

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports

Annual Reporting Guidelines for Academic Programs

Purpose

Annual Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Reports (**SOASRs**) are first and foremost tools for facilitating faculty reflection, planning, and documentation of efforts to ensure student learning and success. Regular engagement in and transparent reporting of this process also serves as assurance to students and stakeholders of our commitment to student learning and success, as well as an opportunity for strengthening assessment practices and the data they yield.

Regular assessment of student achievement of learning outcomes is an important indicator for faculty to gauge student progress through their academic programs. Unlike course grades, well-designed learning outcomes assessment provides more accurate insights into student mastery of the core intended outcomes of an academic degree program, and can inform faculty planning for success and continuous improvement.

Student learning is central to student success, but we know that success is influenced by many factors. Regular review of accepted measures, such as retention, persistence, and graduation rates provides useful reference points for evaluation of program goals and reflection on the valuable activities faculty engage in to support students and promote their success.

Instructions

1. The annual SOASR documents outcomes from the PRIOR academic year, as outlined in your program assessment plan. The report due this year reflects **AY 21-22**. You do not need to report on all program outcomes every year.
2. Include program faculty, at minimum, in the discussion of assessment results and actions to be taken based on findings, and preferably throughout the assessment process.
3. **NEW FOR 2022:** Complete either the **Table Format** (Option A) **OR** the **Narrative Format** (Option B) report based on what makes sense for your discipline. While both forms will include some narrative reflection and specific data reporting, feedback from faculty suggests this option makes reporting more useful.
4. If helpful, review the SOASR Rubric (separate attachment) that will be used to provide program faculty with feedback on their assessment practices to get a sense of what details would be useful to include in your report.

For programs currently undergoing accreditation review: It is recognized that accreditation review often meets or exceeds institutional evaluation standards. If you 1) report program student learning outcome data to your accreditor, 2) data from the current AY for the SOASR is included in your accreditation report, and 3) your report will be completed by the last day to submit the SOASR, you may request an alternate reporting format to streamline your efforts.

Deadlines

To accommodate demands on faculty time and programs undergoing accreditation or program review, SOASR will be accepted on a rolling basis.

CONSULT YOUR ASSOCIATE DEAN OR ASSESSMENT DIRECTOR REGARDING ANY INTERNAL DEADLINES.

Early Submission:
September 1, 2022

Last Day to Submit:
November 23, 2022

How to Submit:
Consult your college Associate Dean or Assessment Director, as guidelines vary by college.

For assistance contact Kelley Woods-Johnson:
kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975, or visit Fall Office Hours in the FCTE, Tuesdays 8:30a-9:30a & Wednesdays 3:30p-4:30p or by appt.



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

Academic Program:	Political Science	Date:	10/05/2022
Author(s):	Matthew Bergbower and Mike Chambers		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelly.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .			__X__ Learning Outcomes __X__ Curriculum Map __X__ Assessment Plan
Is this program offered on-campus <u>AND</u> distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.			___ Yes __X__ No ___ Hybrid

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Expand table cells as necessary to accommodate requested information.

Learning Outcome(s) Assessed Include actual outcome language; enter one per line, add lines as needed	Assessment Strategies Used			Established Benchmark for Proficiency	Actual Student Performance Relative to Benchmark	Prior Results for Comparison (if applicable)
	Course	Assignment/Activity	Evaluation Tool i.e. rubric, exam key, preceptor evaluation, etc.			
1. Written Communication	PSCI 499	In PSCI 499 (Senior Seminar), students composed a research paper on a political science topic.	UDIE/AAC&U Written Communication rubric. A committee scored student papers.	Students should average 12 points out of 20 possible points for each paper using the UDIE/AAC&U Written Communication rubric. 1 = benchmark and 4 = capstone. Zero scores were given as well for those showing no match with the learning outcome. The specific categories ranked 1 thru 4 are (1) Context and Purpose, (2) Content Development, (3) Organization, (4) Sources / Evidence, and (5) Technical Matters.	Of the 7 student papers evaluated in PSCI 499, 4 students averaged 12 points or higher on the papers. The average score across the 7 papers on this learning outcome is 12.66.	In 2020-2021, Of the 8 student papers evaluated in PSCI 340, 6 students averaged 12 points or higher on the papers.
2. Critical Thinking and Analysis	PSCI 499	1.Critical Thinking is partly measured by the department's use of the Major Field Test (MFT) managed through the Educational Testing	1.ETS Exam. See Appendix for more details. 2. UDIE/AAC&U Written	1.Over 60% correct (group score). See Table 2 for more details. 2. In PSCI 499, using the professor-developed rubric combining the AAC&U	1.Group score at 61 for Critical Thinking. See Table 2 for more details.	1.See Table 2 for more details on previous ETS results. 2.In 2020-21, of the 8 student papers evaluated in PSCI

