paul Nienkamp. The committee will continue to evaluate the quality of adjunct courses to make sure that they meet department and CTELT standards. The committee will also serve as the department quality committee for CTELT course development. The committee has also modified the department best practice documents and will present them to the faculty for discussion in the fall.
Curriculum Additions/Changes for Retention	In the fall the department will consider a syllabus for an Orientation to History course for incoming freshman majors. The syllabus was created in collaboration between Dr. Paul Nienkamp and Dr. Kim Perez. The department will also discuss some curriculum changes of some core courses that have frustrated students in the past.

C. Institutional Quality Results

FY2013 University Initiatives	Department Activities/Results
Align Programs and Services with North Central Kansas Technical College (NCKTC)	Since none of the Programs of Study at the NCKTC are history related, the department will have little to lend to this initiative.
Increase Enrollment	The department retention initiatives, including the development of an Orientation course and assigning incoming freshman with a single advisor, should help with retention. Some of the initiative undertaken by the Student Professional Development Committee and the effort the department has made to engage alumni so they can provide examples of career options should help with persistence. Finally, when we have the essential courses through course development, we will begin advertising our on-line MA program, which should help with on-line enrollments.
Improve Persistence and Retention	Again, the activities of the new department committee, the Student Professional Development Committee, including the Clio professional development series, the Outstanding Student Research Award, and developing internship opportunities, should help with persistence. The student organization, Phi Alpha Theta, has become more active and in the near future we will have a "Friends" of Phi Alpha Theta group for students that don't qualify for the honor society, but still want to participate in their activities. The department will consider curriculum changes/additions, including an Orientation to History course, in the fall that will help with retention.

<p>Improve Student Learning</p>	<p>Faculty are encouraged to update and modify their courses annually. All courses that go through CTELT course development will be evaluated by the Virtual College Course Quality committee. And the committee will continue to evaluate adjunct courses to be sure that they meet department and CTELT standards.</p>
---------------------------------	--

FY2013 STRATEGY AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

A. Departmental Reflection of Strengths, Needs, Opportunities, and Threats

Current Strengths	Current Needs
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stability: All positions in the department are filled, which has allowed us to shift our attention toward other initiatives and away from hiring. Qualified Faculty: All on-campus faculty have a Ph.D. in History. World Ready: Due to the nature of our curriculum and our faculty, we already emphasize students being “world ready”. We require our majors to take courses in world history and teach Modern World Civilization to non-majors and majors alike. Engage Alumni. We are engaging our alumni in order to find nominees for the alumni awards and to identify alumni that we can highlight for publicity. We are also using their experience to show current undergraduates career possibilities in history.. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Over the last couple years the department lost a tenure-track faculty position; we need this position back in order to more successfully run our program and offer the diversity of courses we would like to, especially after we launch the on-line MA. We need to pursue opportunities for international travel and partnerships. It is difficult to hire and maintain an Asianist; further, we lost a tenure-track faculty spot for said hire.
Future Opportunities	Future Threats
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Expanding our Public History program on-campus and on-line. This will provide students skills beyond the skills they develop as a major that will make them more marketable. Finishing CTELT Course Development so we can fully launch our on-line MA. Expanding our participation in the campus Internationalization effort by offering international trips. Engage more students in undergraduate research. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of faculty is always a concern in the department. It has been a struggle to get all of the positions in the department filled permanently and turn-over has hurt the long-term goal planning of the department. The department becoming overwhelmed with the increase in our MA program due to adding a virtual component and a public history component. Due to the CTELT hold on Course Development we are behind in developing courses that we need to fully launch our MA on-line; the fear is that we will not be able to meet the demand for courses for the next year or two until we have more courses developed Inability to offer enough upper-division courses both on campus and on-line due to faculty shortage. The fear is that the current capacity

	will not allow adequate advancement for students toward their degree program, especially in the on-line MA.
--	---

B. Opportunities for Improvement

Opportunity for Improvement	Resources Required	Expected Result and Completion Date
Funding for Student Internships	Scholarship fund for student internships in other parts of the state or out of state	The department has developed a partnership with the Truman Presidential Library and Museum to place an intern in the Archive in the summer and fall semesters. Because this internship is so far away and student resources are limited, we have been unsuccessful in filling the positions. A stipend to assist students with housing and food would greatly enhance student's ability to participate. The availability of a fund for stipends would allow us to expand our internship opportunities.
Participate in the University's Internationalization effort	Scholarship funds for student travel	One of the limiting factors for student participation is money. If the university offered scholarships for undergraduates the trips may be successful.

III. SUPPORTING MATERIALS

A. Department Degree Program Affinity Diagram(s)

College of Arts and Sciences Affinity Diagram for Degree Programs

What are the **elements/building blocks** of a B.A. degree program in History that will meet the educational needs of the prospective History major?

