

<NAME OF YOUR PROGRAM/DEPARTMENT/MAJOR OR MINOR>

**ASSESSMENT REPORT**  
**ACADEMIC YEAR 2018 – 2019**  
**REPORT DUE DATE: 11/01/2019**

- Who should submit the report? – All majors, minors (including interdisciplinary minors), as well as graduate and non-degree granting certificate programs of the College of Arts and Sciences.
- Programs can combine assessment reports for a major and a minor program into one aggregate report as long as the mission statements, program learning outcome(s) evaluated, methodology applied to each, and the results are clearly delineated in separate sections.
- Undergraduate, graduate and certificate programs must submit separate reports
- It is recommended that each assessment report not exceed 10 pages. Additional materials (optional) can be added as appendices.
- A curricular map should be submitted along with each assessment report (we suggest that the curricular map should be informed by recent assessment outcomes).

**Some useful contacts:**

1. Prof. Alexandra Amati, FDCD, Arts – [adamati@usfca.edu](mailto:adamati@usfca.edu)
2. Prof. John Lendvay, FDCD, Sciences – [lendvay@usfca.edu](mailto:lendvay@usfca.edu)
3. Prof. Mark Meritt, FDCD, Humanities – [meritt@usfca.edu](mailto:meritt@usfca.edu)
4. Prof. Michael Jonas, FDCD, Social Sciences – [mrjonas@usfca.edu](mailto:mrjonas@usfca.edu)
5. Prof. Suparna Chakraborty, AD Academic Effectiveness – [schakraborty2@usfca.edu](mailto:schakraborty2@usfca.edu)

**Academic Effectiveness Annual Assessment Resource Page:**

<https://myusf.usfca.edu/arts-sciences/faculty-resources/academic-effectiveness/assessment>

**Email to submit the report: [assessment\\_cas@usfca.edu](mailto:assessment_cas@usfca.edu)**

**Important: Please write the name of your program or department in the subject line.**

**For example: FineArts\_Major (if you decide to submit a separate report for major and minor);**

**FineArts\_Aggregate (when submitting an aggregate report)**

## I. LOGISTICS

---

1. Please indicate the name and email of the program contact person to whom feedback should be sent (usually Chair, Program Director, or Faculty Assessment Coordinator).

Before June 2019, Heather J. Hoag, Chair, [hjhoag@usfca.edu](mailto:hjhoag@usfca.edu)

After June 2019, Taymiya Zaman, Incoming Chair AY 2020-2021, [trzaman@usfca.edu](mailto:trzaman@usfca.edu)

2. Please indicate if you are submitting report for (a) a Major, (b) a Minor, (c) a Major and Minor aggregated report (in which case, each should be explained in a separate paragraph as in this template), (d) a Graduate or (e) a Certificate Program

We are submitting an aggregate report for the History major and History minor programs. As of now, we do not have enough data for History minors so are collecting student work and hope to be able to assess that program in a few years (once we have enough data).

3. Please note that a Curricular Map should accompany every assessment report. Have there been any revisions to the Curricular Map?

No revisions to our curricular map have been made.

## II. MISSION STATEMENT & PROGRAM LEARNING OUTCOMES

---

1. Were any changes made to the program mission statement since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state "Yes" or "No." Please provide the current mission statement below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current mission statements of both the major and the minor programs

No changes have been made. We have the same mission statement for both programs.

- Mission Statement (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

The essence of historical inquiry is, simply put, to study and understand the past. The History Department at the University of San Francisco is a community of scholars and students who seek an informed and critical sense of the past and an awareness of the role of the past in shaping the present. Such an understanding is, we believe, the basis for effective and engaged citizenship in the contemporary world.

We seek to educate our students about the variety of past human experience within a global setting. Toward that end, we offer six regional emphases within the history major, and students elect a single or a double emphasis in the histories of Africa, Asia, Europe, the Islamic World, Latin America, and the United States. Our courses similarly cover the span of human history from antiquity to modern times and utilize a range of methodological approaches. History at USF offers both breadth and depth into fields and specializations that reveal the complexity of human societies, past and present.