		Service (ETS). That test is given in PSCI 499 every Spring semester. 2. In PSCI 499 (Senior Seminar), students composed a research paper on a political science topic.	Communication rubric, A committee scored student papers.	Critical Thinking rubric a committee scored student papers on this learning outcome. 1 = benchmark and 4 = capstone. Zero scores were given as well for those showing no match with the learning outcome.	2. Of the 7 student papers evaluated in PSCI 499, 4 students averaged 24 points or higher on the empirical research paper. The average score across the 9 papers on this learning outcome is 23.42.	340, 4 students averaged 24 points or higher on the empirical research paper. The average score across the 9 papers on this learning outcome is 2.05
3. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Skills	PSCI 499	1. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Skills is also partly measured by the department's use of the Major Field Test (MFT) managed through the Educational Testing Service (ETS). That test is given in PSCI 499 every Spring semester.	1. ETS Exam. See Appendix for more details. 2. UDIE/AAC&U Written Communication rubric, A committee scored student papers.	1. Over 60% correct (group score). See Table 2 for more details. 2. Over 2.0 (Milestones) area.	1. Group score at 61 for Methodology. See Table 2 for more details. 2. The committee average score on this learning outcome = 2.34	1. See Table 2 for more details. 2. In 2020-21, The committee average score on this learning outcome = 1.9. In 2019-20, this average score was 2.1.
4. Content Knowledge	PSCI 499	Content knowledge is obviously a central component to all PSCI courses. Written assignments and exams, for example, all examine a student's ability to know and understand the applicability of a vast array of political concepts. For years the department reports content knowledge from a	ETS exam. See Appendix for more details.	Average score of peers (153 total)	See attached form below on ETS results	See attached form below on ETS results (Table 1).

		Major Field Test (MFT) managed through the Educational Testing Service (ETS). That test is given in PSCI 499 every Spring semester.				
5. Oral Communication Skills	PSCI 340	In PSCI 340, students were assessed on their oral presentation of their research papers. This is a PS majors only course.	rubric	In PSCI 340, 75% of students should score 16.5 out of 20 points on the professor developed rubric, with a class mean of 16.5 points or higher	10 out of the 10 students who delivered oral presentations scored higher than 16.5 out of 20. The class mean was 18.5 points All presentations were completed on Zoom in Fall 2020.	8/8 scored higher than 16.5 last year, with a 19.1 mean.

Student Success Activities

Use the "Academic Chair" tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program's data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe current student success activities that are working well.	<p>Personalized advising, in-person always available, seen around 1-3 times per semester for majors.</p> <p>Internship opportunities being encouraged, regularly scheduling PSCI 495, and being fulfilled.</p> <p>Connections with ISU alumni (guest lectures, meetings, PSCI 315 course, etc.) increasing.</p> <p>Once again encouraging extra-curricular activities after the pandemic shutdowns.</p> <p>Offering Freshmen Learning Community, working to get these Freshmen students engaged.</p>
Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?	<p>Enrollment in major, recruitment to ISU and our dept. programs. Fulfilling quality instruction in global politics coursework after retirements from Dr. Fernandez and Dr. Rashid.</p>

If you don't have a Blue Reports account, you can request one using the webpage link, or your Department Chair, Associate Dean, or College Assessment Director can assist you.