Characteristics of History Majors	Expected Learning Outcomes	Curriculum	Assessment Approach And Methods	Results
<p><u>Knowledgeable</u> They discover and master the basic factual information concerning the institutional, cultural technological, social, political, economic, and intellectual legacies of past civilizations.</p> <p><u>Analytical</u> They probe the meaning of what they study, comprehend historical facts in terms of the historical frameworks out of which these facts arose, and seek interconnections among historical events.</p> <p><u>Insightful/Creative</u> They use their factual information to form valid interpretations in order to secure understanding; they recognize the roots of contemporary conditions and problems in the past as well as the persistence in the present of the values and mindsets of former eras.</p> <p><u>Humane/Objective</u> They comprehend, interpret, and appreciate cultural diversity as part of their efforts to deal with the complexities of the modern world; they are tolerant, capable of critical thinking, and aware of the dilemmas posed by the human condition.</p> <p><u>Skilled in Communication</u> They know how to conduct meaningful research and how to impart their findings to others in articulate, effective, and persuasive fashions.</p> <p><u>Professional</u> They have the outlook, talent, and technical skills which make them valued and influential members of the university</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Students will demonstrate basic knowledge of the major movements, developments, ideas, and events of the United States, Europe, and at least one additional area of world history. Students will also demonstrate knowledge of how these major concepts and regions interact. Students will demonstrate their ability to read critically, analyze, and synthesize both primary and secondary sources in order to arrive at a reasoned interpretation. Students will demonstrate their ability to analyze and evaluate multiple approaches to history. Students will apply their research, organizational, and writing skills to produce an original historical paper, including evaluating and selecting sources, taking notes, organizing their research, making an argument, and writing effectively. Students will present and defend the results of their original research. Students will assess how natural and cultural factors have influenced the course 	<p><u>Develops Historical Perspective</u> HIST 110 World Civilization to 1500 HIST 111 Modern World Civilization HIST 130 U.S. History to 1877 HIST 131 U.S. History since 1877 (Proficiency in HIST 110, HIST 111, HIST 130, and HIST 131 may be demonstrated by either completing each of the courses or achieving a score of at least 70 percent on each of the Department’s History Proficiency Examinations; HIST 130 and HIST 131 required of teaching majors) HIST 377 Approaches to U.S. History HIST 378 Approaches to World History</p> <p><u>Develops Historical Perspective</u> Four electives (12 hrs.) in upper division United States history courses One elective (3 hrs.) in upper division European history courses One elective (3 hrs.) in upper division World history courses Two electives (6 hrs.) in upper division European OR World history courses</p> <p><u>Develops Research Skills</u> HIST 379 Historical Methods HIST 675 Seminar in History (applied to Historical Perspective requirement)</p>	<p>The progress toward all goals is measured by the following methods/instruments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Senior Exit Survey and Interview administered in the Fall, Spring or Summer semester of Senior year. (ELO 1-7) Alumni satisfaction survey administered regularly beginning in the third year following graduation. (ELO 1-7) Papers to demonstrate the development of research and writing skills, critical thinking, and scholarly ability for HIST 379 and HIST 675. (ELO 2-7) Teaching units to demonstrate development of knowledge content, writing objectives, daily lesson plans, exam construction, technology skills, and student activities by teaching majors in HIST 479. (ELO 1, 2, 3, 6,7) Content Competency Exams and other assignments in Approaches to U.S. History and Approaches to World History. (ELO 1) <p>In addition, all courses are evaluated each semester by students to measure the effectiveness of content and presentation.</p>	<p>HIST 379 Grade Distribution of Final Draft of Research Paper</p> <p>HIST 675 Grade Distribution of Final Draft of Research Paper</p> <p>Course Grade Distribution for U.S. History Approaches and World History Approaches</p> <p>Senior Exit Survey and Interview</p> <p>(Dr. Kim Perez will be in charge of data collection and interpretation for the B.A. in history artifacts and will be assisted by faculty members teaching the above identified courses).</p>

<p>community and successful after graduation in a variety of careers.</p>	<p>of history, including geography, environment, culture, race, ethnicity, gender, and class.</p> <p>7. Students will apply the professional skills and knowledge necessary to prepare them for success in graduate education, teacher education, museum work, and other work.</p>	<p><u>Develops Teaching Skills (For Teaching Majors Only)</u> HIST 277 Early Field Experiences HIST 479 Methods of Teaching Secondary Social Studies</p>		
---	--	--	--	--

College of Arts and Sciences Affinity Diagram for Degree Programs

What are the **elements/building blocks** of a M.A. degree program in History that will meet the educational needs of the prospective History major?

