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#### Part A

**1. Graduate Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)**

By the time students complete their Master of Arts degree program in history, they should be able to:

1. See themselves and their society from different times and places, displaying a sense of informed perspective and a mature view of human nature.
2. Read and think critically, write and speak clearly and persuasively, and conduct research effectively.
3. Exhibit sensitivities to human values in their own and other cultural traditions.
4. Appreciate their natural and cultural environments.
5. Respect scientific and technological developments and recognize their impact on humankind.

**Graduate Program Learning Outcomes (MA, Concentration in History Education)**

By the time students complete their Master of Arts degree in history, with a concentration in history education, they should be able to demonstrate the learning in the Master of Arts program above and additionally be able to:

6. Participate knowledgeably in the affairs of the world around them, drawing upon understandings shaped through reading, writing, and lectures concerning the past.

**2. Map of PLOs to University Learning Goals (ULGs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ULG</th>
<th>PLO (above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Knowledge</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Integrative Knowledge</td>
<td>3 &amp; 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Skills</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Knowledge</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Global Responsibilities</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This mapping was completed by the current department Assessment Committee representative in 2014 in consultation with members of the College of Social Science’s Assessment Committee.

3. Alignment – Matrix of PLOs to Courses
There is no class taken by all graduate students in history since they choose specialties in European, United States, or World History and complete different sets of requirements. All of our graduate courses require students to demonstrate mastery of the learning outcomes listed above, but they do so within the different areas of emphasis. As a result, we have assessed student learning via the comprehensive (Plan B) examinations that serve as most students’ culminating experiences. A select few of our graduate students complete theses (Plan A). These are examined during the assessment process to determine whether or not they indicate the same sorts of things as do the comprehensive examinations.

4. Planning – Assessment Schedule
The table below indicates the academic year when a PLO will be assessed. Typically, we would expect changes to be implemented during the following academic year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
<th>Year 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLO 1</td>
<td>2015-2016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017-2018</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018-2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLO 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2019-2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Currently, our program includes only a few students pursuing the MA in History, Concentration in History Education. Our practice has been to assess PLO 6 once during each program planning cycle but based on data from the entire cycle instead of on data from each AY.

5. Student Experience
a. Students learn about PLOs via the department website. During Hist 298, the Professional Development Seminar required of all new graduate students, we introduce them to the concept and explain how PLOs, like learning objectives for individual courses, are intended to guide their learning.
b. We have not asked students for feedback regarding PLOs and/or the assessment process.

Part B
6. Assessment Data and Results
We began a new program review cycle in 2015-2016 so assessed PLO 1 based on F15 and S16 comprehensive (Plan B) examinations.

PLO 1— By the time students complete their Master of Arts degree program in history, they should be able to:
1. See themselves and their society from different times and places, displaying a sense of informed perspective and a mature view of human nature.

Ancient/Medieval Europe—1 passed
Modern Europe—5 passed; 1 failed
U.S. History before 1865—3 passed; 2 failed
U.S. History since 1865—1 passed; 1 failed
World History—1 passed

7. Analysis
11 of 15 or 73% of students demonstrated mastery of this objective by passing the comprehensive exam. 3 of 4 students who failed the exam have struggled throughout the program. The other failed to prepare thoroughly this spring.

Appendix A includes samples of essays from two passing exams and an essay from a failing exam. Students write three essays in four hours with no aids except a dictionary. They are expected to include examples of both historical content and significant historiography (historical writing on a particular topic that has influenced the discipline). They may choose from a number of questions, but must demonstrate mastery of multiple topics and time periods as well as historiographical proficiency.

The writers of essays 1 and 2, comparing the French and Russian Revolutions and the causes of the Civil War, respectively, develop nuanced arguments that in the first instance includes both change and continuity over time and in the second presents a sequence of events that in sum created incompatible regions and made war inevitable. Both authors revel in complexity and use sources knowledgeably to advance their cases. In contrast, the third essay on the demise of European empires after 1945 is not well grounded in relevant literature and asserts simplistically that empires fell because of grassroots rebellions. This writer does not consider changes in European attitudes, economics, the roles of the World Wars, etc. Instead of the deep immersion into other times and places that characterizes the first two essays, this one smacks of a presentist (though admirable) desire to present local peoples as heroic without providing much of a context for their heroism. A more mature view would include the consequences of both imperialism and decolonization and clarify why this generation of rebels achieved independence when earlier cohorts failed.

