

SUNY Fredonia
General Education Learning Outcomes
Assessment Report
2011-2012

Subcommittee Information		
General Education Category:	American History	
Subcommittee Chair:	Name: Jennifer Hildebrand	Dept: History
Subcommittee Members:	Name: Tim Allan	Dept: History
	Name: Emily Van Dette	Dept.: English
	Name: Ingrid Johnston-Robledo	Dept: Psychology / Dean's Office
	Name: Taihyeup Yi	Dept: Business Administration
Semester(s) In Which Data were Collected:	Spring 2012	
Report Written By:	Jennifer Hildebrand (after consultation with committee)	
Report Date:	6-22-12	

Course Information					
Please provide the following information for each of the courses that are part of the curriculum for this outcome during the semester(s) of data collection:					
Department	Subject Code	Course Number	Faculty Name	# of Students Enrolled	Were assessment data collected in this course?
American Studies x-list English	AMST ENGL	202 200	Shannon McRae	32	Yes
American Studies x-list English	AMST ENGL	296 296	Bruce Simon	32	Yes
Anthropology x-list Sociology	ANTH SOC	331 331	Alan LaFlamme	34	Yes

English	ENGL	331	Emily Van Dette	31	Yes
English	ENGL	333	Terry Mosher	31	Yes
History	HIST	105	Jeffrey Iovannone	37	Yes
History	HIST	106	Tim Allan	87 (3 sections)	Yes
History	HIST	133	Perry Beardsley	144	Yes
History	HIST	133	Joni Pobedinsky	118	Yes
Honors	HONR	228	Ellen Litwicki	26	Yes
Political Science	POLI	276	Randi Cohen-Brown	49	Yes

Assessment of Learning Outcome 1	
Outcome 1:	Knowledge of a basic narrative of American history: political, economic, social, and cultural, including knowledge of unity and diversity in American society
Assessment Method	We created an assessment instrument which asked for short answers from the students. It was graded using a rubric adopted by the committee. (Please see attached.)
Evaluation Process	<p>We began by studying the previous assessment instrument provided to us. We decided that we wanted to collect a little bit more information about the students' background in history, so we added questions 1-4.</p> <p>With regard to outcome #1 specifically, we modeled our question after that used by the last assessment team; it asked students to identify five key events, place them in chronological order, and explain the significance of those events. In a follow up question, students were asked to choose one of their five events and explain how it demonstrates unity and diversity in American history. In conversation with a colleague who served on the previous committee, it became clear to Dr. Hildebrand that students had struggled when asked to explain the presence of unity and diversity simultaneously, so the committee decided to split that follow-up question into two, one asking the students to discuss unity, and the other diversity.</p>

	<p>Drs. Hildebrand, Allan, and Van Dette did the grading according to a rubric. The rubric was modeled after the rubric used by the previous assessment group. Before it was used, the committee met to evaluate the rubric as modified by Dr. Hildebrand; it was unanimously accepted.</p> <p>In order to ensure consistency in grading, the rubric assigned specific point values. Drs. Hildebrand, Van Dette, and Allan met for a practice grading session; Dr. Hildebrand copied several assessment responses and the committee graded them together, discussing how they interpreted the rubric and how it applied to student responses.</p>
Timing	Assessment instruments were distributed in late February. Faculty were asked to complete the assessment process by April 9. One faculty member's reports came in a week late.
Student Participation	All professors teaching American History CCC courses returned responses from their students. Obviously any student who was absent on the day that the assessment was distributed did not participate. Once all of the responses were collected, 20% of each class's official enrollment (<i>not</i> 20% of the # of responses given by those students present on a given day) were randomly selected to be graded. The sample is representative of the students enrolled in courses for this category with one possible exception. If we assume that those students who absented themselves on the day that the assessment was given are disproportionately weaker students (who chose to cut class) then it is possible that the sample collected is not absolutely representative of all students in each course.
Assessment Results	<p>Exceeds standard: 29 (22%)</p> <p>Meets standard: 57 (45%)</p> <p>Approaches standard: 20 (16%)</p> <p>Does not meet standard: 22 (17%)</p>
Level of Attainment	Outcome 1 is measured in questions 5, 5a, and 5b. To see the scoring breakdown by level, please refer to the attached rubric ("Scoring the American History Assessment"). We worked from the baseline established by the previous evaluation team and adjusted it accordingly to match the changes we made to the questions. (For an explanation of these changes, see "Evaluation Process" above.)
Comparison to Previous Results	Compared to the report for AY 2004-2005, the percent of students who exceeded the standard has improved slightly (from 20% to 23%); those who met the standard decreased slightly (from 48% to 45%); those who approached the standard decreased (26% to 16%); and those who did not meet the standard increased (7% to 17%).

