History PhD Assessment Report, 2013-2014 Academic Year

Expected Outcomes: Public Presentation of Historical Scholarship
Graduates of the doctoral program will be contributors to historical scholarship.

Related typical general education outcomes: None

Assessment method: Graduate Colloquia Performance
All Ph.D. students are required to present on their research at an annual research colloquium, at least once during their tenure in the program. A committee of faculty evaluated these research presentations using a new survey instrument introduced for the first time in AY 2013-2014 (Appendix 2). Awards are given for outstanding scholarship.

Findings:
9 Ph.D. students presented at the Graduate Colloquium in spring 2014, 2 of them for a second time. Two Ph.D. students were recognized for their excellent paper presentations and the research that informed them. Faculty assessed presenters on the basis of six distinct criteria. The benchmark score was “2”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Average (mean)</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Thesis</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Materials</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery techniques</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to extemporize</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


While one or two students were graded by individual faculty below the benchmark score of “2” in 4/6 categories, the average quality of presentations at this year's colloquium was judged highly by faculty assessors, particularly in terms of the construction of papers and the presentation of argument and evidence. Overall, students were scored less highly on delivery techniques.

The department will only get a better picture of student skills in this area when assessment is carried out consistently over a number of years. The strength of the Ph.D. presenters can only be judged in comparison with the average scores achieved by M.A. students in 2013-2014.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Ph.D. average (mean)</th>
<th>M.A. average (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Thesis</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Materials</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery techniques</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to extemporize</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This data points to the possibility of a systematic weakness in the program in terms of students’ ability to present in a polished and confident fashion. The Graduate Committee will pay close attention to this rubric during the 2015 Graduate Colloquium and will discuss means of remediation if necessary.

**How did you use findings for improvement?**

The best way to hone students’ delivery techniques is to encourage them to practice in an arena where they can secure constructive feedback from faculty. The Department has, as a result, looked to encourage students to present at the Colloquium on multiple occasions. To encourage second-time participants, the Graduate Committee decided in 2012-2013 to move the colloquium to late January so it would not take place at a time when students were not focused on completing coursework. Unfortunately, a University closure forced the department to delay the colloquium to late March once again in 2013-2014. Rescheduling meant that one second-time student dropped out of presenting. The graduate committee expects that, if the Colloquium can be held in January in future years, the number of students presenting on multiple occasions, as well as the quality of research presented as a whole, should improve in coming years.

**Additional comments:** Faculty members continue to encourage graduate students to present their work both inside (as part of the Graduate School 3-minute and Research-week presentation competitions) and outside the University. Additionally, a number of graduate students presented at regional and graduate student conferences in 2012-2013, and more are slated to in the months ahead. The Department is limited by College policy in the amount of financial aid it can give to students wishing to attend and present at conferences. The Graduate Committee will more effectively survey external presentations with the introduction of annual reports in spring/summer 2015.

**Expected Outcomes: Research Skills**

Doctoral students will develop the skills necessary to plan and carry out comprehensive programs of research, identifying and locating relevant secondary literature, archives and/or with other substantial collections of primary sources.

**Related typical general education outcomes:** None

**Assessment Methods**

**Method #1: Completion of Ph.D. dissertations.**

Students in the PhD program must produce a substantial monograph-length dissertation offering a strong historical argument, presented in historiographical context, and grounded in extensive original research conducted in archives and/or with other substantial collections of primary sources. Students will be expected to be able to complete and defend their theses within four years of passing their preliminary examinations and attaining Ph.D. candidacy.

**Findings:**

Following the awarding of 10 Ph.D. degrees in academic year 2008-2009, 4 in 2009-2010, 2 in 2010-2011, 2 in 2011-2012, 5 in 2012-2013, the Department had 3 students complete the Ph.D. in 2012-2013.
How did you use findings for improvement? #1
The graduate committee will introduce a new internal assessment tool, a more detailed rubric to assess students’ dissertations, to the official departmental oral final examination report forms in fall 2015.

Method #2: Graduate Colloquia Presentations
Work on the dissertation begins during coursework: the student completes an article or chapter-length piece of work, and is graded on it in the “Research and Writing Seminar” (Hist7710), normally taken by students in their third semester of study. Ph.D. students normally use the research conducted during this “Research and Writing Seminar” to present at the Graduate Colloquium. In AY 2013-2014, faculty evaluated these research presentations using a new survey instrument (Appendix 2). This evaluation rubric included an assessment of the “supporting materials” used to support the presentation and to establish the presenter’s authority on the subject. This assessment offers a valuable window on research skills as the student begins the transition from coursework to ABD research status.

