<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Assessment Findings</th>
<th>Interpretation of Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Students will demonstrate knowledge of major historical, political, and social figures, events, and issues from the Greek and Roman worlds.</td>
<td>Exam: 75% of students in CLAS 2112 and 2113 will receive a grade of C- (70%) or higher on an examination with a blueprint keyed to the learning outcome areas.</td>
<td>CLAS 2112 Early Aegean and Greece to 336 BC (Fall 2016) There were 82 students enrolled in this course (in CLAS2112 there were 42; in HIST2112 there were 40). 79 of the 82 students took the exam. 100% of 79 students who took the exam scored above a C- (70/100) on the blueprint exam that included 50 questions (see attached blueprint exam). CLAS 2113 The Roman World to 337 A.D. (Spring 2016) 73 of the 83 enrolled students took a 30 question exam based on a blueprint consisting of 10 multiple choice questions, 10 fill in the blank (with answers given as options a-e), and 10 matching (5 regarding the Roman Republic and 5 regarding the Roman Empire). Overall, 61.6% of the students who took the exam earned a grade of C- (70%) or higher: 11 earning A- to A; 18 earning B- to B; 16 earning C- to C; 10 earning D- to D; and 18 earning Fs. In the multiple choice section, only one question posed a real problem for students, and in the “fill in the blank” section (where the choice of answers was provided as options a-e), students had difficulties with only three of the ten questions. Students performed most poorly on the matching section, falling below the 70% threshold for answering correctly on 2 of the 5 questions regarding the Roman Republic and on all 5 of the 5 questions regarding the Roman Empire. For fuller report of data, see assessment report for CLAS 2113 attached. According to self-reporting, 3 of the students</td>
<td>For CLAS 2112 Greek History: Because the blueprint exam for CLAS 2112 Greek history had been updated for 2016-17 and only included 23 questions that have been asked in previous years (due to variations in instructors, testing methods, and a technology failure), this blueprint will be reused exactly as administered in Fall of 2016 in the upcoming 2017-18 and 2018-19 assessment cycles to be able to compare data. In addition, the blueprint had been administered in halves with the first portion incorporated into the mid-term and the second incorporated into the final exam, but in the future will be administered as one exam on the final day of classes for the semester (see below). For CLAS 2113 Roman History: Because overall performance on the blueprint exam for CLAS 2113 Roman history fell more than 10 points short of the 75% of students achieving a grade of C- (70%) or higher, for future iterations of this course, the following measures will be implemented to improve overall student performance: 1) It is clear that more work in class needs to be done regarding dates of significant events. For the most part, stress is placed on cause and effect in terms of significant historical events as the class progresses chronologically from the Republic to the Empire, although stress is placed early in the semester on AD 212 and the Antonine Constitution. In the future, I will remind students that while the events themselves are important, so too is the date. 2) In terms of the blueprint exam, more specifically, the following measures will be taken. a) The difficulties with multiple choice question 6 may be due to the negative phrasing of the question (“Which of the following emperors was not a member</td>
<td>In the 2016-17 assessment cycle, CLAS faculty agreed on a streamlined process for administering the blueprint exams, grading them, and analyzing and reporting the data. We were able to implement this in Spring 2017 for CLAS 2113 Roman History course. The standard blueprint of 30 questions was administered on the final day of classes, but was not part of the final exam. Students were told that the blueprint of 30 questions would be graded and that if they earned 85% or higher, they would earn 2 extra points on the final grade for their final exam. Students marked answers on scantron sheets, which were then graded by a scantron machine that generated results in a variety of different formats, making it easier to analyze the data for 70+ students. For the 2017-18 assessment cycle, we will administer the blueprints for both history courses (CLAS 2112 and 2113) following this new system, so that we can have data comparable from year to year and gauge improvement. The goal is to have students in both courses meeting the targets.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
who took the exam have declared a major in Classical Studies and 1 has declared a minor. Two of the Classical Studies majors earned As on the exam, while 1 earned an F; the 1 minor who took the exam earned a D-.