Characteristics of History Majors	Expected Learning Outcomes	Curriculum	Assessment Approach And Methods	Results
<p><u>Knowledgeable</u> They discover and master the basic factual information concerning the institutional, cultural, technological, social, political, economic, and intellectual legacies of past civilizations.</p> <p><u>Analytical</u> They probe the meaning of what they study, comprehend historical facts in terms of the historical frameworks out of which these facts arose, and seek interconnections among historical events.</p> <p><u>Insightful/Creative</u> They use their factual information to form valid interpretations in order to secure understanding; they recognize the roots of contemporary conditions and problems in the past as well as the persistence in the present of the values and mindsets of former eras.</p> <p><u>Humane/Objective</u> They comprehend, interpret, and appreciate cultural diversity as part of their efforts to deal with the complexities of the modern world; they are tolerant, capable of critical thinking, and aware of the dilemmas posed by the</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Students will demonstrate advanced knowledge of the major movements, developments, ideas, and events of the United States, Europe, and at least one additional area of world history. Students will also demonstrate knowledge of how these major concepts and regions interact. Students will demonstrate their ability to read critically, analyze, and synthesize both primary and secondary sources in order to arrive at a reasoned interpretation. Students will demonstrate their ability to analyze and evaluate, at an advanced level, multiple approaches to history. Students will apply their research, organizational, and writing skills to produce an original historical paper, 	<p>Total Program (30 hrs.)</p> <p><u>Develops Knowledge</u> Six or seven electives (18-21 hrs.) in graduate courses, divided between United States and European/World history.</p> <p><u>Develops Professional Awareness</u> HIST 675 Graduate Seminar in History (I), and a choice of HIST 675 Graduate Seminars in History (II), HIST 899 Graduate Thesis in History (6 hrs.)</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The academic progress of all degree candidates is monitored by Graduate Advisor and History Department Graduate Committee. Degree candidates must pass a written and/or oral examination covering all of their graduate work; candidates are evaluated on the basis of their demonstration of factual knowledge, use of critical thinking, and capacity for interpretive analysis. (ELO 1, 2, 3, 6, 8) Degree candidates must submit electronically an approved copy of a research paper, written under the guidance of a graduate faculty member, to prove their ability to conduct original research, integrate the results into a cogent argument, and exhibit 	<p>HIST 675 Grade Distribution of Final Draft of Research Paper</p> <p>Exit Interview & Survey</p> <p>Alumni Survey</p> <p>(Dr. Kim Perez will be in charge of data collection and interpretation for the M.A. in History artifacts. The faculty member who teaches HIST 675 during a given semester assists Dr. Perez in the process.)</p>

<p>human condition.</p> <p><u>Skilled in Communication</u> They know how to conduct meaningful research and how to impart their findings to others in articulate, effective, and persuasive fashions.</p> <p><u>Professional</u> They have the outlook, talent, and technical skills which make them valued and influential members of the university community and successful after graduation in a variety of careers.</p>	<p>including evaluating and selecting sources, taking notes, organizing their research, making an argument, and writing effectively.</p> <p>5. Students will present and defend the results of their original research.</p> <p>6. Students will assess how natural and cultural factors have influenced the course of history, including geography, environment, culture, race, ethnicity, gender, and class.</p> <p>7. Students will apply the professional skills and knowledge necessary to prepare them for success in graduate education, teacher education, museum work, and other work.</p> <p>8. Students will demonstrate their awareness of the more important contemporary theories, fields, approaches, and techniques in the academic discipline of history.</p>		<p>intellectual integrity. (ELO 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)</p> <p>4. Students who choose the non-thesis option must submit two original research papers from HIST 675 to demonstrate the abilities mentioned in 3. (ELO 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8)</p> <p>5. Students will successfully defend the results of their original research in a public presentation and private defense. (ELO 5)</p> <p>6. All courses are evaluated each semester by students to measure the effectiveness of content and presentation.</p> <p>7. Candidate Exit Survey administered in final semester of degree program. (ELO 1-7)</p> <p>8. Alumni satisfaction survey administered regularly, beginning in the third year following graduation. ELO 1-7)</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

B. Department Staffing Plan

College of Arts and Sciences
 Department Staffing Plan and Assignments (Current)
 Department of History
 Date: 06/25/13

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Current Department Needs	Faculty Member	Current Faculty Expertise	Retirement (Birthdate)	Assigned Instructional FTE's	Rank Current Date	Degree Completed	Track	Current Salary In Line
Chair/ World History/ European History	K. Perez	History of Science Research Methods Medieval History Ren and Ref Environmental		.5 .5	Assoc. Prof 2011	Ph.D.	Tenure.	74,091
Latin America/ U.S. History/Modern. World History	N. Caulfield	Latin America Mexico Mexican American Late 19 th c. U.S. U.S. Civil War Labor/Social	1951	1.0	Prof. 2000	Ph.D.	Tenure.	62,614
Mod. World History/ Modern European/ Modern Far East	D. Goodlett	19 & 20 th c. Europe Russia/Soviet Southeastern Europe	1951	1.0	Assoc. Prof 2008	Ph.D.	Tenure	54,671

		Modern Far East						
World History/ U.S. Diplomatic/Virtual College Courses	D. Bovee	Intellectual Social/Cultural U.S. Diplomatic		1.0	Assoc. Prof 2011	Ph.D.	Tenure	53,622
World History/ African History/England/	L. Copp	African History British History Research Methods		1.0	Asst. Prof 2011	ABD (2013 expected completion)	Temporary	44,523
Public History/Western History/Indian History/Women's History	J. Winchester	Public History/Western History/Indian History/Women's History		1.0	Asst. Prof 2012	Ph.D.	Tenure Track	45,403
History of Technology, Science and Education/Secondary Teacher Education	P. Nienkamp	History of Technology, Science and Education/Secondary Teacher Education		1.0	Asst. Prof. 2012	Ph.D.	Tenure Track	45,506

C. Bibliography of Departmental Scholarly Activity

Dr. David Bovee:

Reviews:

- Review of Richard S. Kirkendall, ed., *The Organization of American Historians and the Writing and Teaching of American Teaching to The History Teacher*
- Review of Patrick J. Hayes, *A Catholic Brain Trust: The History of the Catholic Commission on Intellectual and Cultural Affairs, 1945-1965* to The Catholic University of America Press

Chaired Session:

- "Faith and Practice," at the Annual Meeting of the Kansas Association of Historians, Washburn University, Topeka, Kansas, April 26, 2013.