Findings#2:
7 Ph.D. students presented at the Graduate Colloquium in spring 2014 for the first time. Under the rubric of “Supporting Materials,” faculty assessed the presenters’ inclusion of evidence, explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from or appropriate references to relevant authorities. The benchmark score was “2”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Supporting Materials</th>
<th>Average (mean)</th>
<th>Highest</th>
<th>Lowest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Although one was assessed below the benchmark by one assessor, students presenting for the first time scored relatively highly on this measure of research skills.

How did you use findings for improvement? #2
On entering the “Research and Writing seminar”, the Instructor of Record surveys students’ basic research skills. In 2013-2014, the same survey was also carried out for the first time in another “core” seminar, “Historical Methods (Hist7700) and the “Research and Writing Seminar” (Hist7710) (Appendix 1). In the context of both these classes, the Instructor of Record in partnership with Auburn University Libraries faculty developed strategies for remediation in areas of deficiency in direct response to deficiencies uncovered by the survey. In future years, it is hoped that, by comparing results of surveys taken by students in Historical Methods to those taken by the same students in the Research and Writing Seminar, the Graduate Committee will be able to study the issue of students’ retention of research skills as they move through the program.

Additional comments: The Department still faces challenges of getting more of our students who advance to candidacy to research, write, and defend their dissertations in a timely manner. There are some signs that this issue is starting to come under control. Of the 3 students to graduate in 2013-2014, one entered in fall 2006 (eight years), one in fall 2007 (seven years), and one in fall 2009 (five years). They took 4, 2 1/2, and 2 years to complete their dissertation after successfully passing their preliminary examinations respectively. This data suggests that a combination of the Graduate
School's Continuous Enrollment Policy and Department decisions in spring 2013 to impose stricter limits on time to completion and the currency of coursework seem to be succeeding in encouraging both long-term and more recent ABD students to complete in a more expedited fashion. In 2014-2015, the Department will begin to track ABD students more closely by instituting a system of annual reports. The Graduate committee will also debate extending the funding options available to students in their third year after preliminary examinations in order to make it possible for students to concentrate on completion without the distractions of having to take on heavy adjunct teaching loads at Auburn or elsewhere to make ends meet.

**Expected Outcomes: Historical Knowledge**
Doctoral students will exhibit a sophisticated and detailed knowledge of the content and scholarship of their respective major and minor fields.

**Related typical general education outcomes:** None

**Assessment method: Preliminary Examination Performance**
Students in the PhD program must pass a series of written and oral examinations in order to advance to candidacy. These examinations should be taken no later than six months after students complete their coursework. Do students pass their preliminary doctoral exams in their major fields on their first attempt by demonstrating a degree of expertise and professionalism considered appropriate by the department?

**Findings:**
In academic year 2012-2013 all but one of eight Ph.D. students attempting preliminary exams for the first time passed on their first attempt. All were judged “good” or better on the examinations. The failing student recently passed the oral examination on a second attempt, being judged “good” or better on the examination.

**How did you use findings for improvement? #1**
The department add a new internal assessment tool, a more detailed rubric to assess students’ historical proficiency, to official departmental general (prelims) oral examination report forms in fall 2015.

**How did you use findings for improvement? #2**
In 2013-2014 the Graduate Committee, through the Graduate Program Officer, operated a more robust third-semester review system for all Ph.D.-track students – not only to identify Ph.D.-track students who may need remediation strategies or who may need to terminate their studies at the MA. level, but also to have committee members play a more active role in planning students’ coursework in preparation for their major and minor field exams. Operating the system more robustly revealed that the third semester review came too late for students transferring a maximum of 18 hours of graduate credit hours into the program. It is expected in 2014-2015 therefore to begin to phase out the third semester review and to replace it with a system of active faculty participation in annual reports.