Because these numbers are so small, they are statistically insignificant.

of the Flavian Dynasty?"), although the fact that the incorrect answers were almost evenly divided between the three remaining incorrect answers argues against the wording of the question causing confusion for test takers. This question will be monitored in upcoming years.

b) For all three of the fill-in-the-blank questions that posed difficulties, overall, student performance was only slightly below the desired 70% threshold. For question 15, the next most popular incorrect answer makes good sense (30.1% or nearly all who got this question incorrect selected “Golden Age,” which seems a logical answer to “The era of peace and prosperity brought to the Mediterranean world by imperial Rome is called ________.”); perhaps the possible answers for this question need to be rethought. For questions 17 and 20, students simply need to know their facts more thoroughly; these questions will be monitored in upcoming years.

c) Overall, students seemed to have the most difficulty with the matching, it is not clear whether this difficulty was due to the type of question (matching vs. multiple choice or fill in the blank) or due to the fact that all of these questions focused on exact dates/years of events. In the future, more stress will be placed on ensuring that students associate dates with events as mentioned above.

d) Finally, though our faculty had wondered whether separating out Classical Studies majors and minors might highlight improved performance in this self-selecting group, the numbers were far too statistically insignificant to provide such data with only 3 of the 73 students having declared a major in Classical Studies and only 1 having declared a minor.

For both both CLAS 2112 and CLAS 2113:
As of Spring 2017, we instituted a streamlined system for administering the blueprint exams, both to support the faculty teaching these larger courses and to ensure that assessment of courses would be conducted even if other faculty were to teach them (for example we have
no data for CLAS2113 in Spring 2015, because an adjunct taught this large lecture course and did not administer the assessment tool as requested. Therefore, the entire 50 question blueprint for CLAS2112 Greek history and the entire 30 question blueprint for CLAS2113 Roman history will be administered on the final day of classes for each semester, but not in conjunction with the final exam. Results will be collected via scantron, which provides data about student responses in a number of useful formats (by student, by question, etc.). Students will be notified that these exams will be graded, but that the grades will not count toward their final exam grade or otherwise for the course. Instead, instructors will offer incentives to students (such as earning extra points on the finale exam) if they score at a certain level on these blueprint exams; e.g. students in Roman history could be told that if they scored 85% or higher, they would earn 2 points toward their final grade on the final exam). This should ensure consistent data collection that will be comparable on an annual basis.

Measure B may be direct or indirect; indicate which it is: indirect

Examples of Indirect Measures: course grades, responses on student feedback surveys referring to student learning, job placements

<p>| Student course evaluation survey. | Students reported that they felt that after taking the two core history courses (CLAS 2112 and 2113) they had a solid grasp of the major historical, political, and social figures, events, and issues from the Greek and Roman worlds. One stated that he would do well on the classical history segments of Jeopardy! Students noted that other courses in the department also built their knowledge of Greek and Roman history including (but not limited to) AH3102 Ancient Art of the Roman Empire, CLAS 3114 Law and Diplomacy in Near East, and CLAS 3114 The Parthenon and Athens. Students also noted that in many classes, because there were no pre-requisites, faculty often did brief reviews of relevant historical material, so that the information is reinforced in every class students take. | This item is one of the lower rated items; should note it with faculty |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Assessment Findings</th>
<th>Interpretation of Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2. Students will demonstrate intermediate language competency (command of vocabulary, morphology, and syntax) in at least one ancient language (classical Greek or Latin). | Exam: 80% of students score at the C level or higher on for translation of sight passage on final exams graded with a rubric in LATN 2002/3001/3002 and GREK 2001. | GREK2002 Hellenistic Texts  
For the sight translation, students were given an inscriptional text, namely, the Temple Mount Gentile Inscription (Greek, from Jerusalem); and also the Theodotus Synagogue Inscription (Greek, from Jerusalem). Both of these inscriptions are complicated, written in the uncial script, and scriptio continua. Some of the vocabulary is not complicated, but there are a few very difficult words. I didn’t gloss any of the words, as I wanted to see if they would use context clues well.  
Further details: The inscription about Gentiles and the Temple is several lines long, and focuses on the prohibition of Gentiles in the more inner courts. The inscription states that those Gentiles who violate the prohibition may be killed and that it would be their own fault. The Synagogue inscription is fascinating as it describes the synagogue as a place of prayer and a place of teaching. Also, this particular inscription mentions the presence of a hostel for people visiting from distant places. It also references the name of the synagogue ruler and states that he was the third generation (at the very least) to function in this capacity.  
There were three students in the class (which constituted an unpaid course overload for me, as the course was so small). 3 of 3 of the students translated these inscriptions at a rate of 73% or higher. In fact, the translations of all of the students fell in the 85% to 95 percent range. Across the board (i.e., with regard to vocabulary, morphology, syntax, and the clear expression of text’s content), they all did well with two students in the A range and one student in the B range, despite the complexity of these texts. | For GREK 2002 (Spring 2016)  
Although I am quite happy with the performance of the students, the next time that I teach this course, I will use Metzger’s vocabulary book, so that I can systematically go through a book that is based on frequency of usage of Hellenistic vocabulary. Other than that, I will continue doing the same basic things that I did for this iteration of the course.  
For LATN 2002/2002W (Spring 2016)  
Based on findings, comment on assignment, aspects of performance tracked, any changes that should be made either to teaching to assist students to achieve learning goals more effectively OR to assignment to measure the learning goal more effectively.  
This year I continued vocabulary exercises in class and on quizzes, especially during the first half of the semester, which clearly seems to have supported students’ facility with this aspect of reading Latin, so I will continue that in Spring 2018. In addition, students clearly need continued work on morphology and instances of | Faculty will meet to discuss the common rubric and evaluating students’ sight translations. |