While we hope to impart a love of history and an appreciation of its value, we also aim to prepare our students for further study and professional development in the many areas in which history majors find employment, including (but not limited to) teaching, law, business, and the public sector. The study of history—with the training it provides in close reading, logical reasoning, careful argumentation, and persuasive writing—is an ideal major to prepare for “the real world.”

- **Mission Statement (Minor):**

Same as above.

**2. Were any changes made to the program learning outcomes (PLOs) since the last assessment cycle in October 2018? Kindly state “Yes” or “No.” Please provide the current PLOs below. If you are submitting an aggregate report, please provide the current PLOs for both the major and the minor programs.**

Note: It is expected that PLOs will vary in level of mastery between different programs in the same discipline (e. g., a major and minor in the same subject area). Major revisions in the program learning outcomes need to go through the College Curriculum Committee (contact: Professor Joshua Gamson, [gamson@usfca.edu](mailto:gamson@usfca.edu)). Minor editorial changes are not required to go through the College Curriculum Committee.

No changes have been made to either the major or minor PLOs.

- **PLOs (Major):**

The program learning outcomes for the History major are as follows:

1. Understand the breadth and diversity of human experience across time and space
2. Develop a substantive knowledge of range and depth in their areas(s) of concentration, whether regional and/or topical/thematic
3. Think critically and historically about the past

4. Understand and appropriately apply historical research methods
5. Craft and present persuasive historical arguments in both oral and written form
6. Understand how the practice of history can establish a valuable framework for considering ethical issues in the past and present

- **PLOs (Minor):**

The program learning outcomes for the History minor are a subset of those for the major:

1. Understand the breadth and diversity of human experience across time and space
3. Think critically and historically about the past
5. Craft and present persuasive historical arguments in both oral and written forms
6. Understand how the practice of history can establish a valuable framework for considering ethical issues in the past and present

**3. State the particular program learning outcome(s) you assessed for the academic year 2018-2019. What rubric did you use?**

**The Role of Rubrics**

The rubric is the single most important thing you need for assessment, and putting time and thinking into designing a good rubric is going to make the entire process a lot easier, faster, and meaningful. Your rubric should break down your chosen PLO into the smallest measurable components, so that the assessment of each piece of work becomes linear and easy, and the calibration among different faculty assessing more objective. If you still have to debate a while whether that one line of the rubric has been fulfilled or not, chances are your rubric item is still an aggregate and can be broken down further into smaller components. Once you have made a detailed rubric, then not only the “grading” work will be faster and straightforward, but at the end of it you will have data that is significantly more meaningful. For example, some parts of the PLO may be in tiptop shape while others may need to be massaged or tweaked, with more attention given to that particular item in class. Conversely, your data may show you that the PLO itself is not what you thought it should be—it may be that it duplicates something other PLOs include or that a crucial part of what you teach is getting lost in the cracks between your PLOs. So do make sure that the rubric is as detailed and thorough as you possibly can manage (a short rubric in fact makes the grading longer, as counterintuitive as that seems).

## Assessment Rubric: Fall 2018

Class number: HIST 420 Paper number: \_\_\_\_\_

History PLO #4: Understand and appropriately apply historical research methods. For this assignment, the method was oral history.

The paper:	Sophisticated Work	Strong Work	Adequate Work	Marginal Work	Inadequate Work
Applies method by editing interview into a readable narrative					
Presents a historical interpretation drawing on primary source (interview) and secondary sources					
Makes an original contribution to the subject					
Written with appropriate college-level skill					
Properly cites all sources (either MLA or Chicago Manual of Style).					

- PLO(s) being assessed (Major/Graduate/Certificate):

PLO #4: Understand and appropriately apply historical research methods.

Note: For this assignment, the method was oral history.

