Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18   *Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.*

Unit/Program Name: LEGAL STUDIES
Contact Name(s) and Email(s): Robert Van Sickel (Robert.vansickel@indstate.edu)

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the assessment website.

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the **Graduate Student Learning Outcome** each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?
1.Analytic/Problem Solving Skills	* Reading and analyzing legal cases in PSCI 317; 418; 419; 421. * Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions and actions in PSCI 319.	*DWF rates in PSCI 317; 418; 419; 421 (since performance and grades largely dictated by understanding cases) is less than 15% per course.	DWF = 1/14 in PSCI 419 (Fall 2017). DWF = 4/38 in PSCI 317 (Fall 2017). DWF = 1/10 in PSCI 421 (Fall 2017). DWF = 0/15 in PSCI 418 (Spring 2018). DWF = 1/18 in PSCI 421 (Spring 2018).	None.
2.Writing and Research Skills	*In-class essay examinations in PSCI 319. *Senior research project in PSCI 419.	*DWF rates in PSCI 319 (given performance and grades largely dictated by these written assignments). *Did 80% or more of PSCI 419 students successfully complete research project and receive a C+ or better?	*DWF = 0/40 in PSCI 319 (Spring 2018). *All PSCI 419 students completed the senior research project with a grade of C+ or better.	Revision of PSCI 319 essay rubric. Ongoing revisions to PSCI 419 Senior Research Project.

3. Oral Communication / Listening Skills	*Individual research presentations in PSCI 419. *Presentation on scholarly article (PSCI 308). *Speak effectively (professionally and persuasively) through class discussion (all courses).	* Did 80% or more average a C or better on PSCI 419 research presentation?	All students completing the PSCI 419 senior research project received a C+ or above. 75% performed in the A/A- range.	None.
4.Public Service / Promotion of Justice	*Emphasis on citizenship and stewardship seen in Ethical Reasoning Requirement Course (PSCI 107). *Expectation to attend ADP and other co-curricular events required in PSCI courses. * Did student enroll in an internship (or other outside-the-classroom experience)?	*Were ADP, other co-curricular events, required in the LS courses, average 3 events? * Did 25% or more LS Senior students have an internship (or related) experience in their undergraduate experience?	*Relevant Course Syllabi reviewed by Chair and/or Legal Studies Director. Van Sickel, Bergbower, and Schmitt LS - related course syllabi require 2-4 co-curricular events with written responses. *Program did not meet the goal of 25% of graduates having engaged in an internship.	Ongoing discussions of internship outreach, as well as how to assess/report on non-internship co-curricular activities and events.
5.Substantive Knowledge	Substantive knowledge diagnostic test given in PSCI 211 and again in PSCI 419.	Substantial improvement shown between PSCI 211 and PSCI 419 substantive knowledge tests.	This test has been drafted and was administered in PSCI 419 in Fall 2017, but will not be administered for the first time in 211 until Spring 2019. A complete comparison between PSCI 211 and 419 will not be available until Fall 2019.	Finalize and administer the Substantive Knowledge Diagnostic Test annually in both PSCI 211 and 419 annually.

Note: *If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit "tab" to add a new row.*

Notes
   a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
   b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program's outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
   c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of "3" to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark."

d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., "85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark").

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

1. The Legal Studies Program has continued to be hindered by its need to rely on insufficient and unstable faculty. The recent hiring of a full-time contract instructor has allowed the Program to offer more regular and larger sections of the required courses, but the Program still relies too heavily on outside faculty teaching most of the classes in the major. There remains only a single tenured professor with primary duties devoted to Legal Studies, while the major/minor continue to attract students at a comparable level to the Political Science major/minor, which has many times more instructors. Additionally, we are discovering that significantly fewer Legal Studies majors are seeking to enter law school, even while they continue to desire careers in various law-related fields. The department has formed a Legal Studies Subcommittee, which will attempt to gather systematic information on these developments (in part through a more systematic and lengthy "exit interview / data collection" process for graduating seniors), and to make recommendations to the full department faculty.

2. The department must increase the number of faculty serving the Legal Studies program if it wishes to maintain the instructional quality and co-curricular activities that have existed previously. The recent hiring of a full-time contract instructor, while important and needed, does not solve the Program's staffing problems for the longer term. More faculty are also needed in order to build greater relationships among practitioners in the legal community, and to assist in the Program's numerous co-curricular activities such as the Pre-Law Association, the visit of the Indiana Court of Appeals, regional law school visits, and the semi-annual fieldtrip to Washington DC and the U.S. Supreme Court. With a future direction on a liberal arts education emphasizing law and society and public law in Legal Studies, students should be better prepared for more diverse career path options after graduation. Establishing additional, more diverse, and stable / continuing "internship relationships" with the Vigo County legal community is an additional prioritized, and highly labor-intensive, goal.