8. Proposed changes and goals (if any)
It has been our intention to revise the program’s PLOs to ensure they are more readily measurable. The graduate advisor should coordinate the process, but this has been difficult given her current workload (she receives assigned time during only one semester). In addition, after several recessionary years during which admissions were cut severely and the program developed a reputation for being especially competitive, applications to the MA program are down—particularly among secondary history and social science teachers. At this point, it’s likely more important for the graduate advisor to organize recruitment efforts in area schools than it is for her to focus on revising PLOs. In addition, we are awaiting the report of our S16 external reviewer, which will likely influence priorities in the near future.

Part C

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes and Goals</th>
<th>Status Update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revise PLOs to ensure they are more measurable.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) With anything in life, whether the French Revolution (1789-1799) or the Russian Revolution (1917-1922, arguably, 1932, according to Fitzpatrick in *The Russian Revolution*) were really “breaking with the past” or “launching a new era” is subject to interpretation. In other words, yes and no.

*The French Revolution*

We all know the basic very *simplified* history: the French government is in great debt because of costly war with Great Britain. The King needs to call the Estates General to levy new taxes; bad idea at the time as particularly the Second and the Third Estates were not very happy with the French government. The Third Estate, the one composed of “everyone else” (i.e. not the clergy – First – or the nobility – Second) takes the initiative and, through a series of maneuvers, appropriates power for itself by not conceding to the King’s demands. The Third invites the other two Estates to a National Assembly, making it clear that they would continue with or without their participation; the other two Estates finally relent (even some monarchists – realizing that it is better to have *some* voice than no voice at all) and agree to participate in the National Assembly. Eventually, this National Assembly would lead to the creation of a constituent assembly that would create a constitutional monarchy, then a republic, then a directory, and finally a dictatorship by an ambitious Corsican artilleryman. But was this really a break with the past?

Regarding politics and republicanism, on the one hand, we can make the argument that there was, in existence, already a republic on the other side of the Atlantic. The United States of America was truly a modern republic with many of the elements which we think of are indispensable. However, it was a nascent republic that, at its core, did not have centuries of monarchical tradition behind. Sure, it was a dependency of the British Crown, but many of the founding men were born in America and seeped in subversive talk. Thus, an equally strong argument can be made that French republicanism was, in fact, a great break with the past because, unlike Great Britain, it had not even toyed with the idea of a constitutional monarchy up to the point.

What was truly a break with the past was the participation of new players in politics. This is what Lynn Hunt labels “a new political culture” in *Politics and Class in the French Revolution*. The true importance of the French revolution lay with the inclusion of the “others” as political participants. Many of the members of the National Assembly, for example, were men that were not considered appropriate for government because they lacked the proper birth. We have the inclusion of many intellectuals and professionals in this political class, men that would have been impossible to include a few years before, such as local power brokers, lawyers, intellectuals, etc., men that did not belong to the clergy or to the
nobility. Unfortunately, however, and as is mostly the case, the downtrodden, the lower classes, were not included in this new political culture. Sure, peasants and sans culottes might be used for political purpose by the new political elite, but they never really had a voice in government, especially after the Jacobin experiment and the consequent Terror.

Another aspect that Hunt argues is exceptional is that the French Revolution brought nationalism to the fore. Before the French Revolution, a person owed allegiance to his community; to his family and to his town, maybe to the local seigneur. The French Revolution, drawing talent from all over France, allowed the creating of the idea of the French Nation. After the French Revolution, multi-ethnic empires would have a hard time containing their nationalities within their borders as people started to see each other as a national community.

Much is said about the Marxists interpretation that the French Revolution was an alliance between the lower classes and the bourgeoisie to liberate themselves from the yoke of their economic oppressors and unleash the tenets of the free market on the world. This view has been discredited. Furet argues in *Interpreting the French Revolution* that it was not an alliance between the poor and the bourgeoisie to overthrow the government, but a division between the elites, or the Second Estate, that provoked the revolution. Furet’s argument states that, by the time of the revolution, many of the bourgeoisie started joining the ranks of the Second Estate, with the robbed nobility and the nobility of the sword. Many of these newcomers could buy their way into nobility and shared many of the interests of the old, more traditional nobility. Their competition was not against each other, but among each other. Further, the nobility system was set up by French Kings to play off the nobility against each other but, unfortunately, at by the time of the revolution, Louis XVI did not have the political acumen to do this successfully. Further, Furet considers the Revolution a fluke. True, there were many economic factors that played a role in fomenting revolution – bankrupt state, environmental factors evinced in poor harvest, rise in prices, etc. – but he argues in *Interpreting the French Revolution* that these factors had occurred in France before, and the state had been able to resolve them without Revolution. Had all of these factors not converged at this time, we might not be talking about a French Revolution. Lastly, As Hobsbawm argues in *Age of Revolutions*, the Industrial Revolution had at that point already stated in England and would only be a matter of time before it spread to the continent. It did not need the aid of the bourgeoisie to accomplish this. Thus, the French Revolution did not really break away with the past in economic terms.