Measure A (must be direct)
Examples of Direct Measures: scores on capstone presentations and/or papers, comprehensive exams, pre-post test scores, or scores on exam questions.
support (because there are plenty of unusual words in this passage) and even notes, some of which defined new characters introduced in the passage, others of which helped with difficult syntax or syncopated words. All students in the class translated the sight passage at a level of 81% or higher, with the majority scoring 87% or higher (4 out of 6 scored 90-100%; and 2 out of 6 scored 80-89%). Students were fairly strong in their knowledge of vocabulary (84% excellent; 16% fair), but less proficient in their handling of morphology (50% excellent; 16% good; 34% fair), and one student still had extensive difficulty with identifying forms even at the end of this fourth semester of Latin. All of the students were able to move from their solid understanding of the vocabulary and the forms to the function of words in sentences (syntax; 50% excellent; 50% good). Students’ abilities to handle syntax reasonably well meant that they also were able to express the passage meaning and content fairly clearly (84% excellent; 16% good; as evidenced not only by their translations, but also by an essay that I asked them to write in which they provided a brief literary analysis of the passage and commented on its main themes and how the passage fits into the broader historical, social, and cultural context of Augustan Rome). Multiple syntactic options for the same form, even at this fairly advanced intermediate level. Finally, I will continue to include more opportunities to translate sight passages throughout the semester to assist students in both methods for translating and confidence levels.

During the 2017-18 assessment cycle, faculty will meet to discuss grading these sight translations with the common rubric and update one another on their methods for ensuring student success.

Measure B may be direct or indirect; indicate which it is: indirect

Examples of Indirect Measures: course grades, responses on student feedback surveys referring to student learning, job placements