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. <i>What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?</i>	ETS Major Field examination remains strong assessment tool. Results are good indicator of program strength.
What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?	Just starting PSCI 315 coursework in class schedule rotation to expose students to career paths and skill building for such careers. Extra-curricular opportunities increasing from pandemic era.
What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?	No changes.
Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?	Two faculty members composed this document. Dept. meeting to be held on discussing the three reports produced by the Dept.

Graduation Rates	Fall 2015		Fall 2016		Retention Rates	Fall 2021	
	Cohort Total	5 year Cohort Graduation %	Cohort Total	5 year Cohort Graduation %		Cohort Total	Cohort Retention %
College of Arts & Sciences	871	40.87%	809	40.9%	College of Arts & Sciences	526	65.78%
Political Science (total)	22	50.00%	29	48.2%	Political Science	29	62.0%
Political Science - Legal Stud (3626)	5	60.00%	12	50.0%	Political Science - Legal Stud (3626)	12	58.3%
Political Science (3623)	17	47.06%	17	47.06%	Political Science (3623)	17	64.7%

Enrollment Data			
Majors	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022
Political Science	56	40	36
Legal Studies	56	46	44
Minors	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Fall 2022
Civic Leadership	22	19	19
Legal Studies	25	18	18
Political Science	31	35	35
Public Administration	6	2	2
Nonprofit Leadership	29	35	35
Public Lands & Recreation Administration (proposed for 2023)	--	--	--
Graduate Program	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
MPA	34	24	23
Other Considerations	Fall 2020	Fall 2021	Spring 2022
Pre-Law	20	23	25

AY 21-22 STUDENT OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT & SUCCESS REPORT

OPTION B: NARRATIVE FORMAT

Academic Program:		Date:	
Author(s):			
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelly.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning Outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Map <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Hybrid	



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.)

Established Benchmark for Proficiency

Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Benchmark (provide specific data rather than general observations)

Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available

Student Success Activities

Use the “Academic Chair” tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program’s data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)?



Office of Assessment
and Accreditation

Table 1: Class Average Scores on the Major Field Test – Topical (2012-2022)

	Overall	American Gov.	Comparative Politics	International Relations
2022 class average	154	55	55	56
2021 class average	153	56	50	52
2020 class average				
2019 class average	152	54	53	52
2018 class average	154	56	57	53
2017 class average	139	40	40	39
2016 class average	153	56	54	53
2015 class average	146	47	46	49
2014 class average	156	56	56	58
2013 class average	157	58	55	56
2012 class average	159	59	59	58

Subscores are reported for **individual** students on most Major Field Tests, on a scale of 20–100. For every major there are subfields. The number of questions on the exam and the breadth of the subfield determine if a reliable subscore can be reported for an individual. Because subscores require 30 questions for a specific subfield to be completed, not all Major Field Tests provide subscores.

How scores for the Major Field Test in Political Science are reported

- Total Score – Reported for each student and summarized for the group
- Subscores – Reported for each student and summarized for the group
 - Comparative Government and Politics (22–30)
 - International Relations (22–30)
 - United States Government and Politics (48–56)

Numbers in parentheses are the approximate number of questions in each category.

Table 2: Class Average Scores on the Major Field Test – Assessment Indicators (2012-2022)

	Analytical & Critical Thinking Questions	Methodology Questions	Political Thought Questions
2022 class average	61	61	42
2021 class average	63	47	52
2020 class average			
2019 class average	62	52	45
2018 class average	61	50	49
2017 class average	47	37	42
2016 class average	63	38	46
2015 class average	55	36	46
2014 class average	66	44	56
2013 class average	67	45	58
2012 class average	67	45	58

Assessment Indicators are reported only for **groups** of students. Assessment Indicators report the average percent of correct answers, in a particular subject area, for all students tested so you can determine if your students are having difficulty with specific clusters of questions. Content areas for which assessment indicator scores are reported typically have approximately 15 questions on the exam.

How scores for the Major Field Test in Political Science are reported

- Assessment Indicators – Reported for the group* only
 - Analytical and Critical Thinking (20–26)
 - Methodology (7–14)
 - Political Thought (11–20)

Numbers in parentheses are the approximate number of questions in each category.