Finally, one other aspect that was unique to the French Revolution was the manipulation of symbols for political gain. Hunt explores this in depth, and the use of clothing, images, and flags to foment a nationalism and loyalty to the new regime. Recently I had an opportunity to observe an info
graphic of when national flags were adopted for each country and found that most (with the exception of England and maybe Sweden) were born in the early 19th century, surely a result of the French Revolution.

Furet in *Interpreting the French Revolution* would argue that it was not really a break with the past as he sees continuity between what had been occurring in the 17th and 18th century and the French Revolution. For example, many of the economic conditions that supposedly caused the French revolution – bad harvests, growth of small manufacturing – were an evolving process. In fact, regarding republicanism, it was not, according to Furet, until after the fall of the 1850s-1860 Napoleon (Napoleon III?) that France truly became a republic never to fall under the sway of monarchism again.

*Russian Revolution*

The Russian Revolution is the common name for two revolutions that occurred in 1917: the February and the October Revolution. (I should mention that Fitzpatrick does not see the end of the Revolution until the start of the first 5-year plan, in 1932.) The February Revolution was led by members of the Duma, which had been set up as a result of the 1905 Revolution, dissatisfied with the course World War I was taking. They sent an ultimatum to the Tsar to change or else, which he disregarded because he had been anointed by god to act as the Russian people’s father and protector, which eventually led to strikes, unrest, and the seizure of the government. From February to October, the Bolsheviks refused to participate in government. In fact, they were opposed to many of its dictates, continued participation in the War being one of them. Slowly, the Bolsheviks gained adherents and by July of 1917, they could have seized power, but they failed to seize the moment.

What would have been the end for any other party was not for the Bolsheviks as the Provisional Government continued to stumble. All parties but the Bolsheviks cooperated with the government, and the Bolsheviks were able to say they we not contaminated by the failure.

Having organized Soviets that had been created in factories, they created a dual legislative body that competed with the Provisional Government. Later that year, in October, counterrevolutionary were on the rise, the Provisional Government stumbled, and the Bolsheviks were finally able to seize power.

A pure Marxist interpretation will state that, for the first time – and distinct from the French Revolution, as we argued above – proletarians, the gravediggers of the bourgeoisie, took history into their own hands and seized power, forming a proletarian state. A true break from the past, right?

Unfortunately, reality is a bit more complicated. For one, did the proletarians really seize power? According to Figes in *Interpreting the Russian Revolution*, Lenin hijacked the revolution for the Bolsheviks, which were not all proletarians. Figes argues that the real revolution was a war for appropriation of symbols of revolutionary change between the old order, the provisional government,
and the Bolsheviks. Take, for example, the changing nature of the word bourgeoisie, which at the beginning had absolutely no class connotation and simply meant enemy of the state. As the Bolsheviks became more adept at political language, they changed the definition and imbued class, evidence by their slogan, “loot the looters.”

Furthermore, the Russian Revolution was not a complete ideological break with the past as its underlying philosophy, at the time Marxism-(proto) Leninism, had its origins in the ideals of the Enlightenment. Thus, ideologically speaking, can we speak of a complete break with the past? Probably not. However, just like the French Revolution that allowed a new class of men to participate, changing politics forever, the Russian Revolution was the first of its kind that, if not truly proletarian in origin, ruled in the name of proletarians.

However, there is a historiographical current of Neo-Traditionalists that see the Russian Revolution, and the system that it engendered, something old with new clothes. Fitzpatrick would be one historian that shares this view. For example, as laid out in Figes’s *Interpreting the Russian Revolution*, the cult of the leader had much sway in Revolutionary Russia, and we can trace its origins to Tsarist times. In *Stalinism: New Directions*, there are mentions of the use techniques used in Orthodox Church images (iconographs?) to present Stalin to the people, as a saintly figure. With the advent of cinema, these representations became endemic. A strong centralized government, set up by the Bolsheviks, was another remnant of the tsarist past.

**Conclusion:**

While we can point to some aspects of both the French and the Russian Revolutions that were “truly” revolutionary – such as the new French political culture or the Russian proletarian state – we can also point to many that were continuity with the past. In the world of ideas, none of them evolve in the vacuum and, necessarily, all of the new ideas will be touch by the old, either because the new ideas perfected the old, or because the new stand on the shoulders of the old. The French and the Russian Revolutions are no exception.