| Responses to questions regarding learning goal posed to Student Focus Group at end of semester. | Target met | Students felt that the Latin and Greek courses that they have been required to take to fulfill the language proficiency provided them with the tools that they need to read a short passage of Latin or Greek with relative accuracy and ease. They reported that the focus on vocabulary, morphology (word forms), and syntax (grammar) “definitely” supported their ability to read ancient Greek and Latin. They noted that in their... |
experience, prose is easier than poetry, but that they were glad that for GREK 1001 they were now using a text in which they were reading Homer! They also noted that they wished that they could have studied both languages, but that they simply did not have the time. Students also noted that their knowledge of Greek and/or Latin had been very useful in other classes, for example students described employing their language skills in the study of temple inscriptions, in Greek history class, in art history to read words written on vases, and in research for senior capstone projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Assessment Plan</th>
<th>Assessment Findings</th>
<th>Interpretation of Findings</th>
<th>Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Students will engage critically with primary sources as well as interpretations in secondary sources.</td>
<td>Select assignments in CLAS 3000- and 4000-level courses (with the exception of CLAS 3901/4901 Directed Study and CLAS 4111 Capstone Study) and in LATN/GREK 3001/3002 will be graded with a common rubric (see attached); 70% of the class can engage critically with primary and secondary sources at a level of “Acceptable” as defined according to the common rubric.</td>
<td>CLAS 3111 Topics in Ancient History: Alexander the Great. For grades on the overall assignment (which combined analysis of primary and secondary sources), 75% performed at 100% or above, 17% scored 90%, and 1 student earned 60%, but she was from China and English was not her first language. In terms of analyzing primary sources, 75% earned 100%, 17% earned 90%, and 8% scored 60%. In terms of analyzing secondary sources, 14 students (83%) scored 100%, and 4 students (17%) scored 90% (with no students earning lower scores), thus students did extremely well with analysis of secondary sources. By this time in the semester, the students had daily familiarity and interaction with their primary sources and this paper introduced secondary sources that were very grounded in those primary sources. Articles that were more theoretical in nature would have been more challenging, but those provided to students were selected because they were appropriate for this student group, most of whom had no background in Classics whatsoever. CLAS 3111 Warfare and Diplomacy in the Ancient World. 24 of 25 students completed the research paper assignment asking them to analyze primary sources; 21 of 24 (87.50%) of the students were able to analyze the primary source at a level of ‘good’ or better as defined on the rubric grading scale. All papers were acceptable. In terms of analyzing secondary sources, 24 of 25 students completed the research paper assignment asking them to analyze secondary sources; 20 of 24 (83.33%) of the students were able to analyze the secondary source at a level of ‘good’ or better as defined on the rubric grading scale. All papers were acceptable. There was one case, however, that was borderline. This involved a Chinese student whose command of English was not the best. In the end, I</td>
<td>For GREK 2002 (Spring 2016) Although I am quite happy with the performance of the students, the next time that I teach this course, I will use Metzger’s vocabulary book, so that I can systematically go through a book that is based on frequency of usage of Hellenistic vocabulary. Other than that, I will continue doing the same basic things that I did for this iteration of the course.</td>
<td>For LATN 2002/2002W The Classical Studies faculty will meet to discuss how to best support students in engaging with secondary sources; part of this discussion could include exchanging examples of specific assignments that seem to have worked well. Though originally planned for 2016-17, this meeting was delayed due to the need to focus on LO1 and LO5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessed her paper as acceptable. These percentages are consistent with previous years.

CLAS 3114 Law and Diplomacy in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean
All of the students succeeded in engaging with the primary sources at an acceptable level. And of these, 20 out of 23 (ca. 87%) of the students succeeded in engaging with the primary sources at the level of “good” or “excellent.”

In terms of analyzing secondary sources, all of the students succeeded in engaging with the secondary sources at an acceptable level. And of these, 20 out of 23 (ca. 87%) of the students succeeded in engaging with the secondary sources at the level of “good” or “excellent.” As part of preparation for undertaking their research papers this year, I spent even more time attempting to discuss secondary sources, the cogent nature of the analyses of certain scholars and the difficulties at other times with certain other scholars. In addition, I made a concerted effort to provide students with some of the names of some of the movers and shakers in this or that sub-field of ancient Near Eastern and Mediterranean law. This seemed to help quite a bit in getting students off on the right foot with regard to the critical analysis of secondary sources.

CLAS 3114 Classics and Film
Seventeen of the eighteen students completed the assignment; the missing student has not been included in these calculations. A majority of the students did well on the use of primary sources, and many showed skill in interpreting evidence of various types, including visual evidence. Almost all the students (94%) successfully incorporated and analyzed primary sources at a level of Acceptable or higher. A reasonable number (35%) of them did an excellent job, and used the sources to make a comprehensive argument. An equal amount (29%) produced work that was Good or Acceptable. Only 5% failed to use primary sources in an acceptable way. The most challenging aspect of the course was that it required so many different
competencies in the ancient material and modern cinema; only the top students were able to combine sophisticated visual analysis of the modern films with a clear understanding of the ancient sources.