Assessment of Learning Outcome 2

Outcome 2:	Knowledge of common institutions in American society and how they have affected different groups
Assessment Method	We created an assessment instrument which asked for short answers from the students. It was graded using a rubric adopted by the committee. (Please see attached.)

<p>Evaluation Process</p>	<p>With regard to outcome #2 specifically, we modeled our question after that used by the last assessment team, but it was here that we made the most significant alterations. We decided to make these alterations based on 1) Dr. Hildebrand's conversation with a colleague who had served on the same subcommittee previously; this colleague indicated that students disproportionately struggled with the old version of the question 2) the belief, voiced by Dr. Hildebrand and seconded by other committee members, that the focus on institutions creates a significant problem for many teachers of American history, who have long since eschewed the "top down" model of history that focuses on the "big men" who controlled the presidency, the Congress, the Supreme Court, etc. We tried to reshape the question so that students addressed issues of identity within the context of American institutions.</p> <p>Understanding that students had struggled when asked to explain the significance of certain institutions selected from a list, we gave them two working definitions of "institution" (see the attached assessment instrument). Rather than giving them a list of institutions and asking them to choose several to discuss, we gave them a list of rights and responsibilities frequently associated with the American experience and asked them to reflect on how those rights and responsibilities shaped American institutions and identity. We made a list of rights and responsibilities associated with American identity and institutions that students might choose to discuss, then we circulated that list, via email, with all professors who would be giving the assessment in their classes. We edited the list of rights and responsibilities based on their input.</p> <p>Drs. Hildebrand, Allan, and Van Dette did the grading according to a rubric. The rubric was modeled after the rubric used by the previous assessment group. Before it was used, the committee met to evaluate the rubric as modified by Dr. Hildebrand; it was unanimously accepted.</p> <p>In order to ensure consistency in grading, the rubric assigned specific point values. Drs. Hildebrand, Van Dette, and Allan met for a practice grading session; Dr. Hildebrand copied several assessment responses and the committee graded them together, discussing how they interpreted the rubric and how it applied to student responses.</p>
<p>Timing</p>	<p>Assessment instruments were distributed in late February. Faculty were asked to complete the assessment process by April 9. One faculty member's reports came in a week late.</p>
<p>Student Participation</p>	<p>All professors teaching American History CCC courses returned responses from their students. Obviously any student who was absent on the day that the assessment was distributed did not participate. Once all of the responses were collected, 20% of each class's official enrollment (<i>not</i> 20% of the # of responses given by those students present on a given day) were randomly selected to be graded. The sample is representative of the students enrolled in courses for this category with one possible exception. If we assume that those students who absented themselves on the day that the assessment was given are disproportionately weaker students (who chose to cut class) then it is possible that the sample collected is not absolutely representative of all students in each course.</p>

Assessment Results	Exceeds standard: 16 (13%) Meets standard: 30 (23%) Approaches standard: 34 (27%) Does not meet standard: 48 (38%)
Level of Attainment	Outcome 2 is measured in question 6. To see the scoring breakdown by level, please refer to the attached rubric ("Scoring the American History Assessment"). We worked from the baseline established by the previous evaluation team and adjusted it accordingly to match the changes we made to the questions. (For an explanation of these changes, see "Evaluation Process" above.)
Comparison to Previous Results	Compared to the report for AY 2004-2005, the percent of students who exceeded the standard has decreased (from 19% to 13%); those who met the standard decreased (from 48% to 23%); those who approached the standard increased slightly (26% to 27%); and those who did not meet the standard increased (7% to 38%).