- **PLO(s) being assessed (Minor):**

N/A

### III. METHODOLOGY

Describe the methodology that you used to assess the PLO(s).

For example, “the department used questions that were inputted in the final examination pertaining directly to the <said PLO>. An independent group of faculty (not teaching the course) then evaluated the responses to the questions and gave the students a score for responses to those questions.”

**Important Note** – WSCUC advises us to use “direct methods,” which consist of a direct evaluation of a student work product. “Indirect methods” like exit interviews or student surveys can be used only as additional complements to a direct method.

For any program with fewer than 10 students: If you currently have fewer than 10 students in your program (rendering your statistical analysis biased due to too few data points), it is fine to describe a multi-year data collection strategy here. It would be important to remember that every 3 years, we would expect you to have enough data to conduct a meaningful analysis.

**Important:** *Please attach, at the end of this report, a copy of the rubric used for assessment.*

- **Methodology used (Major):**

Our method was as follows:

1. In Spring 2019, the department selected an assessment committee comprised of two members (raters) and the chair (who would direct the process and write the report). PLO #4 was selected to assess.
2. For the major program assessment, the final papers from our senior seminar (HIST 420, offered in Fall 2018) were collected. For our minor program, we only had one graduating senior in a History course and his/her final paper was also collected and will be held until we have enough to assessment.
3. Next, the department chair created an appropriate rubric based on the competency chart the department created to articulate what skills each learning outcome refers to, basically, how we know if students meet our expectations, and in line with the specific paper assignment. The rubric was then reviewed by the two raters who corresponded as to their approach to the rating process. This rubric is attached.
4. Two faculty raters were the course instructor (Kathy Nasstrom) and a non-instructor tenured associate professor (Katrina Olds). They were provided with the rubric and the scanned papers (numbered with names redacted). Since the topic of the paper contained some sensitive information on some students’ family migration history we took extra precaution to maintain the students’ privacy.

5. The raters read each paper and scored them using the rubric provided.
6. Raters returned the rubrics to the chair who calculated the results.
7. Because the department is currently discussing our Program Review (completed spring 2019) as of the writing of this report, we have not had the opportunity to discuss the findings. This will be done at a future department meeting and an update can be submitted if required. What the department has been able to do is discuss plans for the 2019-2020 assessment and are currently working on putting this into place.
8. The chair then wrote and submitted the assessment report.

- **Methodology used (Minor):**

As mentioned above, we only had one graduating minor in a history course in spring 2019. We have collected that student’s paper and are holding it until we have enough to assess. This has been an ongoing issue—as it has for other programs—as we have only a handful of minors and they often do not take history courses their final year. There is also not a required class that they must take for which we can easily pull course work (like we do for majors in the senior seminar).

#### IV. RESULTS & MAJOR FINDINGS

**What are the major takeaways from your assessment exercise?**

**This section asks you to highlight the results of the exercise. Pertinent information here would include:**

- a. **how well students mastered the outcome at the level they were intended to,**
- b. **any trends noticed over the past few assessment cycles, and**
- c. **the levels at which students mastered the outcome based on the rubric used.**

**To address this question, among many other options, one option is to use a table showing the distribution, for example:**

<b>Level</b>	<b>Percentage of Students</b>
Complete Mastery of the outcome	8.7%
Mastered the outcome in most parts	20.3%
Mastered some parts of the outcome	66%
Did not master the outcome at the level intended	5%

**Results (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

Seventeen papers were scanned and sent to raters to evaluate. In the case that the rater marked an intermediate category (say between adequate and marginal), the paper was put in the higher category. This only happened four out of the eighty-five rated boxes. No papers were thrown out, so total rated papers was seventeen.