**Additional comments:** Previous assessments had indicated that a low success rate in terms of students taking preliminary examinations within six months of completing coursework. This issue is no longer critical. In fall 2013, all but 1 of the 6 students scheduled to take preliminary examinations
took their examinations on schedule. The sixth took and passed his examination early in the subsequent semester. Both of the 2 students scheduled to take preliminary examinations in spring 2014 took and passed their examinations on schedule. Commencing in fall 2014, the Department will operate new common deadlines for preliminary written exams, which are designed to prevent individual students slipping past the deadline. The Graduate Program Officer – in conjunction with major professors – will continue to monitor preliminary examination completion and success rates.

**Expected Outcomes: Placement**
Graduates of the doctoral program will be highly competitive on the job market. Graduates of the doctoral program who are pursuing an archival career will exhibit a strong knowledge of the theories and practice of the archival profession.

**Related typical general education outcomes:** None

**Assessment Method: Survey of Graduates, 2011-2014**
Survey graduates of the MA program to determine what percentage are successfully employed within three years of completion of degree (*Appendix 3*). Particular attention will be given to placement results for those Ph.D.’s who completed a minor field or received a certificate in archival studies, public history, and/or college and university teaching (AU Biggio Center for Teaching and Learning).

**Findings:** Following the advice of Auburn University’s Office of Institutional Research and Assessment, the department abandoned its practice of reporting back based on faculty knowledge, which allowed the department to account for the job placement of 100% of graduates. Instead, the department launched a new formal survey instrument. The survey was addressed by email to students who graduated in the last three years (since fall 2011). 9 Ph.D. students received the questionnaire. The department received responses from 4 graduates or 44% of the total. None of the students who responded to the survey had completed a graduate certificate in archival studies or public history. One, however, had completed a minor field in Archival Studies. Another had completed a graduate certificate in College and University Teaching through the Biggio Center.

Q5 in the survey revealed that, in this cohort,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25% (1)</td>
<td>teaching at a higher-level / post-secondary educational institution in a tenured or tenure-track position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50% (2)</td>
<td>teaching at a higher-level / post-secondary educational institution in a non-tenure-track position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>employed in a professional capacity in the field of archives or public history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>employed in another professional capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>continuing in graduate education at Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0% (0)</td>
<td>continuing in graduate education at another institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25% (1)</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The one graduate to respond as currently holding a tenure-track position is employed by the University of West Alabama. This graduate completed a minor field in archival studies and was first employed at UWA as the Director of the Center for the Study of the Black Belt.
The 2 students working in non-tenure track positions are employed by Kennesaw State (GA) and Grand Valley State University (MI). The latter respondent indicated that he will be leaving the teaching profession to enter seminary in 2014-2015. The student who chose “other” completed his Ph.D. in spring 2014, and is currently a postdoctoral fellow at the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum in Washington, DC. He will occupy a non-tenure track adjunct position at Auburn University in 2014-2015.

In terms of these respondents, our placement rate is 100%. An informal survey of the graduates addressed by the survey reveals a no less impressive employment record.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Employment Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>teaching at a higher-level / post-secondary educational institution in a tenured or tenure-track position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.55%</td>
<td>teaching at a higher-level / post-secondary educational institution in a non-tenure-track position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>employed in a professional capacity in the field of archives or public history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11%</td>
<td>employed in another professional capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>continuing in graduate education at Auburn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>continuing in graduate education at another institution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.23%</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The students who did not respond to the survey are currently employed as adjunct lecturers at Alabama State University, Chattanooga State Community College (TN), and Winthrop University (SC), and as a high school teacher at Saint James School in Montgomery. One student who graduated in Fall 2013 is still seeking a permanent employment opportunity.

In addition to tracking job placement, Q9 in the survey asked respondents to assess the program from the perspective of recent graduates. The response was overwhelmingly positive.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not much (1)</th>
<th>A little (2)</th>
<th>A good deal (3)</th>
<th>A lot (4)</th>
<th>Average (mean)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did your time at Auburn increase your level of historical knowledge?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did you become more effective as a researcher over the course of your degree at Auburn?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your training at Auburn make you a better writer?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your training at Auburn make you a better communicator and/or presenter?</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition to the criteria above, and noting the importance of archival or public history training, respondents to Q10 identified teaching experience as a key factor in helping them achieve...
employment. These responses also identified the unevenness of this provision in the department. One student (the recipient of a Department Graduate Instructor Fellowship and two years of employment as a full-time instructor pre- and post-doctoral thereafter) noted that “teaching experience” was the “aspect of your training at Auburn has helped you most since completing the program.” Another (given the chance to teach just once as a Graduate Instructor in a core “History and Civilization” section) commented in response to the question “What aspect of your training at Auburn has been least helpful?” that “I did not receive enough chances to teach.”

