

**NECHE Inventory of Educational Effectiveness Indicators  
Undergraduate Programs  
(History, AY 22-23)**

Degree Granting Program Name	(1) List ONLY the program learning objective(s) assessed during the current reporting period	(2) For each learning objective listed in column (1), other than GPA, what data/ evidence was used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated objectives? (e.g., capstone assignment, portfolio review, licensure examination)	(3) What were the results/outcomes/findings/conclusion(s) of the assessment? Explain results/findings/conclusions for each program learning objective listed in column (1)	(4) Who interprets the evidence? Describe the process (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee).	(5) What changes/improvements have been made as a result of using the data/evidence (3)? Link discussion in this column with a learning objective (1) and the results of assessing that objective (3)	(6) Date of most recent program review
History	PLO 3: Evaluate and analyze scholarly sources, with particular attention to argument, use of evidence, and place in the literature.	Assessment of a scholarly source worksheet using an agreed-upon rubric.	Overall students did best on properly citing scholarly works and identifying an author's arguments. In both of these cases the average was about 2.5 (on a 0-5 scale) and approximately half of all students met the benchmark target of a 3, with less than 15% falling into the 0-1 category. There is still room for progress in these areas, but overall students demonstrated relative proficiency in these areas. Overall, students struggled the most with identifying an author's intended historiographic contribution. The quantitative data shows no evidence of development in the assessed skills as students progress through the major. Some of this variation and lack of linear progress may be explained by the different nature of articles assigned, points an assignment was worth, and other elements that affected how challenging it was to complete the worksheet and what incentives students had to do their best work, but there are also some features of the patterns to suggest that scores may correlate to some degree with how much time and attention was devoted to an individual skill in that specific course. In other words, the data suggests that students are learning to do each skill, but are frequently not transferring that	The program assessment coordinator processes the data and compiles a report. The report is then circulated to the entire department and findings and any possible changes are discussed by the department as a whole.	This is going to be the subject of an upcoming department meeting. The results have been circulated to members of the department to review in advance. department to review in advance.	2019

			knowledge between semesters and courses. Helping students see more explicitly the continued applicability of these skills after they leave a given course should be the next item of the department's focus.			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--



If you have any questions or concerns about the form, please contact Jena Shepard at [jshepard1@framingham.edu](mailto:jshepard1@framingham.edu) or 508-215-5884.

## Program Assessment

First Name: \* Sarah

Last Name: \* Mulhall Adelman

Banner ID: \* 300818719

Email: \* sadelman1@framingham.edu

Please select the reporting period this assessment/accreditation work was completed:

\* 2022-2023

Please select the type of program you completed assessment/accreditation work for this reporting period:

Note: If changing your initial selection, please refresh this page prior to making a new selection.

\* Undergraduate Program

Please select the program you completed assessment for during this reporting period:

\* History

Please select the option that best describes the assessment work completed during this reporting period.

- \*  Only assessed program learning objective(s)
- Only completed other assessment activities (ex. assessment plan, rubrics etc.)
- Assessed program learning objective(s) and completed other assessment activities (ex. assessment plan, rubrics etc.)
- Did not undertake program assessment work

## Program Learning Objectives Assessed

List the first program learning objective assessed during this reporting period:

Evaluate and analyze scholarly sources, with particular attention to argument, use of evidence, and place in the literature.

For the first program learning objective assessed, other than GPA, what data/evidence was used to assess student learning? (e.g. capstone assignment, portfolio review, licensure examination)

Assessment of a scholarly source worksheet using an agreed-upon rubric.

For the first program learning objective assessed what were the results/outcomes/findings/conclusion(s)?

Overall students did best on properly citing scholarly works and identifying an author's arguments. In both of these cases the average was about 2.5 (on a 0-5 scale) and approximately half of all students meet the benchmark target of a 3, with less than 15% falling into the 0-1 category. There is still room for progress in these areas, but overall students demonstrated relative proficiency in these areas. Overall, students struggled the most with identifying an author's intended historiographic contribution. The quantitative data shows no evidence of development in the assessed skills as students progress through the major. Some of this variation and lack of linear progress may be explained by the different nature of articles assigned, points an assignment was worth, and other elements that impacted how challenging it was to complete the worksheet and what incentives students had to do their best work, but there are also some features of the patterns to suggest that scores may correlate to some degree with how much time and attention was devoted to an individual skill in that specific course. In other words, the data suggests that students are learning to do each skill, but are frequently not transferring that knowledge between semesters and courses. Helping students see more explicitly the continued applicability of these skills after they leave a given course should be the next item of the department's focus.

Attach any additional documents (data or survey summaries, charts, graphs etc.) that support your results/findings/conclusions (optional):

For the first program learning objective assessed what changes/improvements have been made as a result of using the data/evidence?

This is going to be the subject of an upcoming department meeting. The results have been circulated to members of the department to review in advance.

Did you assess any additional program learning objectives during this reporting period?

- Yes
- No

Who interprets the results/findings of the assessment? Describe the process (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee).

The program assessment coordinator processes the data and compiles a report. The report is then circulated to the entire department and findings and any possible changes are discussed by the department as a whole.

### Funding

Are you seeking funding for assessment work completed in this report?

You can request a maximum of \$2,000 for this reporting period.

- Yes
- No

### Program Information

Enter the year of the most recent program review. If the program is new, enter the upcoming program review year or enter TBD (to be determined).

\*2019

Insert the URL of the web page where Program Learning Objectives for this program are published:

NECHE requires this as part of being transparent to stakeholders.

\*<https://www.framingham.edu/academics/colleges/arts-and-humanities/history/mission-and-objectives/index>

### Signatures

...3130343934

Sarah Mulhall Adelman  
Submitter Signature

10/26/2023  
Date

### Office of Institutional Assessment

Office of Institutional Assessment Only

\_\_\_\_\_  
Institutional Assessment Signature

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date