Table 1: Findings for Rater #1

<b>Rater #1 HIST 420</b>	<b>Sophisticated</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
Goal #1	15 (88%)	0 (0 %)	1 (6%)	1 (6%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #2	5 (29%)	6 (35%)	1 (6%)	5 (29%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #3	5 (29%)	4 (24%)	2 (12%)	4 (24%)	2 (12 %)
Goal #4	6 (35%)	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	2 (12%)	2 (12%)
Goal #5	5 (29%)	3 (18%)	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	2 (12%)

Table 2: Findings for Rater #2

<b>Rater #2 HIST 420</b>	<b>Sophisticated</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
Goal #1	2 (12%)	9 (53%)	5 (29%)	1 (6%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #2	4 (24%)	9 (53%)	3 (18%)	1 (6%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #3	5 (29%)	3 (18%)	7 (41%)	2 (12%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #4	1 (6%)	6 (35%)	6 (35%)	4 (24%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #5	3 (18%)	5 (29%)	4 (24%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)

Table 3: Cumulative Findings Rater #1 and Rater #2

<b>Cumulative HIST 420</b>	<b>Sophisticated</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
Goal #1	17 (50%)	9 (26%)	6 (18%)	2 (6%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #2	9 (26%)	15 (44%)	4 (12%)	6 (18%)	0 (0 %)
Goal #3	10 (29%)	7 (21%)	9 (26%)	6 (18%)	2 (6%)
Goal #4	7 (21%)	9 (26%)	10 (29%)	6 (18%)	2 (6%)
Goal #5	8 (24%)	8 (24%)	7 (21%)	8 (24%)	3 (8%)

HIST 420 Undergraduate Seminar in American History is one of our senior seminars. Seniors from all the different concentrations take it the fall of their graduating year. The goal of the course is to help students integrate the six History Program Learning Outcomes. Through intensive reading on a subject (varies by instructor) and the completion of a research paper and presentation, students demonstrate their ability to meet the major's learning outcomes.



The subject of this year’s seminar was migration and the main method was oral history. All students were assigned a project that focused on identifying and interviewing appropriate subjects and editing those interviews into a coherent historical narrative (see assignment in appendix).

For Goal #1, 76% of papers were scored Sophisticated or Strong. 94% were Adequate or above.

For Goal #2, 70% of the papers were scored Sophisticated or Strong. 82% were Adequate or above.

For Goal #3, 50% of the papers were scored Sophisticated or Strong. 76% were Adequate or above.

For Goal #4, 47% of the papers were scored Sophisticated or Strong. 76% were Adequate or above.

For Goal #5, 48% of the papers were scored Sophisticated or Strong. 69% were Adequate or above.

The results for our assessment of senior seminar papers from AY 2017-18 (previous year) was as follows: We rated 17 papers. Five goals were identified. The findings are shown below.

Table 4: Cumulative Findings for AY 2018-2019 (previous year)

<b>Cumulative HIST 410</b>	<b>Sophisticated</b>	<b>Strong</b>	<b>Adequate</b>	<b>Marginal</b>	<b>Inadequate</b>
Goal #1	9 (26%)	14 (41%)	11 (32%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Goal #2	9 (26%)	15 (44%)	8 (24%)	2 (6%)	0 (0%)
Goal #3	8 (24%)	19 (59%)	7 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Goal #4	12 (35%)	15 (44%)	6 (18%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Goal #5	6 (18%)	16 (47%)	11 (32%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)

The majority received adequate or above: goal # 1 (78%), goal #2 (94%), and goal #3 (100%), goal #4 (97%), and goal #5 (97%).

The findings for this year (AY 18-19) are consistent with previous years: the overwhelming majority of our graduating seniors are meeting our expectations, with many of them being rated as Sophisticated or Strong in their work. In terms of student learning, there appeared to be a few this year with weaker papers than the previous years.

We continue to find that some variation. This most likely can be explained in the rater’s differing understanding of the particular topic (we usually have two raters, one of which is not a specialist in the particular field). Also, collectively we think this is to be expected in

humanities/qualitative fields as it is sometimes difficult to assess the intangible and/or creative elements of a paper using a rubric.