How did you use findings for improvement?
Although placement of graduate students has been quite good given the inhospitable job market, we continue to look for ways to add value to students’ qualifications. The tenure-track employment of a Ph.D. graduate with archival training at UWA gives hope that the Graduate certificates in Archives and Public History will enhance our graduate students’ chances on the job market once students who have received that qualification begin to graduate (1 Ph.D student received a certificate in archival studies in 2012-2013; 2 received certificates in archival studies or public history in AY 2013-2014; 1 is already qualified to receive a certificate in public history in AY 2014-2015).

In terms of teaching experience, the Graduate Committee commissioned a second trial of World History discussion sections taught by graduate students for fall 2013. Another set of these discussion sections will be run in fall 2014, but the department is no closer to finalizing a plan for a comprehensive mentor-based scheme for providing Graduate Teaching Assistants with structured opportunities to secure in-classroom teaching experience as promised in last year’s assessment report. The Graduate Committee will continue to make efforts in this regard in AY 2014-2015.

Additional comments: The department has continued to implement a policy passed in 2012 requiring all students to take a breadth or minor field in World History, preparing them to offer courses in that field after graduation. The first set of students affected by this policy took preliminary examinations in AY 2013-2014.

Reductions in the number of tuition waivers covered by Graduate Teaching Assistantships (to 110% of the number of hours required for a graduate degree) has now made it impractical for our graduate students to complete the requirements for the Biggio Center’s Graduate Certificate in College/University Teaching.

2. You have located this citation within a bibliography:


   **Detail** the steps you would take to determine if the source is available at Auburn University Libraries.

3. You have located this citation within a bibliography:

   Burton, Antoinette. “‘history is now’: how feminist theory and the production of historical feminisms” Women’s History Review 1.1(1992): 25-39

   **Detail** the steps you would take to determine if the source is available at Auburn University Libraries.
4. You are writing an article on Maxwell Air Force Base during the Vietnam War and need to conduct a fairly extensive secondary literature review on the topic. Which resources do you use? List as many as you feel are necessary. Justify each selection.

5. You have an idea for a new article/project. What are the first two (2) resources you consult to see if anyone has "done" the topic? Why did you choose those two resources?
6. What are the differences between Google and Google Scholar?

7. You need to locate letters and diaries regarding biologist and author Eugene B. Sledge, both in and outside of Auburn holdings. Where do you look?

8. You are about to undertake a research project which will take at least a year to complete. Over that time you will be compiling a bibliography of over 100 resources (both primary and secondary). What system, if any, will you use for organizing and managing those citations?
9. Consider this your thesis statement: "The founding of the Filson Club in Louisville, Kentucky was a major milestone in the history of American archives." Using the generic database interface below, what is your primary search strategy? Two alternate search strategies?

Primary:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>in</th>
<th>Search Fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

OR

NOT

Alternate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>in</th>
<th>Search Fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

OR

NOT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Search terms</th>
<th>in</th>
<th>Search Fields</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AND

OR

NOT
### Evaluation Rubric for AU History Grad Colloquium Presentations
Adapted from AACU Oral Communication VALUE Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Distinction</th>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>Organization. Specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions</td>
<td>Organization, clearly and consistently observable, is skillful and makes the content of the presentation cohesive.</td>
<td>Organization is clearly and consistently observable within the presentation.</td>
<td>Organization is intermittently observable within the presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Central Thesis.</td>
<td>Central thesis is compelling (precisely stated, appropriately repeated, memorable, and strongly supported.)</td>
<td>Central thesis is clear and consistent with the supporting material.</td>
<td>Central thesis is basically understandable but is not often repeated and is not memorable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Supporting Materials. Includes evidence, explanations, examples, illustrations, statistics, analogies, quotations from or appropriate references to relevant authorities.</td>
<td>Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that significantly supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that generally supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
<td>Supporting materials make appropriate reference to information or analysis that partially supports the presentation or establishes the presenter's credibility/authority on the topic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Language.</td>
<td>Language choices are imaginative, memorable, and compelling, and enhance the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are thoughtful and generally support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is appropriate to audience.</td>
<td>Language choices are mundane and commonplace and partially support the effectiveness of the presentation. Language in presentation is inappropriate to audience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Delivery techniques. Includes posture, gesture, eye contact, and vocal expressiveness.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques make the presentation compelling, and speaker appears polished and confident.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques make the presentation interesting, and speaker appears comfortable.</td>
<td>Delivery techniques make the presentation understandable, and speaker appears tentative.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ability to extemporize. Answering audience questions with facility and with a command of necessary information.</td>
<td>Impressive extemporaneous performance, drawing on a high level of knowledge, providing comprehensive answers to more sophisticated questions, and relating answers skillfully back to the presentation.</td>
<td>Comfortable speaking extemporaneously, demonstrating a good level of knowledge, and answering more sophisticated questions with explanations and useful elaboration.</td>
<td>Somewhat comfortable speaking extemporaneously. Can provide answers to both rudimentary and more sophisticated questions but is tentative or fails to elaborate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a zero to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (1/4) level performance.
Evaluation Rubric for AU History Grad Colloquium Presentations
Adapted from AACU Oral Communication VALUE Rubric