Table 3: Class Scores on the Major Field Test Per Student (2022)

Students (last 3 digits of 991 #)	Overall	American Gov.	Comparative Politics	International Relations
897	153	63	47	42
398	172	76	70	72
006	146	36	57	60
679	156	57	57	54
449	162	54	67	63
591	136	42	31	42
2022 class average	154	55	55	56

*Total score and subscores are reported as scale scores. The scale range for the total score is 120-200.

Table 4: Comparing ISU Political Science Results to Other Universities (2016 – 2022)

	Overall	American Gov.	Comparative Politics	International Relations
2022 class average	153	56	50	52
Peer Public Institutions ^a	151	51.7	50.7	51.4
Private Institutions ^b	151.7	51	53	52.6

^a Public Institutions include scores from 2016 to 2022 for the following colleges/universities: Austin Peay State University, Ball State University, Missouri State University, South Carolina State University, Tennessee State University, Truman State University, University of Central Florida, University of Southern Indiana, University of Tennessee at Martin, and Wichita State University.

^b Private Institutions include scores from 2016 to 2022 for the following colleges/universities: Barry University, Lake Forest College, Quincy University, Texas Christian University, Hope College, University of Evansville, University of St. Thomas (MN), Westminster College (MO), Xavier University, Virginia Wesleyan University.



Find out how to prove — and improve — the effectiveness of your Political Science program with the ETS® Major Field Tests.

Content Validity

The Major Field Test (MFT) in Political Science, first administered in 1989, assesses mastery of concepts, principles and knowledge by graduating Political Science students. To ensure fairness and content relevance, the test is revised approximately every four to five years.

Developed by Leading Educators in the Field

Experienced faculty members representing all the relevant areas of the discipline determine test specifications, questions and types of scores reported. ETS assessment experts subject each question to rigorous tests of sensitivity and reliability. Every effort is made to include questions that assess the most common and important topics and skills.

In addition to factual knowledge, the test evaluates students' abilities to analyze and solve problems, understand relationships and interpret material. Questions that require interpretation of graphs, diagrams and charts are included. Academic departments may add up to two subgroups and as many as 50 additional locally written questions to test areas of the discipline that may be unique to the department or institution.

National Comparative Data

A *Comparative Data Guide*, published each year, contains tables of scaled scores and percentiles for individual student scores, departmental mean scores and any subscores or group assessment indicators that the test may support. The tables of data are drawn from senior-level test takers at a large number of diverse institutions. Nearly 1,500 colleges and universities employ one or more of the Major Field Tests for student achievement and curriculum evaluation each year.

Who Develops the MFT in Political Science?

Individuals who serve or recently have served on the Committee for the MFT in Political Science are faculty members from the following institutions:

Clemson University
Hofstra University
Metropolitan State College of Denver
Swarthmore College
Texas Christian University
University of California, Los Angeles
University of Evansville
University of Vermont

For more information about the MFT in Political Science:

Phone: **1-800-745-0269**
Email: **highered@ets.org**
Visit: **www.ets.org/mft**

Educational Testing Service
Rosedale Road
Princeton, NJ 08541



Listening. Learning. Leading.®

Test Content — Political Science (4HMF)

The Major Field Test in Political Science consists of 130 multiple-choice questions. The questions are drawn from the courses of study most commonly offered in undergraduate programs; the diversity of curricula is taken into account. Programs can choose when and where to administer the tests. It is designed to take two hours and may be split into two sessions. This test must be given by a proctor.

Fifteen to 20 percent of questions in the test must qualify as “Critical thinking and analysis” questions. These questions can have content grounding in any of the five major content areas. The questions will be stimulus-based, using reading passages, tables, or graphs and may cover any or all of the following skills: identification of salient data and facts, comparisons and making associations, drawing inferences and evaluation.

The outline below shows the content areas covered on the test and the approximate distribution of questions among the areas. Numbers in parentheses represent the proportion of the test devoted to a particular content category or subcategory.