Because of other assessment obligations this semester, we have not had an opportunity to discuss these particular findings as a whole department. This will occur at our December 2019 department meeting. At that time, I can submit an update if need be.

### **Results (Minor):**

No rating was undertaken due to too few student papers. We have collected a paper from the one graduating minor who had enrolled in an upper-division history course. This has been archived until we have enough papers to evaluate.

## **V. CLOSING THE LOOP: ACTION PLAN BASED ON ASSESSMENT RESULTS**

1. Based on your analysis in Section 4, what are the next steps that you are planning in order to achieve the desired level of mastery in the assessed learning outcome? This section could also address more long-term planning that your department/program is considering and does not require any changes to be implemented in the next academic year itself.

- **Closing the Loop (Major):**

As mentioned above, due to other assessment requirements we have not had the opportunity to discuss the findings as a department yet. This will occur at our Dec. 2019 meeting. At that time, I can submit an update to this report with a synopsis of our discussion.

We have been discussing what to do for 2019-2020 though. Our plan is to assess students' oral competency. We are in the process of taping short prospecti presentations in this year's senior seminar. These will be evaluated by two reviewers for the AY 2019-2020 assessment report.

For AY 2020-2021, we will assess PLO # 6 Understand how the practice of history can establish a valuable framework for considering ethical issues in the past and present. A specific essay assignment will be assigned to the students in the 2020 senior seminar to provide the data for the assessment report.

- **Closing the Loop (Minor):**

As we only had one graduating minor, we will hold that paper and assess it when we have more to consider. This has been an ongoing issue. One of the recommendations of our recent program review is to promote the minor. The department will be exploring ways to do this and hopefully this will assist with the assessment dilemma.

2. What were the most important suggestions/feedback from the FDCD on your last assessment report (for academic year 2017-2018, submitted in October 2018)? How did you incorporate or address the suggestion(s) in the more recent assessment discussed in this report?

- **Suggestions (Major): From Mark Merritt**

*Program Information:* Complete contact information is clearly provided.

*Program Learning Outcomes and Mission Statement:* The History department's mission statement clearly indicates the goals and values of the program, and program learning outcomes thoroughly yet concisely describe the knowledge gained and practices mastered by students in the major and minor. Though suggestions have been made in the past for minor stylistic changes to the mission statement and program learning outcomes, History has rightly decided not to make changes to either as the department is undergoing a program review that will more meaningfully guide any changes the department wishes to make. (In other words, there is little point to making minor changes outside of the more substantive context of the program review.)

**Department action:** As mentioned, we underwent APR in AY 2018-2019. We did not make any changes to our PLOs or mission statement. The APR review team did not find issue or suggest any changes regarding either our PLOs or mission statement. At this time, there is no plan to change either of these as they are working well and reflect the goals of the department.

*Assessment Methods:* History's methods of assessing student achievement of its third program outcome ("think critically and historically about the past") were thoughtful, thorough, and direct. The rubric used was designed to include department-established criteria for meeting the outcome and was reviewed by faculty raters prior to implementation. Final papers from upper-division courses were used to assess the work of majors (and one minor) according to this rubric. All work products were evaluated and scored by two faculty raters (one course instructor and one faculty member who did not teach the course), thereby ensuring reliability and validity of scores. Scoring differences between the raters were minor and to be expected in assessment of written work in the humanities.

**Department Action:** Since our method has worked well in the past, we kept it this year. One of the raters was the course instructor again, this time due to confidentiality and the sensitive subject of the student papers (oral histories on immigration issues, some including family experiences).

*Assessment Results and Closing the Loop:* Assessment results suggest that the vast majority of majors are meeting or exceeding expectations for the outcome assessed. Assessment thus confirms the overall effectiveness of the history curriculum. Faculty in the department discussed results and suggested refinements to the assessment rubric. History faculty have also begun discussing possible methods for assessing oral presentations (to evaluate achievement of outcome #5, "craft and present historical arguments in written and oral form"). The work of only one minor was available for assessment, and issues relating to the assessment of History minors will likely be addressed in the department's upcoming program review. The

History assessment report also notes challenges in managing workload when multiple assessment projects and program reviews occur simultaneously.