2) The causes of the American Civil War lie in the deeply-flawed economic and political structure of the young republic. In the mad dash to colonize and therefore profit from Britain’s North American and Atlantic Island colonies, the tragic decision to use slave labor instead of free labor to begin and to operate large-scale farming operations would of course have long-lasting repercussions. Alison Gomes
acknowledges the long history of slavery in the Mediterranean and Atlantic basins in her book The Web of Empire. The deeply-rooted institution was socially acceptable prior to contact between Indians and Europeans, and I have yet to see a contemporary account arguing against its introduction to the North American colonies. Once slavery took hold and proved to plantation owners (and to investors back in England) of its viability, Pandora’s Box was opened, as was the road to civil war.

In so many of the monographs about the causes of the Civil War, some themes tend to stand out as exceptionally persuasive. To begin with, the devastating human toll of American slavery is apparent on several levels. To the slave, first and foremost, went the greatest pain and hardships. We know from the work of Richard Dunn in Sugar and Slaves how the British plantations in the Caribbean and the Atlantic were absolute meat-grinders. High mortality and a gross gender imbalance required slave traders to constantly replenish the supply of slave labor. Slave treatment ranged from poor to sadistic, as evidenced by the notorious slave-owner Thomas Thistlewood. American slave masters meted out some of the same harsh punishment as Thistlewood, but by the end of the eighteenth century they could at least get to know their slaves on a first name basis because of the relatively healthy natural growth rate of African slaves in America.

The examples of the inhumane treatment of slaves in the Southern states contrasted starkly to the benefits of freedom in a republican democracy. A growing knowledge of the human cost to the South’s “peculiar institution” spread in the Northern states to the point of literary response-Harriet Beecher Stowe’s Uncle Tom’s Cabin, to the efforts of Southern leaders to stifle any discussion of the issue of slavery in Congress.

By the time of the Missouri Compromise in 1820, the basic argument of the Southern states had been articulated. To men like John C. Calhoun and Jefferson Davis, slave states were protected by the United States Constitution, case closed, end of argument. The expedient agreement to join the thirteen colonies together politically in order to gain independence from Britain was of course a socio-political dagger in the heart of African Americans, for it ensured that an independent America had to tolerate
slavery. Thus it appeared to so-called Slave Power politicians and their Northern sympathizers. While it is easy from our perspective to label the Constitution a deal with the devil, to a fledgling nation surrounded by potential adversaries in Britain and Spain, the legal codes which safeguarded slavery appealed to contemporaries who participated in the Constitutional Convention.

While previous historiography glosses over the intentions and the actions of slave owners and their fall-back states’ rights argument, more recent scholarship reveals the devastating impact of the prolonging of slavery as a legal institution. Walter Johnson, for example, in his book Soul By Soul, gives a clear picture of the slave marketplace, whose very existence demonstrates to students of history the deeply-rooted socio-economic realities of slavery. The splitting of families as slave offspring made commoditization possible and profitable, was especially poignant. Johnson gives many examples of such commoditization, none of which make for very comfortable reading. Aside from the emotional impact, one can see in Johnson’s book the persistence of slavery, and its place in American society.

The persistence of slavery makes the major events leading up to the Civil War more understandable. Slave Power, held by Democrats and Whig sympathizers (the aptly-named Cotton Whigs), fought a long and bitter fight in the halls of power and in the forum of public opinion. Some key events following the Missouri Compromise include the rise of a market economy based on wage labor, whose proponents argued was the antithesis of slave labor and thus threatened by its demise. Bruce Laurie depicts the rise of the laboring classes in his book Artisans to Workers, and of how laborers, especially in the North, viewed their economic circumstances. Slave Power was for several decades able to manipulate much of this class into acquiescence regarding slavery. It was from this group, many of whom were recent immigrants to the United States that slave sympathizers in the North recruited thugs to disrupt, through intimidation and violence, abolitionists and anti-slavery advocates.

The treatment of William Lloyd Garrison in Boston, that bastion of republican fervor, was very telling. Garrison, perhaps the most influential of all the abolitionists, was nearly lynched after trying to appear in public to deliver a speech against slavery. Of course, pro-slavery political leaders would go so
as censuring free Americans from petitioning Congress to consider the issue of containing and even ending slavery. In a decade-long struggle, Representative John Quincy Adams led a winning fight to end the so-called Gag Rule. In addition to successfully compromising a constitutional right, pro-slavery advocates also limited the spread of anti-slavery propaganda delivered via the US mail. Death threats were the norm in this difficult era, as were attacks against anti-slavery newspapers and their editors.