Assessment of Learning Outcome 3 (delete this table if not applicable)	
Outcome 3:	Understanding of America's evolving relationship with the rest of the world.
Assessment Method	We created an assessment instrument which asked for short answers from the students. It was graded using a rubric adopted by the committee. (Please see attached.)
Evaluation Process	<p>With regard to outcome #3 specifically, we asked students to put one of the rights or responsibilities that they had discussed in Question 6 into a global context, and to reflect on whether and how the global context affected Americans' view of themselves or other nations.</p> <p>Drs. Hildebrand, Allan, and Van Dette did the grading according to a rubric. The rubric was modeled after the rubric used by the previous assessment group. Before it was used, the committee met to evaluate the rubric as modified by Dr. Hildebrand; it was unanimously accepted.</p> <p>In order to ensure consistency in grading, the rubric assigned specific point values. Drs. Hildebrand, Van Dette, and Allan met for a practice grading session; Dr. Hildebrand copied several assessment responses and the committee graded them together, discussing how they interpreted the rubric and how it applied to student responses.</p>
Timing	Assessment instruments were distributed in late February. Faculty were asked to complete the assessment process by April 9. One faculty member's reports came in a week late.
Student Participation	All professors teaching American History CCC courses returned responses from their students. Obviously any student who was absent on the day that the assessment was distributed did not participate. Once all of the responses were collected, 20% of each class's official enrollment (<i>not</i> 20% of the # of responses given by those students present on a given day) were randomly selected to be

	graded. The sample is representative of the students enrolled in courses for this category with one possible exception. If we assume that those students who absented themselves on the day that the assessment was given are disproportionately weaker students (who chose to cut class) then it is possible that the sample collected is not absolutely representative of all students in each course.
Assessment Results	Exceeds standard: 19 (15%) Meets standard: 36 (28%) Approaches standard: 41 (32%) Does not meet standard: 32 (25%)
Level of Attainment	Outcome 3 is measured in question 7. To see the scoring breakdown by level, please refer to the attached rubric ("Scoring the American History Assessment"). We worked from the baseline established by the previous evaluation team.
Comparison to Previous Results	Compared to the report for AY 2004-2005, the percent of students who exceeded the standard has decreased slightly (from 16% to 15%); those who met the standard decreased (from 36% to 28%); those who approached the standard decreased (36% to 32%); and those who did not meet the standard increased (12% to 25%).

Conclusions

What are the three most important conclusions drawn from your data about attainment of student learning outcomes within the category?

- Students are relatively comfortable with the narrative of American history; they struggle more when asked to evaluate or analyze the significance of events.
- We added questions 1-4, which asked about the students' background in American and world history as well as their grade level. It is not surprising, but it is significant, that juniors and seniors generally outperformed freshmen and sophomores, and that students who had more than one American history course outperformed those who had little exposure previously.
- Certain classes performed better than others. Generally speaking, students in 300-level courses performed better than students in 100-level courses. However, it also appears that the willingness of the student (and possibly the professor) to take the assessment seriously mattered significantly to the outcome of the assessment. There is a consensus among the graders that a more concerted effort quite likely would have improved the outcome. For example: Question 5 asked the students to list five events, put them in chronological order, and explain their significance. Too many students made no effort to arrange events chronologically; too many more either made no attempt to explain the significance or tried to do so in five words or less. This minimal effort hints more at a lack of commitment than a lack of knowledge. Certainly there are other improvements we can make to the assessment process, and good teachers always try to improve their courses. Too often, however, students did not seem to engage with the instrument.

What factors make it difficult to draw conclusions about student learning in this category?