The Test Outline

I. United States Government and Politics (37–43%)

- A. Foundations of United States Politics (7–13%): constitutional principles (freedom and equality; individual and community), systemic change (the nature of federalism, separation of powers, civil rights and civil liberties, constitutional law); political economy and political culture.
- B. Dynamics of Institutional Interaction (17–23%): presidential politics, legislative politics, judicial politics, bureaucratic politics, political party politics, interest group politics, state and local government and politics, domestic public policy, foreign and defense policy, media, social movements, United States in comparative perspective
- C. Political Beliefs and Behavior (7–13%): public opinion, political socialization, political participation, group-based politics

II. Comparative Government and Politics (17–23%)

- A. Political Institutions (3–9%): legislative and executive (and relationships between), judiciary and judicial forms, regime types, supranational organizations, parties and party systems, electoral systems
- B. Comparative Political Economy (2–8%): globalization and opposition, regionalization/free-trade zones (e.g., EU, NAFTA), transition to market economy, market-state relationships, politics of economic policy, factors contributing to development
- C. Political Change (2–9%): regime change (e.g., democratization), challenges to sovereignty/regionalization, civil war/revolution, religious fundamentalism, transnational diffusion of information and values

- D. Citizens and Social Movements (1–6%): politicization of ethnicity and religion, interest groups, social capital/civil society, legitimacy (e.g., challenges to, sources of), media, human rights

III. International Relations (17–23%)

- A. Theories of International Relations: (2–8%) realism/neorealism, liberalism/neoliberalism, alternative theories (e.g., neo-Marxism, transnational norms, feminist)
- B. Security Studies/Peace Studies (1–7%): interstate conflict; alliances, strategy, collective security; conflict resolution; terrorism; human security (e.g., refugees, spread of disease, famine, environment); intrastate conflict
- C. International Political Economy (2–8%): globalization and opposition, neoclassical theories, politics of trade and finance, international economic institutions (e.g., International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization, World Bank, Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries), intellectual property rights
- D. International Organization (1–6%): inter-governmental organizations (e.g., United Nations, European Union, Organization of African Unity), non-governmental organizations (e.g., Amnesty International, Greenpeace)
- E. International Law (1–6%): humanitarian

law (e.g., human rights, humanitarian intervention), law of the seas, environment, sources of international law, settlement of disputes (e.g., arbitration, adjudication)

IV. Political Thought (9–15%)

- A. Pre-Modern (1–7%): Classical (Greek and Roman), Medieval through Renaissance and Reformation, non-Western political thought
- B. Modern (5–11%): American political thought, Black political thought, conservative political thought, contemporary liberalism, critical theory, feminist political thought, liberalism/communitarian debate, liberalism and the social contract, libertarianism, postmodernism, progressivism and pragmatism, the German tradition

V. Methodology (5–11%)

- A. Epistemology
- B. Research Design
- C. Formal Modeling and Rational Choice
- D. Quantitative Methods
- E. Qualitative Methods

How scores for the Major Field Test in Political Science are reported

Total Score – Reported for each student and summarized for the group

Subscores – Reported for each student and summarized for the group

- Comparative Government and Politics (22–30)
- International Relations (22–30)
- United States Government and Politics (48–56)

Assessment Indicators – Reported for the group* only

- Analytical and Critical Thinking (20–26)
- Methodology (7–14)
- Political Thought (11–20)

Numbers in parentheses are the approximate number of questions in each category.
* A minimum of five (5) students is required for assessment indicators to be reported.

Student Outcomes Assessment & Success Report Evaluation AY 21-22

Program: BS Political Science

Evaluation: Mature

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>	Be sure to include the language of the LOs in future reports.	CE
Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.	<p>Excellent use of multiple points of assessment from the MFT tool, as well as significant course assignments to provide a variety of data points on student mastery across the curriculum.</p> <p>Clear description of evaluative tools, including use of normed instruments like the AAC&U Value Rubrics.</p>	<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>		Exemplary

<p>Results & Analysis</p> <p>Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>		Mature
<p>Continuous Improvement</p> <p>Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.</p>		<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>		Mature

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.