3. The Legal Studies Substantive Knowledge Test, as mentioned above, is currently being refined, and should be in place by Spring 2019. This, combined with a revised senior exit data collection strategy, will allow the Program to present much more systematic data on both the desires and needs of our students on the one hand, and also to collect better data on these students' performance and student evaluation of the Program.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals

				can also be added on a new line.
1.Increase or maintain retention rates for LS majors. Meet or exceed CAS rates.	Continued participation in freshman learning community.	Retention data for LS and CAS.	While LS retention rates have fluctuated, they currently stand at 75.27%. PSCI majors are at 71.96%, while CAS rates are at 67.61%.	Now that freshmen are advised in the University College, the LS Program has little opportunity, aside from participation in the PSCI learning community, to actively influence freshman retention.
2.Maintain low – under 15% - DWF rates in 3/400-level LS courses.	Continued discussion on possible pedagogical revisions to these courses, as well as improvements to course-specific assessment methods.	DWF rates for 3/400-level LS courses.	LS maintains exceptionally low DWF rates in its 3/400 level courses. In AY 2017-18, LS recorded 3 drops out of approximately 165 total upper division students.	This success is due in part, we believe, to the fact that LS majors move thru the curriculum within a focused cohort, with all core courses being offered in a tight, predictable rotation.
3.Improve LS student preparation for careers in an increasingly diverse and varied range of law-related careers, both as attorneys and in related job categories.	Ongoing attempts to increase and broaden the range of available internship placements. Develop efforts to bring alumni and community members to campus to expose LS majors to a broader range of career opportunities.	These efforts will be assessed via data collected regarding rates of internship and co-curricular participation, as well as through better tracking of the career choices of LS alumni.	These efforts are still in the discussion and planning stages.	These efforts are continuing, and are unable to be systematically assessed at present.

Notes
  a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
  c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See Blue Reports database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the Office of Institutional Research for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

As a medium-sized major, administered within the Political Science department, the Legal Studies Program faces a number of challenges. While typically having 50-60 majors, and somewhere around 20-25 minors, the Program enjoys the full-time focus of only one tenured professor and one full-time instructor. Thus, it simply lacks the personnel to engage in anything like systematic approaches targeting the success of particular sub-groups of its students, such as transfers, first

generation students, students of color, students of a particular class level, and so on. The Program's somewhat striking success relative to other CAS programs can be attributed to the self-selection of high achieving students, who have always been attracted to law-related college programs. Additionally, the Program has worked hard over several years to offer a very predictable cycle of its core courses. Additionally, the Program attempts to foster community through the Pre-Law Association, involvement in the American Democracy Project, as well as via a variety of co-curricular, experiential learning activities, such as internships, Constitution Day, the visit of the Indiana Court of Appeals, law school trips, and the fieldtrip to the Supreme Court in Washington DC.

Please prepare this report as a Word document. Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials (e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.

Dear Robert,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: BS Legal Studies	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Undeveloped (0.875/3.00) **Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Developing (1.50/3.00)**	
Strengths	**Recommendations**
- Information is provided about the courses that will have assignments used for assessment. - Some good assignments are identified for understanding student learning (parts of a research project, presentation on scholarly article). - Some expectations for student performance are acceptable (ex: 80% of more should score C or better on the research presentation). - Good strategy to see learning improvement over time using the difference between the PSCI 211 and PSCI 419 tests.	- The learning outcomes, as written, aren't learning outcomes. These are broad categories of skill. If you have more specific learning outcomes that you measure in each of these areas, make sure to list them in upcoming reports. If not, they need to be much more specific and student-centered in order to be measurable, describing what the student should be able to do to demonstrate mastery of a certain level of a certain concept/skill. In some of the notes in column b, certain aspects of what could be learning outcomes are mentioned. - Assignments for each learning outcome can be more clearly specified (for instance, "reading and analyzing legal cases in PSCI 317; 418; 419; 421 – what will students produce that faculty will assess? Is it a brief, a paper, will they take a quiz, etc? - Note how each assignment is evaluated for student learning, and attach examples (ex: rubric, checklist, test key, etc.). A rubric is mentioned for PSCI 319, but student performance is related to DWF rather than the rubric. - DWF rates, and course grades in general, are not an indicator of student achievement of the learning outcomes because these are reflective of more than one specific outcome and other factors. More accurate indicators are the specific scores on the specific

	assignments or parts or assignments that are directly related to the outcome in question.
	• Consider raising some expectations where students are far outpacing the set expectation (ex: for outcome 3).
	• Good information provided about the challenges facing faculty in the Legal Studies program, and that likely influences ability to manage assessment processes. Think about moving this information to the student success portion of the report (part 2) and focusing here on using assessment of student learning to address learning improvement directly.
	• Make note of how these assessment findings are shared with faculty.
	• **Note the faculty and/or instructors responsible for the action plans.**
	• **Consider how working with University College advisors or with campus resources for student success can help share the weight of promoting student success in your program without overburdening the limited faculty.**

Assessment (Parts 1a & 1b) Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success (Parts 2a & 2b) Scoring Rubric is included below with no notations just for your reference (the SSC did not choose to report in this way).
Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.) Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcome(s) is specific, measureable, and student-centered. Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)	At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle. Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.	No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the ==outcomes that are identified== are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or ==are not measurable.==
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure. Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.). ==Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.== Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).	==Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.== Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures. ==Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.==	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.

| Analysis & Results | Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.

Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).

Results are shared in relation to performance goals.

Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards. | Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.

Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).

Results are shared in relation to performance goals. | Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.

Results are reported with little description of analysis. | No data is being collected.

No results are provided. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement | Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.

Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.

A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined. | Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.

Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice. | Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.

Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided. | No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.

No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn) |
| **Overall Rating** | □ **Exemplary** | □ **Mature** | □ **Developing** | X **Undeveloped** |

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)**Unit/Program:**
Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/ challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	□ **Undeveloped**	□ **Developing**	□ **Mature**	□ **Exemplary**