- Though we generally felt that a commitment to perform strongly on the assessment was lacking, it is ultimately impossible to measure whether a student's response was lacking because of his/her effort or because of his/her knowledge.
- More than ever before, international students took part in this assessment process. (Because professors were asked to give their students some sort of class grade connected to the assessment instrument, many, though not all, of the assessments had student names on them.) American students learn their history in layers over many years. Using one assessment tool to measure students who have learned aspects of American history in elementary, middle, and high school as well as students who may be learning about American history for the first time is problematic. Additionally, language issues presented a problem. On the assessments that I read, several students indicated that they did not understand the question being asked. Such responses, of course, went into the "does not meet standard" category, but to conclude that this is somehow a failure of the course or the instructor would be wildly inaccurate. I graded 47 assessments. Six of those documents had names written on them that suggested that the students were among our Korean cohort; there may have been others who did not write their names. Six of 47 is almost 13%, which means that the results this year have good reason to be significantly different from AY 2004-2005.
- A somewhat related point: I understand that one way that we as a university have addressed the recent funding challenges is by accepting more students, which has led us to lower our standards just a bit. Because this version of an assessment instrument makes it possible for students to draw upon what they have learned in their course OR what they have learned in middle and high school, it seems possible that some of our freshman might be starting from a slightly less developed foundation.
- I find learning outcome #2 problematic. There was a time when American history was taught from the top down, giving particular emphasis to institutions and the rich white men who controlled them. But after the various social revolutions of the 1950s-1970s, many historians (and scholars whose work is informed by history) have changed their focus. While we still teach about institutions (from the Supreme Court to the family; from the Congress to the institution of slavery), our focus is often on attempting to reveal how American identity evolved among many different groups (men and women; whites and people of color; straight and gay; rich and poor...). A learning outcome that posits the institution as a central focus in American history does not accurately reflect the way that many historians study the past. Learning outcome #2 needs to be updated to reflect some of the changes that have taken place in the academy. Otherwise, some professors might feel pressure to teach to the learning outcome in order to increase performance scores; this would be tantamount to refusing to allow for progress in the way that history is interpreted and taught.
- In order to get our grading done in a reasonable time, we distributed the

	<p>assessments at the end of February and asked professors to have them completed by April 9. (I understand that this is a common practice across the CCC assessment committees.) Several professors returned their students' completed assessments in early March. Though I understand the necessity for an early cut-off date, this seems very problematic in terms of measuring the full impact of that course. If we truly expect a single course to prepare students to meet our standards for the three learning outcomes, it seems that the assessment should be administered at the very end of the semester to be meaningful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many students indicated that the class in which they took our assessment was their first American history course; many others indicated that they had taken as many as five American history courses before completing our assessment. To grade all of these students' responses using a single rubric, a single standard, is perhaps not the best approach.
<p>What are your recommendations for improving the process of assessment of student learning in this category?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Right now, we have questions that basically rephrase the learning outcomes and then ask the students to prove they've learned something that fits in that category. In my opinion, we need to flip roles. The questions need to be specific (and specifically designed for each class), and then it should be the responsibility of the professor to parse the responses and determine how well the students have met the standard. I do not believe that vague, open-ended questions allow students to really demonstrate what they have learned. This would take a significant amount of planning and labor on the part of the committee and the professor, however, and many instructors are already feeling the strains of work creep. Since it would cost money, I know this won't be a popular suggestion, but I think that one professor should be appointed to an assessment position (with very limited teaching responsibilities) during each spring semester; his/her job would be to meet with each individual instructor and craft questions to be used on the final which satisfy both the professor's desire to evaluate material specific to his/her class and the need to correlate learning outcomes to that material. • Instructors are told not to prepare the students in any way for the assessment. This may be a mistake, especially if we continue to use assessment instruments that ask broad, open-ended questions. Shameful though it is, students are not always good about reading instructions. In Question 5, it was clear that some students confused "definition" with "significance." Many students observed the request that they include an event prior to 1900 in their lists, but many failed to include an event after 1990 as instructed. I suspect that many of them misread the date, believing that they were being asked for a pre- and post-1900 event, not a post-1990 event. (I'm not sure why we ask for a post-1990 event. We kept the instruction because our predecessors used it, but personally, I would like to see it changed to, perhaps, 1950. The vast majority of students who note the post-1990 requirement refer to 9/11, but many scholars are not yet comfortable analyzing that recent event historically, so it is unlikely that our students are prepared to do so. Moreover, since students take the assessment comparatively early in the semester, they may not have learned much about any post-1990 event.) We should not

have to read instructions to students, but if we want accurate measurements of our courses, we may need to take action to ensure that a student's knowledge, not his/her ability or willingness to read directions, is truly what the assessment instrument measures.