Student name: ________________________ Spring __________

Presentation Title: __________________________________________

Additional Comments:
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________________

I agree for these comments to be passed on to the student’s major adviser (please tick) □

Evaluators are encouraged to assign a **zero** to any work sample or collection of work that does not meet benchmark (1/4) level performance.
Appendix 3:
Survey of Successful Graduates (Ph.D.),
2011-2014

All the information you provide in this survey will remain within the department. We need to know your name so that we can tie the information collected to specific programs and their assessments. Providing an up-to-date email and snail mail address is optional. If you do provide them, we will use them to contact you in future but we will not use them for random advertising purposes or give them to anyone for funding raising, etc.

1. Your Details
   Name: 
   Best email at which to contact you (optional): 
   Current address (optional): 

2. Program Information

2. In what year and semester did you earn your Ph.D. degree?
   - Before Fall 2011
   - Fall 2011
   - Spring 2012
   - Summer 2012
   - Fall 2012
   - Spring 2013
   - Summer 2013
   - Fall 2013
   - Spring 2014
3. Did you complete a graduate certificate at Auburn? If so, which one(s)? Select all that apply.
☐ Certificate in Archival Studies
☐ Certificate in Public History
☐ Certificate in College/University Teaching (Biggio Center)
☐ I did not receive a Graduate Certificate

4. Have you secured further professional degrees or qualifications since completing your degree at Auburn?
☐ Yes
☐ No
If you answered yes, what further qualification(s) / degree(s) have you secured?

Your work history since graduation

Please let us know where you are currently employed as well as your work history since completing your degree at Auburn. The more information you can provide the better. Fields that do not apply to your situation can be left blank.

5. What is your current occupation?
☐ I am teaching at a higher-level / post-secondary educational institution in a tenured or tenure-track position
☐ I am teaching at a higher-level / post-secondary educational institution in a non-tenure-track position
☐ I am employed in a professional capacity in the field of archives or public history
☐ I am employed in another professional capacity
☐ I am continuing in graduate education at Auburn
☐ I am continuing in graduate education at another institution
☐ Other (please specify)
6. If you are currently employed as an educator or in another professional capacity, what is your current occupation? (otherwise leave your answers to this question blank).

Organization: 

Job title: 

Month and Year when you started this position: 

Previous positions held *since* completing your graduate studies at Auburn - list in order starting with the most recent (place approximate date ranges within brackets after each job):

7. If you are currently in a degree program at Auburn or at another institution:

What degree are you seeking? (e.g. Ph.D.)

What subject are you studying (e.g. History)

In what year did you commence this degree program?

8. If you clicked 'other' in Question 5, please provide details as to your current situation and plans for the future.
# Impact

9. What did you learn at Auburn?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Did your time at Auburn increase your level of historical knowledge?</th>
<th>Not much</th>
<th>A little</th>
<th>A good deal</th>
<th>A lot</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did you become more effective as a researcher over the course of your degree at Auburn?</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>A good deal</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your training at Auburn make you a better writer?</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>A good deal</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did your training at Auburn make you a better communicator and/or presenter?</td>
<td>Not much</td>
<td>A little</td>
<td>A good deal</td>
<td>A lot</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. How has the history program at Auburn impacted you professionally?

What aspect of your training at Auburn has helped you most since completing the program?

What aspect of your training at Auburn has been least helpful?

Any other comments?