Another key reason for the durability of slavery as a legal institution in spite of growing opposition was the ability of Slave Power to manipulate federal politics, including foreign policy. With each White House occupant after Washington seeking the politically rewarding goal of territorial expansion, the grip of slavery was evident in the motivations of politicians on both sides of the issue. Chief among the expansionists were President Taylor, who in the waning days of his administration persuaded Congress to annex Texas (and thus make an enemy of the Mexican government), and President Polk, who fomented war with Mexico in spite of the pleadings of those who saw in the war a naked land grab and a nefarious means of extending slave power. In his book Manifest Design, Thomas Hietala makes this one of his central themes. Hietala sees American territorial expansion as a band aid approach to resolving the slavery issue. Of particular note is his research on Slave Power’s argument that Texas would serve as a safety valve of sorts. The new state would be a conduit for American slaves to be magically funneled to Central and South America, away from White America forever. This episode proves that slavery advocates and apologists were desperately living in a fantasy world, either that, or they were skilled at using Orwellian-sized lies to maintain their socio-economic status.

As Eric Foner explains in Free Soil, Free Labor, Free Men, the Mexican Cession and the annexation of Texas set the stage for the conflict between free labor and slave power. By the 1850s, Northern (and Northwestern) anti-slavers were sufficiently moved to protect their own interests at the point of a gun. By the time of “Bleeding Kansas,” the ideological battle had metamorphosed into a prelude to civil war. In framing the issue as not only a moral issue but as an economic one as well, the combined effect was crucial to the rise of the Republican Party. Here again the long road to
emancipation is well-described by Foner, and by Bruce Levine in Half Slave, Half Free. The complex party politics of the divisive decades prior to the war concluded with the election of Abraham Lincoln, and served as the battleground between Slave Power, anti-slavery, and the moderates caught in between. It is a fascinating history and is a reminder that like today’s Republican Party, no party is immune to changes in ideology, and changes in constituency.

3) European history since 1945 depicts the story of the collapse of European Imperialism. At this time, the British Empire and the smaller empires under French, Italian, etc. control began to decline and eventually fall due to uprisings by the indigenous populations. Historians Robert Aldrich and Yasmin Khan uncover this topic in their works covering different parts of the world.

In his 1996 work, Greater France: the History of French Overseas Expansion, historian Robert Aldrich discusses the wide reaching hand of French Imperialism across land and sea. This book covers French rule of North Africa, Asia, Polynesia and the Levant. Aldrich also discusses the contemporaneous Bolshevik Revolution and argues that this was the force supporting the change in thought among the colonized people of the world. In The Age of Extremes Hobsbawm describes how Communist artists would give public expositions illustrating their political views in Paris and other major cities. This book also details the modern relationships these countries have with their respective conquerors.

In the Middle East, France had control over Syria and Lebanon which was partitioned into four parts, including Jibed el Druze - for the Druze minority. The Druze was a minor sect of Ismaili Islam and their first governor was Jibin Al Atrash leader of the head family. In 1840, the Druze rose up against the French and due to their larger numbers, won (even though the French had superior weaponry). The French enlisted Circassian and Armenian soldiers to fight the Druze; making the conflict a Christian vs. Muslim one.

In French Indo-China, the people rose up against their leader Ho Chi Minh in the Battle of Dien Ben Fu resulting in a huge loss of life. The people in French Polynesia also wanted independence. By 1954 the Middle Eastern and Asian regions had independence and in North Africa (particularly Algeria)
the native Berber, Arabic and other Muslim communities expelled the Pieds Noir (North African born Europeans).

In her work *The Great Partition*, Yasmin Khan discusses the “jewel” in Britain’s crown while taking an unbiased look at the different regions of the Indian sub-continent, from the Punjab to the Northern frontier, and the two major religious groups; the Hindus and Muslims. What is unique about this work is that it does not cover political leaders like Gandhi, Jinna or even Nehru – as more concise works on the Partition include – but uniquely, Khan’s sources are interviews. This strategy both puts a face on the people affected and honors Khan’s own family history.

After 1945, in Europe and the wider world, decolonization had taken effect bringing down colonial thinking, political and economic structures. By this time, the indigenous populations, as in the case of Hawaii, had their sovereignty and were creating new systems of government to rule themselves. While colonialism facilitated trade, aiding capitalist societies, it was bound to break down eventually - thanks to the efforts of native populations who learned to think for themselves, strategize and fight for their land and freedom.