**Department Action:** We are already collected data to allow us to assess oral competencies and will do so for the AY 2019-2020 report.

*Summary Comments:* The History department has clearly engaged in carefully conceived direct assessment of outcomes achievement by students in its major. Assessment results suggest an effective curriculum enabling virtually all students to meet program outcomes. History faculty also reviewed and refined assessment methods and are considering future assessment of oral presentations. Assessment of the minor remains a challenge due to enrollment issues and the resulting inability to collect student work products. Last, History raises important questions about assessment workload. In response, assessment leaders might help the department find ways to streamline the assessment process.

**Department Action:** None. We concur with this statement (as does our APR reviewers).

- **Suggestions (Minor):**

None.

## VI. BIG PICTURE

What have you learned about your program from successive rounds of assessment? Is a picture of the whole program starting to emerge? For example, what areas of strength have emerged? What opportunities of improvement have you identified?

- **Big Picture (Major/Graduate/Certificate):**

In sum, we have learned that in general our history majors are not only meeting our expectations, but that the majority are exceeding them. While there will always be some variation, the department and our recent APR external reviewers are confident that we are providing a strong curriculum and are successful in our instruction.

We have also learned, and this too was echoed by our reviewers, how time consuming this whole process is and how difficult it is to have non-specialists read work in other fields in a detailed manner (which how historians work). As assessment responsibilities pile on—for AY 2018-2019 we had the annual report, our 7-year APR, and the assessment of the C2 area of the Core that we oversee—faculty are getting fatigued, making it difficult to really engage with the process.

- **Big Picture (Minor):**

The same picture as last year has emerged: We have few minors and a curriculum that allows them flexibility to choose their courses. They often finish the minor before their final year at USF. They take such a variety of courses it is hard to plan in advance how to collect student work. All of this combines to make it practically impossible to do any worthwhile assessment. We do know that in general their gpas in the minor are high, so they must be learning what we

want. (And yes, we realize that grades are not considered an adequate assessment means.) But how to assess them within the procedures that we are instructed to follow remains a challenge.

## VII. Feedback to your Assessment Team

What suggestions do you have for your assessment team (the Faculty Directors of Curriculum Development and the Associate Dean for Academic Effectiveness)? What can we do to improve the process?

From our 2019-2019 APR:

“New assessment procedures are perceived as taxing, which is exacerbated by the fact that they appear to exist primarily to serve bureaucratic imperatives. While department members agreed that assessment exercises offered an opportunity to reflect upon student learning, they felt that that time could have been spent more effectively meeting the other demands of their jobs.

Recommendation: **12. Assessment.** Create assessment tools such that departments can ask “big questions” about their futures, their pedagogies, and student experiences of the major. Current assessment tools demonstrate that learning objectives are being met by students who take history courses, but whether they help a department address short- and long-term planning is unclear. Also, provide more transparency regarding how departmental assessments are used by the college and then by the university.”

## ADDITIONAL MATERIALS

(Any rubrics used for assessment, relevant tables, charts and figures should be included here)

**Assessment Rubric: Fall 2018**

Class number: HIST 420 Paper number: \_\_\_\_\_

History PLO #4: Understand and appropriately apply historical research methods. For this assignment, the method was oral history.

The paper:	Sophisticated Work	Strong Work	Adequate Work	Marginal Work	Inadequate Work
Applies method by editing interview into a readable narrative					
Presents a historical interpretation drawing on primary source (interview) and secondary sources					
Makes an original contribution to the subject					
Written with appropriate college-level skill					
Properly cites all sources (either MLA or Chicago Manual of Style).					

--	--	--	--	--	--

**SEMINAR PAPER ASSIGNMENT:** a chapter in an edited book of oral histories on migration

You will produce, on a small scale and at a level appropriate to undergraduate work, a professional piece of oral history scholarship suitable for publication.