Students were slightly less successful at critically interpreting secondary sources, although 88% performed at a level of Acceptable or higher. Their performances clustered at the top and bottom of the scale, with 29% producing Excellent analyses and 41% only Acceptable ones; 18% performed at the level of Good, and 12% failed this part of the assessment. Students who simply used the secondary sources to mine facts were more likely to be non-majors struggling to master the basic material on cinematography and/or classics.

CLAS 3115 Excavating Armageddon
There were 16 students enrolled in the course. Students were asked to undertake four written journal assignments, to be completed by 11 pm on the evening before our once-a-week class. In terms of analyzing primary sources, all 16 completed the assignment; all (100%) were able to analyze the primary source at a level of ‘acceptable’ or better as defined on the rubric grading scale. The students read the Amarna letters sent to Egypt by Biridiya of Megiddo as well as the original excavation reports of Stratum VIIIB-A at Megiddo, including half of the palace itself. Based on their analyses of these primary sources, both textual and archaeological, they were able to successfully articulate where the Late Bronze Age archive is likely to be found at the site in the future. In terms of analyzing secondary sources, all 16 students completed the assignment, and all (100%) were able to analyze the secondary sources at a level of ‘acceptable’ or better as defined on the rubric grading scale. The students successfully compared the interpretations of an historical event put forward in multiple secondary sources and were able to articulate which scholars' dating of the destruction of Megiddo VIA were more plausible and why. Most of the enrolled students were archaeology majors and had taken numerous previous archaeology classes prior to this one; also, by this point
in the semester, they had already turned in and gotten feedback on the first two journal assignments, so they had learned what to do by this point.

CLAS 3115 Art and Architecture of the Roman Provinces
In terms of analyzing primary sources, 14 of 15 students performed at a level of acceptable or higher; one student earned an F and simply did not follow the paper assignment in any way. Of the 14 students who addressed the assignment, 4 (19%) performed at the level of Excellent; 9 (64%) performed at the level of Good; and 1 (7%) performed at the level of Acceptable. Overall, 100% of the students were able to analyze the secondary source at a level of acceptable or higher, with 8 of 15 (53.33%) performing at the level of Excellent, 5 of 15 (33.33%) performed at a level of Good, and 2 of 15 performed at a level of Acceptable (13.33%). The areas with which students had the most difficulty were, not surprisingly, with identifying specific critiques and with articulating the ramifications of their arguments for the broader field.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure B</th>
<th>may be direct or indirect; indicate which it is: indirect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Examples of Indirect Measures:</td>
<td>course grades, responses on student feedback surveys referring to student learning, job placements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Responses to questions regarding learning goal posed to Student Focus Group at end of semester | Target met. | Students felt as though they had had ample instruction on and practice with analyzing unknown or new primary sources (like a Greek or Latin text in translation OR a piece of Greek or Roman material culture) to derive plausible conclusions about those sources’ creators and/or the context and/or time in which they were created. They cited specific examples of this from their coursework including unknowns on quizzes and exams in Greek art (AH 3101), text IDs in Near East and Egypt (CLAS 2803), and the snippets of texts that students are asked to analyze and discuss in Greek and Roman |
One student noted that “from the very beginning [the courses are] set-up to train you to do that”!

In terms of evaluating another scholar’s interpretation of that same primary source, students were again able to cite specific courses that provided experience and training in doing this including courses on Ancient Identity (CLAS 3111) and the Ancient Economy (CLAS 3111) in which students are asked to read two or three articles on each subject, usually presenting differing opinions, and then come to class to discuss who is right and who is wrong; courses on Pompeii (CLAS 3115) and the Roman Provinces (CLAS 3115) in which students are asked to critique articles; and Gods and Goddesses (CLAS 3114) and Hebrew Scripture (not a CLAS course, but taught by a CLAS faculty member) in which the final paper asked students to analyze a primary source and then evaluate secondary interpretations of that source.