- It was also clear that students struggled with the question asking them about institutions as well as the one asking them to place American history in a global context. It might help to allow professors to discuss the questions' framework with the students. Many students have come to expect study guides; they are not necessarily used to coming up with thoughtful answers without any preparation. Obviously we should not prompt them about how to answer the questions, but a brief discussion about the various institutions that function in our society might get their minds working. A brief discussion about global context could similarly be useful. One way to allow professors to have this discussion with their students in a meaningful way without crossing the line into prompting them to give certain answers would be to provide them with a 10-minute PowerPoint presentation or a brief handout that they can walk through with their students. It might even provide sample answers to the questions (of course students would be instructed that they could not use that topic/example in their response). This would ensure that all students received the same type of limited preparation.
- I find rubric grading very difficult for these sorts of interpretive questions. Everyone serving on this committee is a professor with significant experience grading. I think that the evaluations of the assessment instruments might be more effective if graders met to discuss the responses expected and the qualities that separate an "at standard" response from an "approaches standard" response. But I think each professor should then be allowed to grade each response using his/her well-developed grading intuition. Historical analysis simply does not lend itself to a rigid point system.
- A smaller point: right now, question seven (used to evaluate LO#3) is ethnocentric. If a future committee decides to use this question or one like it, please be sure to remove references to the way that "we see ourselves as Americans." Not all of the students taking this assessment are Americans! Sorry not to have caught this sooner.
- Another smaller point: I printed the assessments as one-sided sheets in the hope that it might encourage students to write more (on the back of the paper). I only had one student do so. For the sake of the environment, it would probably be better to print double-sided.
- Another smaller point regarding question 5: Assigning students 3 points if they get the chronological order right (as we and our predecessors did) is too much. Comparatively, correctly identifying the significance of all five events only yields 2.5 points. I believe that it skews the results away from analytical thinking, which is what we really want to measure.

<p>What are your recommendations for improving student learning in this category?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● One of the skills that it has taken me longest to develop (and which I am still developing) is the ability to “scaffold” – not simply present students with content, but to explain to students why I am presenting certain content. One way to improve student learning in this category might be to make it more obvious to them what we are teaching them in the big picture. I don’t mean to suggest that we “teach to the test” – bend our material to fit the LOs – but that we make sure to show them how the material that we teach relates to the LOs. ● Students struggled most with the questions that asked them to interpret, to analyze, to think creatively. I think we need to continue to emphasize to students that these are all skills, and that the courses that meet the American history requirement are just as important for the skills that they teach as for the content that they provide. Then we need to make sure that we are really pushing students to develop those skills in our classes. HIST 133 seats 120 students; POLI 276 enrolls 50; HIST 105 and 106 seat 35 students. To really allow professors to engage students with these skills, these classes should be smaller. (Again, I’m sure that this suggestion is untenable because of cost, but I think it would make a real difference in student learning.) ● On campus in general, students often look at CCC courses with disdain or simply do not take those courses seriously. Having taught HIST 133, I know that it is not at all unusual to have 50 (of 120!) students show up on any given day. There is often a sense that because CCC courses are required, they should be easier. Based on my own experience, I know that it is not uncommon for students to comment that HIST 133 and HIST 105 are “too difficult for a CCC.” We need to change students’ perceptions of CCC courses. They are not owed an automatic ‘B’ for enrolling in the class. They should not be able to walk away with a “gentleman’s ‘C’” for attending 50% of the classes. If we are going to rely on one course to teach students what we want them to know about American history (or any other CCC category), then we need to make sure that the students attend those courses and take them seriously.
<p>Please share any other comments the subcommittee may have.</p>	

AMERICAN HISTORY & CULTURE: CCC PART 8 ASSESSMENT

Date: _____ Class: Freshman ___ Sophomore ___ Junior ___ Senior ___

1. In what class are you taking this assessment? _____
2. How many American history classes have you taken at this or another college institution? _____
3. How many Western Civilization AND World history classes have you taken at this or another college institution? Western Civ: _____ World: _____
4. Are you taking this class to get CCC credit for the American History category? Yes: _____ No: _____
5. List **at least 5** important events or developments (political, economic, and/or social/cultural) in American history. Include **at least two** events/developments from **before 1900** and **no more than one** from **after 1990**. **Number the events in chronological order**, with 1 being earliest. After each event/development, **explain briefly WHY it was important**

5a. Choose **ONE** of the events/developments listed above and explain how it demonstrates a shared set of core values among Americans. (If none of the events/developments listed above does so, choose another event/development.)

5b. Choose **ONE** of the events/developments listed above and explain how it demonstrates that the United States is composed of a diverse group of people. (If none of the events/developments listed above does so, choose another event/development.)

