

1. Rubric.

Please find attached to this email a completed rubric for our senior seminar and a curriculum map for our research skills component of student learning.

2. Student Assessment Plan.

Our SAP has not changed.

3. Response to Targeted Feedback.

During the fall semester department members finalized our research-focused curriculum map. The map in hand, Dr. Sasha Pfau created an exercise for her Hist 226 designed to teach students how to select relevant sources, which is one aspect of our research map and a scaffold goal for student research. Similarly, Dr. Hancock added an assignment in his Hist 342 and modified an existing assignment in his Hist 230 as a result of our research map. Dr. Hancock's new assignment asked students to locate a primary source, then two scholarly sources that pertained to the primary sources and finally, write an essay that addresses how the secondary source authors used the primary source in their studies. The Hist 230 assignment asked students to locate a scholar who interested them and write about how the author uses an ethnohistorical reading of primary sources.

Dr. Shutt used the senior seminar rubric for papers and presentations in the Hist 480 Capstone course. Students used the presentation rubric to give their peers feedback on practice presentations while Dr. Shutt used the paper and presentation rubric to give students feedback on their graded work.

Finally, both Drs. Shutt and Skok have plans to incorporate aspects of the research rubric in their 2019-2010 classes.

History Major Capstone Rubric

Component	Basic	Competent	Exemplary
Capstone Paper	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument is unclear and/or unoriginal.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents an argument, though it may lack sophistication and/or coherence across the body of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents a clear, coherent, and sophisticated argument about significant aspects of the topic.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates little creativity in choice of and approach to topic and sources; historical grounding is not clear.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates limited creativity in choice of and approach to topic and sources; historical grounding may be less clear or inconsistent.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates creativity in choice of and methodological approach to topic and sources, while maintaining historical grounding.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Fails to engage the interest of the reader due to a lack of relevant anecdotes, questions, or quotes, lack of clarity, or poor organization.	<input type="checkbox"/> Presents relevant information through basic means; features some engaging devices, but may lack not hold reader's attention throughout.	<input type="checkbox"/> Engages reader in the topic through skillful and creative use of relevant anecdotes, questions, quotes, or other devices.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not engage secondary literature or make an effort to explain the significance of own work in the field.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates some understanding of/engagement with secondary literature on topic; attempts to explain the relevance and significance of own work in the field.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates a thorough understanding of historiographical approaches to the topic and situates own work in the field.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence is clearly insufficient, of poor quality, and/or not relevant to the topic of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Evidence is deployed in support of argument, though it may not fully support claims, may be of limited quality, and/or may not clearly relate to the overall argument of the paper.	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates skillful use of high quality, credible, relevant sources to support the argument of the paper.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is not clear; paper lacks coherence, logical flow, and integrity.	<input type="checkbox"/> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is evident, though it may not be entirely clear or consistent, and/or may not clearly contribute to the logical development of the argument.	<input type="checkbox"/> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and contributes to the logical development of the argument of the paper.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Demonstrates poor control of syntax and mechanics, lack of attention to basic spelling and grammar errors, and uninformed use of topic-related vocabulary.	<input type="checkbox"/> Communicates meaning to readers, but may lack sophisticated diction and/or control of syntax and mechanics; some basic spelling and grammar errors have not been corrected.	<input type="checkbox"/> Uses graceful language that skillfully communicates meaning to readers with clarity and fluency; is virtually error free.

History Major Capstone Rubric

Capstone Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument is unclear and lacking cues (signposting phrases, vocal cues, PowerPoint slides, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> Provides a discernable argument that is indicated by some cues (signposting phrases, vocal cues, PowerPoint slides, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly expresses an argument through the use of signposting phrases, vocal cues, PowerPoint slides, or other means.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat difficult to gain and maintain audience attention. Lacks interesting hook, vivid language, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> An engaging presentation with a good hook; holds audience attention through most of the presentation through limited use of vivid language, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, etc..	<input type="checkbox"/> Engages the audience in the topic through the use of an interesting hook, vivid language, eye contact, vocal expressiveness, or other means.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Relationship between argument and larger scholarship is not articulated through the use of signposting phrases, PowerPoint slides, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument is placed within larger scholarship, though this relationship could be made clearer through the use of signposting phrases, PowerPoint slides, etc.	<input type="checkbox"/> Clearly expresses the relationship between own work and secondary historical literature on the topic through the use of signposting phrases, PowerPoint slides, etc.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument is supported by limited, vague, or misunderstood evidence with no clear ties to the overarching claims of the presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument is supported by some evidence, but evidence is vague or not clearly tied to the overarching claims of the presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Argument is supported by specific evidence that is directly tied to the overarching claims of the presentation.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Vaguely connects ideas with a generic use of language for the intended audience. Needs more transitions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Has a natural progression of ideas with awareness of the audience and clear transitions.	<input type="checkbox"/> Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is clearly and consistently observable and makes the content of the presentation cohesive and accessible to the audience.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Some issues with tone, body language, eye contact, and/or vocal presentation. If applicable, PowerPoint could use editing to better communicate ideas.	<input type="checkbox"/> Tone, body language, eye contact, and vocal presentation are generally appropriate, but may be inconsistent. If applicable, PowerPoint used well to supplement the presentation.	<input type="checkbox"/> Appropriate tone, body language, eye contact, and varied vocal presentation. If applicable, PowerPoint is used effectively to add value to the presentation.

History Major Capstone Rubric

Peer Review	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not participate consistently, fails to complete assigned peer reviews on time or in a thorough and thoughtful manner.	<input type="checkbox"/> Participates in peer review activities consistently; not always prepared or thorough in review work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Participates in all peer review activities and completes all assigned peer reviews on time and in a thorough and thoughtful manner.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Does not provide written and oral feedback, or provides feedback that is vague, mean-spirited, or otherwise detrimental to peers' revision process.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provides written and oral feedback that focuses on minutiae, is imprecise, or otherwise lacks helpful critique.	<input type="checkbox"/> Provides written and oral feedback to peers that is critical and precise, but also constructive.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Detrimental to collegial and supportive group climate through use of demeaning or demoralizing communication, lack of thoughtful, careful, and respectful engagement with peers' work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Participates in group, but uses written or oral communication that does not always express a thoughtful, careful, and respectful attitude toward peers' work.	<input type="checkbox"/> Contributes to a collegial and supportive group climate through use of polite and constructive communication and demonstration of thoughtful, careful, and respectful engagement with peers' work.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Rarely or never demonstrates active listening and is not receptive to constructive critique.	<input type="checkbox"/> Sporadically demonstrates active listening and receptiveness to constructive critique.	<input type="checkbox"/> Consistently demonstrates active listening and receptiveness to constructive critique.