Awards:

- Nominated for President's Distinguished Scholar, 2013

Dr. Norman Caulfield:

Presentations:

- "The Long Slump and the Class War," presented at the Kansas Association of Historians, Washburn University, Topeka, KS, April 26-27.

Research:

- Collaborated with the International Labour Organization's International Institute for Labor Studies series

Professor LaGretia Copp:

Other:

- Completed her Ph.D., 2012, *Ohio State University*, Columbus, OH, Dissertation Title: "There and Back Again: British Agents and Imperial Projects in Nigeria, 1886-1914"

Presentation:

- Session Chair and Commentator, "At Play in the Fields of Adversity," Missouri Valley History Conference, Omaha, NE, March 7-9, 2013.

Dr. David Goodlett:

Research:

- working on 20th century political leaders and how they used language

Dr. Paul Nienkamp:

Publications:

- “Engineering a National Character: Early Land-Grant College Engineering and the Quest for an American Identity in the Late-Nineteenth Century.” – Conference Proceedings, Thinking Land Grants: A “Celebration’ of the 150th Anniversary of the Morrill Land-Grant Act, forthcoming, Fall 2013 by University of Alabama Press.

Presentation:

- *Engineering a National Character: Early Land-Grant College Engineering and the Quest for an American Identity in the Late-Nineteenth Century.* 150th Anniversary of the Morrill Land-Grant College Act and the 125th Anniversary of the Hatch Agricultural Experiment Station Act, Mississippi State University, Starkville, MS, October 2013.

Dr. Kim Perez:

Publication:

- “‘Nature as a Field for Fiction’: Mabel Osgood Wright Responds to the Nature Faker Controversy.” *ISLE: Interdisciplinary Studies in Literature and Environment*, 19.1 (Winter 2012): 24-42.

Research:

- Continued research on the Science and Nature Study activity of Lou Henry Hoover
- Serve as a research consultant on a Kansas Humanities Council Heritage grant

Presentation:

- “Balancing the Real and the Imagined in Nature Literature,” Panel: *Nature as a Catalyst for Creativity*, presented at The World We Have Imagined: Literature, Nature & the Environment, Southwestern College, Winfield, KS, April 4-6, 2013.
- Roundtable Participant, “Attracting and Retaining History Students,” presented at the Kansas Association of Historians, Washburn University, Topeka, KS, April 26-27, 2013.

Dr. Juti Winchester:

Presentation:

- Session Chair, “The History and Current State of Affairs at Academic Community Colleges: A Report from the Four Corners of the American West,” Western History Association Annual Meeting, Denver, Colorado, October 5, 2012.

Research:

- Continued work on her book manuscript on Buffalo Bill Cody

D. Department Program Assessment Results**Department Program Assessment Results****Direct Measures**

ELO 1: Students will demonstrate advanced knowledge of the major movements, developments, ideas, and events of the United States, Europe, and at least one additional area of world history. Students will also demonstrate knowledge of how these major concepts and regions interact.

Assess using: Content Competency Exam in HIST 377 and 378

Results:

Grade/Number	A	B	C	D	U
	25	4	0	2	6

Discussion:

Students take content competency exams in both HIST 377: Approaches to US History and HIST 378: Approaches to World History. The percentage score of their exams is recorded. The vast majority of history majors performed at a high level. Of the 37 students who took the exam in fall 2012 and spring 2013, 25/37 (67.6%) received an A, while 4/37 (10.8%) received a B. The remaining 8/37 (21.6%) received a D or lower (there were no C grades in Fall 2012 or Spring 2013). These results indicate that our students are mastering the content for these courses at a very high level.

Data Available Upon Request

ELOs 2-7: See Affinity Diagram for an explanation of these ELOs. The competencies we are measuring are ability to read critically, analyze and synthesize information, analyze and interpret multiple approaches to history, and their research and writing skills. These skills are all required for producing an original research paper.

Assess using: Percentage grade on final draft of original research papers in HIST 379: Historical Methods and HIST 675: Seminar.

Results:

HIST 379: NOTE that this information is also used for NCATE accreditation which is why we refer to Standards.

The purpose of the artifact in question, a final draft of an original research papers meets the History and Government Professional Standards in the following manner:

- **Standard #1:** Students were required to select their own topics and part of this process was selecting the question that they seek to ask of the historical material and selecting the evidence to demonstrate their thesis statement (Knowledge 1). Students would have to analyze how the subject matter of their choice changed over time and would also seek to explain the cause behind the historical change (Knowledge 2). Further, students had to read and understand the historical secondary literature regarding their topic which encouraged them to “investigate, interpret and analyze multiple historical and contemporary viewpoints” (Knowledge 3). Finally students had to weigh evidence from the primary literature and the arguments from the secondary literature which encouraged “checking their credibility, validating and weight evidence for claims and searching for causality (Performance 2).