Prepare a chapter of not less than 18 pages, following these steps:

- 1) Select the interview material you will use to tell your interviewee's migration story
- 2) Edit it into a readable narrative, applying the editing principles in "Editing Oral History for Publication," pp. 5-11 (*no less than 11 pages, double-spaced—as in the "Sample Narrative formatted for assignment"*)
- 3) Annotate any information in the narrative that warrants explanation—as in this sample annotation<sup>1</sup>
- 4) Write a biographical and contextual introduction to your narrative (*about 1 page, double-spaced—as in the "Sample Narrative formatted for assignment"*)
- 5) Write an analytical commentary on your narrative (*no less than 6 pages, double-spaced—using the "Sample Commentary," pp. 55-62, as your model for how to interpret an oral history narrative, but recognizing that your analysis will be shorter and will draw on fewer research sources than in this sample*)
- 6) Come up with a title for your chapter.

### **Instructions for the analytical commentary**

The best historical scholarship makes an *original* contribution to our understanding of the past; that is, it teaches us something *new* (something we couldn't know from existing research). Oral history research can often function in this way (as many of our course readings have pointed out to us). Your goal, in the analytical commentary, is to make an original contribution (even if a small one, befitting your work as an undergraduate student) to historical understanding of migration by exploring the meaning and significance of your interview within the context of your research and our course readings.

In your analytical commentary, address the following question: How does your oral history narrative contribute to historical understanding of migration? An ideal commentary will:

---

<sup>1</sup> For each annotation: In Microsoft Word, select the "references" tab, then the "insert footnote" button, which will create a footnote (as here), into which you type your annotation.

1- present an interpretation of the edited narrative of your interview that explores its meaning and significance and clearly indicates the new understanding it yields about the history of migration

*Note: For a model of how to clearly indicate your original contribution, read the two paragraphs following the “Commentary” heading on p. 55 of “Sample Commentary.”*

2- draw on secondary sources (and, as appropriate, other primary sources) to develop and support that interpretation

*Note: Your interview is a primary source, but you will use additional primary and/or secondary sources (a minimum of 5), as indicated in the annotated bibliography assignment. These sources should be carefully chosen so as to allow you to develop and support your interpretation.*

3- draw on course readings to develop and support that interpretation

*Note: Carefully choose course readings that help you develop and support your interpretation, and use as many course readings as possible.*

4- be written in a manner that is consistently clear, concise, well organized, and has few (if any) errors (that is, be almost ready for publication)

5- properly cite all sources used, including the interview, and contain a Works Cited Page or Bibliography

*Note: Do not include annotations (these were only for the annotated bibliography assignment).*

6- be formatted according to the specifications for this assignment.

### **Specifications for formatting**

- combine all elements of the chapter into one Microsoft Word document
- use Times New Roman font, 12 point, throughout
- double-space the document throughout
- use 1-inch margins throughout (top, bottom, left, and right margins), which is the “normal” margins settings in Microsoft Word
- no headers, no footers, and no pagination
- separate the edited narrative from the analytical commentary using the word “Commentary”—see the “Sample Commentary,” p. 55, for how this looks
- italicize your biographical and contextual introduction; everything else should be in regular font
- include a Works Cited Page or Bibliography, but do not make this a separate page; rather, place it immediately after the end of your analytical commentary, separated only by the usual double-spacing
- bold these (and only these) elements of your chapter: title, author name (you), the word “Commentary,” the words “Works Cited” or “Bibliography,” and any section headings you create (section headings are optional—see the “Sample Narrative formatted for assignment,” pp. 2, 5, and 7 for sample section headings)

### **Submission and deadline**

Submit on Canvas no later than Tuesday, December 11, 12:30 pm and bring a printed copy to class. (Per the syllabus, although we do not have a final exam in this course, we will be meeting during our final exam period, which is Tuesday, December 11, 12:30-2:30 pm.)