## Student Learning Outcomes Assessment
Department: HAWL – History program

### Academic Year: 2014-2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Direct Measure (DM)</th>
<th>DM Results</th>
<th>Indirect Measure (IM)</th>
<th>IM Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted November 2015</td>
<td>Ability to understand general historical terminology</td>
<td>Conducted content assessment</td>
<td>Average score: 73%. Previous averages: 72%, 71%, 67%</td>
<td>Collection of syllabi: HIST 100, 300, 499</td>
<td>Rubrics are reflected in syllabi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Impression

**Limitations**
No measures were taken regarding the second capstone (which is HIST 495, Internship in History).

**Same as left — no data re. HIST 495**

### Proposed Action Item: Assessment Tool
Revise/update Content Assessment

### Proposed Action Item: Program Content and Course Assessment Practices
Discuss mechanics of administering senior exit survey in Spring 2016.

### Action Items Implemented
New concentrations in History (Military History and Digital History)

### Objective to be Assessed Next Year
Focus on citation has been considered.

### Feedback
1. In what courses was the content assessment conducted (i.e., only with seniors?)
2. Is 73% high enough to meet your standards? What do you propose to do with your programs to raise your results?
3. Syllabi are not indirect measures. See [http://www.edinboro.edu/directory/offices-services/provost/documents/Direct%20Indirect%20Measures.pdf](http://www.edinboro.edu/directory/offices-services/provost/documents/Direct%20Indirect%20Measures.pdf) for a complete list of options. Why are you reporting on syllabi from lower-level courses? What results are you gathering from the syllabi? (i.e., what are they telling you about the degree to which your students are meeting your standards in your program?)
4. Were the new concentrations developed as the result of SLOA data?
## Political Science
### Student Learning Outcomes Assessment, 2015-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective Assessed</th>
<th>Direct Measure</th>
<th>Direct Measure Results</th>
<th>Indirect Measure</th>
<th>Analysis of Indirect Measure Results</th>
<th>Proposed Action Items</th>
<th>Implemented Action Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective communication skills – written communications skills</td>
<td>Student research papers scored with AACU’s written communication rubric</td>
<td>Class average for POLI 507, Seminar in Political Science: <strong>12.08</strong> (of possible 20: scores of 1-4 in five categories). N = 12</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>The POLI faculty should discuss the role of oral presentations in lower- and higher-level courses (beyond POLI 300, Political Analysis, and POLI 507, Seminar in Political Science), and will evaluate students’ performances in this category in a future annual assessment.</td>
<td>Political Science faculty members have already introduced a required writing assignment for each 100-level course.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>