- **Standard #3:** The focus of the research assignment was U.S. History because primary sources would be more readily available in the Forsyth Library. Therefore, each topic that the students chose was based in U.S. History, which furthered their understanding of a particular area of this large subject matter. In order to correctly evaluate their primary and secondary literature the students had to understand the “difference between historical facts and interpretations” (Knowledge 2). They had to understand the process and execute historical research (Knowledge 3). Because students were required to work with primary documents they were required to “reconstruct the literal meaning of a historical passage” and to “identify the central questions addressed in historical narrative” (Performance 1). It should be noted that many of these standards were emphasized in previous exercises which culminated in their use in their final drafts of their research papers. Further, other standards were emphasized in exercises that may have enhanced, but did not contribute directly, their final drafts.

Data Available Upon Request

Fall 2012:

There were five Teacher’s Education majors and four non-teaching majors enrolled at the end of the semester. The highest score on the final draft was by a non-teaching major, scoring 95.5%. This student was also a graduate student retaking an undergraduate course. Typically, these students score higher than the undergraduate students, and this semester continued the trend. The second highest score (91.5%) was also a non-teaching major. There is no discernible pattern to the data with regards to the remaining three students who submitted a final research paper. The third highest score (87%) was earned by a History Teacher Education major, while the fourth highest score (82%) was earned by a non-teaching history major. The lowest score of the five (69%) was earned by a Teacher Education major. This indicates significant variability in the quality of work submitted by History Teacher Education majors.

Three of the four students who did not submit a final research paper, and all of whom stopped coming to class early in the semester without officially dropping the class, were Teacher Education majors. The remaining student, who attended class but did not submit a final research paper, was a non-education major. This indicates a high percentage of Teacher Education majors who did not finish the requirements of the course.

There were three female and six male students still enrolled in the class at the end of the semester. There is no discernible pattern in the gender data. The highest score and fourth highest score were earned by females, while the second highest, third highest, and lowest scores were submitted by males. Of the students who did not turn in a final research paper, one was female and three were male.

Spring 2013:

There were three History Teacher Education majors and five non-teaching majors enrolled in the class at the end of the semester. The highest score on the final paper was by a non-teaching major, scoring 87%. The second highest score (80%) was earned by two students – one was a History Teaching major and the other was a non-teaching major. The third highest score (78%) was earned by a Teaching Education major. The lowest score of the five students who turned in a final paper (55%) was earned by a non-teaching major. The two History

Teaching majors who turned in final papers fell within the median range of grades. The scores do not indicate a significant variability in the quality of work submitted by non-teaching majors.

All three students who did not submit a final research paper stopped coming to class without officially dropping the course. One of these students was a Teaching Education major. This student has subsequently dropped the Teacher Education major for personal reasons, but remains a History major. The pattern of non-completion for the final paper and course indicates that one-third of Teacher Education majors did not finish the requirements of the course during the Spring 2013 semester.

There were two female and six male students still enrolled in the class at the end of the semester. All Teacher Education majors were male. The highest and second highest scores (87%, 80% and 80%) were earned by males; non-teaching, non-teaching and teaching majors respectively. The lowest paper score was earned by a female student. Of the three students who did not turn in final papers, one was female and two were male.

HIST 675:

NOTE that this information is also used for NCATE accreditation which is why we refer to Standards. HIST 675 is also used as a comparison with HIST 379 data, both utilizing final original research paper drafts (unless otherwise noted) to meet the History and Government Professional Standards. This requires that the same standards be applied to both HIST 379 and HIST 675 each semester.

The purpose of the artifact in question, a final draft of an original research paper (unless otherwise noted) meets the History and Government Professional Standards in the following manner:

- **Standard #1:** Students were required to select their own topics and part of this process was selecting the question that they seek to ask of the historical material and selecting the evidence to demonstrate their thesis statement (Knowledge 1). Students would have to analyze how the subject matter of their choice changed over time and would also seek to explain the cause behind the historical change (Knowledge 2). Further, students had to read and understand the historical secondary literature regarding their topic which encouraged them to “investigate, interpret and analyze multiple historical and contemporary viewpoints” (Knowledge 3). Finally students had to weigh evidence from the primary literature and the arguments from the secondary literature which encouraged “checking their credibility, validating and weight evidence for claims and searching for causality (Performance 2).
- **Standard #3:** The focus of the research assignment was U.S. History because primary sources would be more readily available in the Forsyth Library. Therefore, each topic that the students chose was based in U.S. History, which furthered their understanding of a particular area of this large subject matter. In order to correctly evaluate their primary and secondary literature the students had to understand the “difference between historical facts and interpretations” (Knowledge 2). They had to understand the process and execute historical research (Knowledge 3). Because students were required to work with primary documents they were required to “reconstruct the literal meaning of a historical passage” and to “identify the central questions addressed in historical narrative”

(Performance 1). It should be noted that many of these standards were emphasized in previous exercises which culminated in their use in their final drafts of their research papers. Further, other standards were emphasized in exercises that may have enhanced, but did not contribute directly, their final drafts.