6. American citizenship comes with certain rights and responsibilities. Choose one right and one responsibility from the lists below, and briefly explain how each is necessary to and contributes to the development of American identity and American institutions. For the purposes of this assignment, an institution could be identified as 1) an organization or establishment founded for a specific purpose, such as a hospital, church, or branch of government or 2) an established custom, law, or relationship in a society or community, such as the institution of slavery or the institution of the family.

Rights [select 1 for your response]:

equal protection under the law
freedom of thought
freedom of speech/expression
freedom of association
vote
privacy (including but not limited to rights to
marriage, procreation, contraception,
abortion, and private education)
own property
public education

Responsibilities [select 1 for your response]:

vote
maintain a rational discourse
military service
environmental stewardship
jury duty
pay taxes

7. Place ONE right or responsibility listed above in a global context. Does that right or responsibility affect the way that we see ourselves as Americans? Does it affect the way that we see the rest of the world?

Scoring the American History Assessment (CCC Part 8)

SUNY General Education Requirement Student Learning Outcome Areas for American History:

- (1) Knowledge of a basic narrative of American history: political, economic, social, and cultural, including knowledge of unity and diversity in American society

Question 5

(A): Asks students to identify important events and explain their significance. 5 points possible.

- Give ½ point for each historically important event listed
- Give ½ point (each) for explaining the significance of each event

(B): Asks students to put events in proper chronological order. 3 points possible.

- 3 points – no chronological errors
- 2 points – minor chronological errors
- 1 point – significant chronological errors
- 0 points – not completed

Deductions:

- Deduct 1 point if students do not include an event/development before 1900
- Deduct 1 point if students do not include an event/development after 1990

Question 5(a)

Demonstrate knowledge of unity (“shared set of core values”) in the United States

- 3 points – above average
- 2 points – average
- 1 point – below average
- 0 points – not completed

Question 5(b)

Demonstrate knowledge of diversity in the United States

- 3 points – above average
- 2 points – average
- 1 point – below average
- 0 points – not completed

Question 5, 5a, and 5b are worth a total of 14 points.

12-14 points: *exceeds standard*

8-11 points: *meets standard*

5-7 points: *approaches standard*

0-4 points: *does not meet standard*

SUNY General Education Requirement Student Learning Outcome Areas for American History:
(2) Knowledge of common institutions in American society and how they have affected different groups

Question 6

(A) Identify 1 right and 1 responsibilities often associated with citizenship

- Assign 1 point for each right or responsibility identified (**2 points maximum**)

(B) Relate that right and that responsibility to an institution

For each item listed: (**4 points total**; 2 points maximum for the right, 2 points maximum for the responsibility)

- 2 points - shows understanding of the relationship between the right/responsibility listed and the institution
- 1 point – connects the right/resp. to the right institution, but doesn't show a relationship
- 0 points – not completed

(C) Explain how those rights and responsibilities contributed to the formation of American identity

For each item listed: (**4 points total**; 2 points maximum for the right, 2 points maximum for the responsibility)

- 2 points – demonstrates cause and effect relationship between right/resp. and its impact on American identity
- 1 point – asserts a reasonable connection, but does not show causality
- 0 points – not completed

Question 6 is worth a total of 10 points.

9-10 points: *exceeds standard*

6-8 points: *meets standard*

4-5 points: *approaches standard*

0-3 points: *does not meet standard*

SUNY General Education Requirement Student Learning Outcome Areas for American History:

(3) Understanding of America's evolving relationship with the rest of the world.

Question 7

Place one of the rights/responsibilities from Question 6 in a global context.

- 3 points – explains how the global context explains American identity and the way that Americans see the rest of the world (*exceeds standard*)
- 2 points – explains the significance of the event in a global context, but does not connect it to the way that Americans see selves/the world (*meets standard*)
- 1 point – touches upon the global context, but not in a meaningful way (*approaches standard*)
- 0 points – not completed (*does not meet standard*)

Score Sheet for the American History Assessment
CCC Part 8, American History

1. Knowledge of a basic narrative of American history: political, economic, social, and cultural, including knowledge of unity and diversity in American society (Questions 5, 5a, 5b)

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Does not meet standard

2. Knowledge of common institutions in American society and how they have affected different groups (Question 6)

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Does not meet standard

3. Understanding of America's evolving relationship with the rest of the world

Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Approaches Standard	Does not meet standard