Data Available Upon Request

Fall 2012 – HIST 675: U.S. Religious History

Interpretation of Data

There were five students enrolled in the class at the end of the semester, three graduate students and two undergraduate students. Two graduate students were female, and one was male. Both undergraduate students were male. The three highest grades on the research paper (98, 95 and 92.5%) were all by a graduate students, which maintained the trend that graduate students typically score higher than undergraduates. The undergraduate scores (90 and 82.5%) were still well above average, though the sample size was quite small.

The students' final drafts generally reflect the grading criteria (see attached document for HIST 675: U.S. Religious History). Areas of concern include proper footnote form, lack of analysis, weak and unclear introduction and conclusion paragraphs, use of unreliable sources, poor writing style and poor grammar and spelling.

Only one of the students was a History Teacher Education major, and he was one of the two undergraduates. His score of 90% on the final research paper is well above average, though the second lowest score in the class. Though the sample size of one is too small, it does indicate that History Teaching major continue to perform well in seminar courses.

There is no discernible pattern in the gender data. The two female students were both graduate students and both scored in the "A" range, above 90% on their final research papers. These two student had the highest and third highest scores in the class (98 and 92.5% respectively). The three male students were comprised of one graduate student, who scored a 95%, and the two undergraduate students (90 and 82.5% respectively). The data showed the graduate and undergraduate status had a greater significance in associate with final research papers than any other category.

Grading Criteria Available on Request

Spring 2013 – HIST 675: Technology in World History

NOTE: The seminar course during this semester used a modified approach to the typical artifact of a final original research paper. This semester's course utilized a Bibliographic Research Essay based on extensive secondary source reading during the semester. Both Standard #1 and Standard #3, which are typically used for this criteria, are still valid forms of assessment and comparison, as detailed below.

The purpose of the artifact for this course, a final essay paper, meets the History and Government Professional Standards in the following manner.

- **Standard #1:** Students were required to select their own topics and analyze how that topic had changed over time in a number of different areas. They also had to seek to explain the causes of historical change (Knowledge 2). As part of reading multiple secondary sources and gaining a better understanding of the historical literature regarding their topic, they were asked to “investigate, interpret, and analyze multiple historical and contemporary viewpoints.” (Knowledge 3). In their final paper, students had to evaluate their sources and arrive at a thesis statement regarding the historiographical approach to their topic (Knowledge 1). Students had to weigh evidence and arguments from the secondary literature, encouraging them to “check their credibility, and validate and weigh evidence for claims and search for causality” (Performance 2).

- **Standard #3:** The focus of their topic was left up to the students, following five weeks of general discussion on the development of technology in world history using the two assigned texts. Part of this assignment was to allow them to investigate a topic they were interested in, so that they would be more driven to find and research sources. The other part of this process was to allow them to understand the importance of selecting a topic based on materials available and how that topic might take them in different directions than they originally intended. The topics focused primarily on Western Civilization and American related history, though two of the topics did branch significantly into Eastern cultures. Each of the topics the students chose allowed them to gain a deeper understanding of how technology plays a role in political, economic, and social history, as well as how society affects the development of technology over time. In order to appropriately evaluate and analyze their secondary sources, the students had to understand the “differences between historical facts and interpretations” (Knowledge 2), as well as understanding the process of historical research and carrying out their investigations in a timely fashion (Knowledge 3). Though the students did not “reconstruct the literal meaning of a historical passage” or “identify the central questions addressed in the historical narrative” of primary documents (Performance 1), they were asked to critically examine and analyze the author’s approaches and use of primary historical documents and evaluate the aspects of various author’s historical narratives as they applied to their chosen topics. Historical skills were emphasized throughout the semester and these skills along with questions asked during the semester were then made part of the final essay analysis of the literature the student had reviewed for the course.

Interpretation of Data

The artifact used in this course was the final essay paper. This paper was not an original research paper, rather the course was structured to focus on other areas of Expected Learning Outcomes, while still meeting Standards #1 and #3 as described above. For undergraduates, the focus was on ELO’s 2, 3, and 6, with components of 4 and 5 included (see Department Affinity Diagram for an explanation of the ELO’s). Students were asked to critically read, analyze, and synthesize secondary sources on the history of technology, focusing their attention on a specific topic of their choosing in consultation with the instructor.

Over the course of the semester each student analyzed and evaluated multiple sources and approaches (six on their chosen specific topic and two assigned general texts). Each week, students were asked to present and defend their analysis and evaluation of their sources in a three minute presentation of the thesis, supporting evidence, and sources used by the author. Also over the course of the semester they were asked to keep in mind three questions: 1) What is

technology?, 2) Why does technology change?, and 3) How does technology affect society and society affect technology? These three questions were meant to focus their attention on natural and cultural factors that might have influenced their topic of choice.

The final artifact was a Bibliographic Synthesis Essay in which each student was asked to provide a brief thematic summary of their topic from the readings they did (themes, and major components, summary of interpretations), an historiographical summary of their readings (viewpoints of authors, conclusions, analysis or interpretations, an evaluation of interpretations, and a student generated overall thesis for their topic), and address the three overall questions of the course.

There were four history majors, one general education (historical emphasis), and one graduate student enrolled in the course. The highest score on the final paper was by a non-traditional student who had taken multiple upper level courses, scoring a 95%. The student who did not submit a final paper, had stopped taking part in class in early March. The one graduate student performed comparably with the other undergraduates. She was also assigned an annotated bibliography assessment to support her topic research readings and to enhance her historiographical understanding of the topic for her future comprehensive exams. The remaining students performed comparably in the course and submitted final essays in the average to above average range (80-90%). There were no teaching majors in the class, and the student submitted papers all contained numerous errors in citation usage, grammar, structure, and analysis.

There were four female students and two male students enrolled in the class. There was no discernible pattern associated with gender. The highest final essay score was by a male (95%), the second highest by a female (90%), and the remaining three were very close in final scores (85, 83, and 80%). The one student who did not turn in a paper was female.

Guidelines and Grading Criteria Available Upon Request

Indirect Measures

Summary: Undergraduate Senior History Major Exit Survey—Fall 2012

5=Strongly Agree

4=Agree

3=Neither Agree or Disagree

2=Disagree

1=Strongly Disagree

1. I have a better understanding of the field of history and the study of history than when I began the program.
Average= 4.67/5 (93%)
2. I have a much better understanding of history as both a national and international dynamic.
Average= 4.83/5 (96%)
3. I have a much better understanding of U.S. History than when I began the program.
Average= 4.33/5 (87%)

4. I have a much better understanding of World History than when I began the program.
Average= 4.83/5 (96%)
5. I better understand the ways in which U.S. History is linked to World History.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
6. I have a much better appreciation of elements of culture, i.e. nationality, religion, race, ethnicity, gender, class, etc. and their role(s) in influencing historical change.
Average= 4.5/5 (90%)
7. I have substantially improved my critical thinking skills.
Average= 4.33/5 (87%)
8. I feel that my writing ability has improved as result of my experiences in the History Department.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
9. I feel that my computer literacy and other technological skills related to history have improved as a result of my experienced in the History Department.
Average= 3.83/5 (76%)
10. My research skills have improved as a result of my experiences in the History Department.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
11. I am well prepared either to begin work in a history-related field (teaching, public history, etc.) or to begin graduate study in history.
Average= 4.66/5 (93%)

Summary of Results: The Undergraduate Exit Survey results demonstrate that students feel that they have a better understanding of the dynamics of both American history (87%) and World history (96%) and the relationship between the two (100%). Overall, they feel that they have a much better understanding of the field of history (90%) when they leave the program. Much of the focus of the history program is research and writing, which is required in almost every history course we offer; this emphasis has produced students who feel that they are better researchers (100%) and writers (100%) upon graduating from the history program. There are a couple areas that could use some improvement; the department could do a better job emphasizing computer literacy and calling attention to when students are asked to use their critical thinking skills. Overall, the students feel that the department has done a great job preparing them for their careers in the field or for graduate school (93%). If you averaged the scores for the questions that we ask to assess undergraduate student satisfaction with the department and program, students rate their satisfaction a 93% or an A.

Summary: M.A. Candidate Exit Survey—Fall 2012
--

5=Strongly Agree
 4=Agree
 3=Neither Agree or Disagree
 2=Disagree

1=Strongly Disagree

1. I have a better understanding of the field of history and the study of history than when I began the program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
2. I have a much better understanding of history as both a national and international dynamic.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
3. I have a much better understanding of U.S. History than when I began the program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
4. I have a much better understanding of World History than when I began the program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
5. I better understand the ways in which U.S. History is linked to World History.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
6. I have a much better appreciation of elements of culture, i.e. nationality, religion, race, ethnicity, gender, class, etc. and their role(s) in influencing historical change.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
7. I feel capable of undertaking Ph.D. studies in History.
Average= 3/5 (60%)
8. I feel that the increase in my knowledge of history, research skills, writing skills justified the additional expenditure of time and resources required by the department's M.A. program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
9. I feel that my computer literacy and other technological skills related to history have improved as a result of my experienced in the History Department's M.A. program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
10. I am satisfied with the personal and professional growth opportunities provided by the department's M.A. program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)

Summary of Results: The M.A. Candidate Exit Survey results demonstrate that students feel that they have a better understanding of the dynamics of both American history (100%) and World history (100%) and the relationship between the two (100%). Overall, they feel that they have a much better understanding of the field of history (100%) when they leave the program. Much of the focus of the history program is research and writing, which is required in every graduate-level history course we offer. Graduate students who write a thesis, which is writing and research intensive, also take a seminar. Those students who choose the non-thesis option are asked to take two seminars that emphasize research and writing. This emphasis on research and writing has produced students who feel that they are better researchers and writers (100%) upon graduating with and M.A. in history. As with the undergraduates,

the department could emphasize computer literacy more in the classroom. Overall the students feel that they are satisfied with their personal and professional growth (100%). The student interviewed did not feel prepared to continue on to the Ph.D. level (60%), but that has never been the intent of this student.. Again, if you average the scores for the questions that we ask to assess graduate student satisfaction with the department and program, students rate their satisfaction at 94% or an A.

Summary: Undergraduate Senior History Major Exit Survey—Spring 2013
--

5=Strongly Agree

4=Agree

3=Neither Agree or Disagree

2=Disagree

1=Strongly Disagree

1. I have a better understanding of the field of history and the study of history than when I began the program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
2. I have a much better understanding of history as both a national and international dynamic.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
3. I have a much better understanding of U.S. History than when I began the program.
Average= 4.75/5 (95%)
4. I have a much better understanding of World History than when I began the program.
Average= 4.75/5 (95%)
5. I better understand the ways in which U.S. History is linked to World History.
Average= 4.5/5 (90%)
6. I have a much better appreciation of elements of culture, i.e. nationality, religion, race, ethnicity, gender, class, etc. and their role(s) in influencing historical change.
Average= 4.75/5 (95%)
7. I have substantially improved my critical thinking skills.
Average= 4.75/5 (95%)
8. I feel that my writing ability has improved as result of my experiences in the History Department.
Average= 4.25/5 (85%)
9. I feel that my computer literacy and other technological skills related to history have improved as a result of my experienced in the History Department.
Average= 3.25/5 (65%)

10. My research skills have improved as a result of my experiences in the History Department.
Average= 5/5 (100%)

11. I am well prepared either to begin work in a history-related field (teaching, public history, etc.) or to begin graduate study in history.
Average= 5/5 (100%)

Summary of Results: The Undergraduate Exit Survey results demonstrate that students feel that they have a better understanding of the dynamics of both American history (95%) and World history (95%) and the relationship between the two (90%). Overall, they feel that they have a much better understanding of the field of history (100%) when they leave the program. Much of the focus of the history program is research and writing, which is required in almost every history course we offer; this emphasis has produced students who feel that they are better researchers (100%) and critical thinkers (95%) upon graduating from the history program. There are a couple areas that could use some improvement; the department could do a better job emphasizing computer literacy. Overall, the students feel that the department has done a great job preparing them for their careers in the field or for graduate school (100%). If you averaged the scores for the questions that we ask to assess undergraduate student satisfaction with the department and program, students rate their satisfaction a 93% or an A.

Summary: M.A. Candidate Exit Survey—Spring 2013

5=Strongly Agree

4=Agree

3=Neither Agree or Disagree

2=Disagree

1=Strongly Disagree

1. I have a better understanding of the field of history and the study of history than when I began the program.

Average= 5/5 (100%)

2. I have a much better understanding of history as both a national and international dynamic.

Average= 4.5/5 (90%)

3. I have a much better understanding of U.S. History than when I began the program.

Average= 3.5/5 (70%)

4. I have a much better understanding of World History than when I began the program.

Average= 5/5 (100%)

5. I better understand the ways in which U.S. History is linked to World History.

Average= 4.5/5 (90%)

6. I have a much better appreciation of elements of culture, i.e. nationality, religion, race, ethnicity, gender, class, etc. and their role(s) in influencing historical change.

Average= 5/5 (100%)

7. I feel capable of undertaking Ph.D. studies in History.
Average= 4.5/5 (90%)
8. I feel that the increase in my knowledge of history, research skills, writing skills justified the additional expenditure of time and resources required by the department's M.A. program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)
9. I feel that my computer literacy and other technological skills related to history have improved as a result of my experienced in the History Department's M.A. program.
Average= 3.5/5 (70%)
10. I am satisfied with the personal and professional growth opportunities provided by the department's M.A. program.
Average= 5/5 (100%)

Summary of Results: The M.A. Candidate Exit Survey results demonstrate that students feel that they have a better understanding of history as both a national and international dynamic (90%) and World history (100%) and the relationship between World and American history (90%). Overall, they feel that they have a much better understanding of the field of history (100%) when they leave the program. Much of the focus of the history program is research and writing, which is required in every graduate-level history course we offer. Graduate students who write a thesis, which is writing and research intensive, also take a seminar. Those students who choose the non-thesis option are asked to take two seminars that emphasize research and writing. This emphasis on research and writing has produced students who feel that they are better researchers and writers (100%) upon graduating with and M.A. in history. As with the undergraduates, the department could emphasize computer literacy more in the classroom. Overall the students feel that they are satisfied with their personal and professional growth (100%) and those that seek to pursue a Ph.D. (of which there was only one in this group) felt prepared for that task (90%). Again, if you average the scores for the questions that we ask to assess graduate student satisfaction with the department and program, students rate their satisfaction at 91% or an A.

Interview Responses for the Exit Surveys are Available Upon Request.

E. Other Departmental Information

N/A

General Parameters

1. No more than 20 pages, excluding appendix information.
2. Report submitted electronically to Dean, Assistant Provost for Quality Management, and Provost.
3. Note deadlines attached below.

Annual Timeline for Department Annual Report

April 1	Final template and Directions distributed to Department Chairs. Selected enrollment data (fall 20 th day counts) distributed to Chairs and Deans in the departmental template.
June 1	Student system information (graduates, SCH) delivered to Chairs. Final cutoff date for elements to be considered in the Department's Annual Report.
June 30	Complete Department Annual Report due to Deans, Assistant Provost for Quality Management, and Provost. Submit electronically.
August 15	Completed College Annual Report due to Assistant Provost for Quality Management and Provost.