

Degree Program Name: Legal Studies

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 form/forms along with this summary.

Part One

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	b. What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?	d. What were the actual results?	e. Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? How were they shared with the department?
1. Analytic/Problem Solving Skills	* Reading and analyzing legal cases in PSCI 211; 308; 317; 418; 419. * Demonstrate an understanding of the ethical implications of decisions and actions in PSCI 107; 319. * Self-assessment survey in PSCI 419 (Questions 4; 14). * Legal Studies Assessment test implemented in PSCI 419.	* DWF rates in PSCI 211; 308; 317; 418; 419 (since performance and grades largely dictated by understanding cases) is less than 15% per course. * Mean of 3.5 or better on self-assessment survey responses.	DWF = 3/21 in PSCI 419 (Fall 2015). DWF = 0/41 in PSCI 317 (Fall 2015). DWF = 0/38 in PSCI 211 (Spring 2015). DWF = 2/37 in PSCI 308 (Spring 2015). DWF = 2/22 in PSCI 418 (Spring 2015). * See Appendix 1 for Self-assessment survey results (Questions 4; 14).	* Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data. * Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.
2. Critical Reading	* Reading and analyzing legal cases in PSCI 211; 308; 317; 418; 419. * All courses have assigned readings which are analyzed in class discussions. * Self-assessment survey in PSCI 419 (Question 3).	DWF rates in PSCI 211; 308; 317; 418; 419 (since performance and grades largely dictated by understanding cases) is less than 15% per course. * Course syllabi to have adequate and appropriate assigned readings. * Mean of 3.5 or better on self-assessment survey response.	DWF = 3/21 in PSCI 419 (Fall 2015). DWF = 0/41 in PSCI 317 (Fall 2015). DWF = 0/38 in PSCI 211 (Spring 2015). DWF = 2/37 in PSCI 308 (Spring 2015). DWF = 2/22 in PSCI 418 (Spring 2015). * Course Syllabi reviewed by Chair and/or Legal Studies	* Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data. * Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.

			director, and approved. *See Appendix 1 for Self-assessment survey results (Question 3).	
3. Writing and Research Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *In-class essay examinations in PSCI 319. *Senior research project in PSCI 419. *Self-assessment survey in PSCI 419 (Questions 10; 12; 32). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *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? *Mean of 3.5 or better on self-assessment survey responses (Questions 10; 12). Responses to Question 32 will vary greatly, seeking highest average. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> DWF = 0/15 in PSCI 319 (Spring 2015). *C or better on PSCI 419 research project = 18/21. *See Appendix 1 for Self-assessment survey results (Questions 10; 12; Table 6). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data. *Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.
4. Oral Communication / Listening Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Individual research presentations in PSCI 419. *Presentation on scholarly article (PSCI 308). *Speak effectively (professionally and persuasively) through class discussion (all courses). *Self-assessment survey in PSCI 419 (Questions 1; 5; 11). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Did 80% or more average a C or better on PSCI 419 research presentation. *Mean of 3.5 or better on self-assessment survey responses. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *C or better on PSCI 419 research presentation = 18/21. *See Appendix 1 for Self-assessment survey results (Questions 1; 5; 11). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data. *Instructor for PSCI 419. *Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.
5. Task Organization / Management Skills	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Research project and presentation execution (PSCI 319; PSCI 419). * Timely submission of major assignments in PSCI 419 major course assignment(s). *Graduation rates for LS major 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Did 80% or more of PSCI 419 students successfully complete research project and receive a C or better? *Did 80% or more of PSCI 419 students submit major assignments before the deadline? *Graduation rate be above mean for the University. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *C or better on PSCI 419 research project = 18/21 (Fall 2015). * No late papers in PSCI 419, 3 not submitted (Fall 2015). *See Appendix 1 for Graduation rates (Table 12). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data. *Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.

6. Public Service / Promotion of Justice	<p>*Emphasis on citizenship and stewardship seen in Ethical Reasoning Requirement Course.</p> <p>*Expectations to attend ADP and other co-curricular events seen in PSCI courses.</p> <p>* Did student enroll in an internship (or other outside the classroom experience)?</p> <p>*Self-assessment survey in PSCI 419 (Questions 2; 13; 15; 26; 28).</p>	<p>*Were ADP, other co-curricular events, required in the LS courses, average 3 events?</p> <p>* Did 25% or more LS Senior student have an internship (or related) experience in their undergraduate experience?</p> <p>*Mean of 3.5 or better on self-assessment survey responses (Questions 2; 13; 15). Other response averages will vary greatly, seeking high numbers.</p>	<p>*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.</p> <p>*See Appendix 1 for internship data (Table 4).</p> <p>*See Appendix 1 for Self-assessment survey results (Questions 2; 13; 15; Table 6).</p>	<p>*Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data.</p> <p>*Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.</p>
7. Substantive Knowledge	<p>* Legal Studies Assessment test implemented in PSCI 419.</p> <p>*Self-assessment survey in PSCI 419 (Questions 6-9).</p>	<p>*Mean of 3.5 or better on self-assessment survey responses.</p>	<p>*See Appendix 1 for Self-assessment survey results (Questions 6-9; Table 6).</p>	<p>*Legal Studies Assessment Sub-Committee, Legal Studies Director, Department Chair share responsibility in data collection and analyzing the data.</p> <p>*Report out shared with the department electronically, and discussed in Department meeting.</p>

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

- Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- 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 outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.
- 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.”
- 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).
- This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

Part Two

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students' learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator's feedback on last year's summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

Point 1)

Appendix 1 presents student response summary data on a variety of metrics related to their legal studies education at ISU. Most responses are from seniors and all responses are from legal studies majors. The surveys were distributed in PSCI 419. Table 1 presents data on those questions with Likert scaled eligible responses. Student responses indicate positive evaluations of the faculty and education received in Legal Studies. High marks are seen for productive learning environments, development of ideas and viewpoints, legal writing proficiency, and understanding of politics and conflict.

Some alternative assessment data can be seen in tables 2 thru 12. The 2014 class of senior Legal Studies students have strong GPA scores, overall and within the major. This should be applauded because many Legal Study students are employed and work a high amount of hours per week (Table 9). Furthermore, many of them (50%) had an internship experience. The number of students working on faculty led research is low, but the number of faculty in Legal Studies is also low. Finally, we should recognize the mixed results on the number of students who take a practice LSAT or those who have taken the LSAT.

One of the more positive notes is the graduation success rate of Legal Studies majors. According to Table 12, Legal Studies majors consistently graduate at a higher level than what is seen for Political Science majors and the university at large.

Point 2)

The department wishes to increase the faculty size of the Legal Studies program so greater relationship can be bonded between student (research done at the university and their academic performances) and faculty. 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.

Point 3)

The assessment plan for next year should have data from a Legal Studies Assessment test administered in PSCI 419. Sub-Committee is further concerned on how it can be expected to produce a legitimate Legal Studies assessment plan when it has so little security and predictability in terms of faculty. Dr. Van Sickel can continue to do a lot of the data collection in PSCI 419, but the Sub-Committee is not sure it is reasonable to expect or to mandate much assessment work in our other courses (which is part of what the Sub-Committee had planned to do as with any new plan), which are all taught by adjunct faculty. The Sub-Committee is not sure that the College understands what it means to mandate a full program assessment for a Legal Studies major that houses only one permanent faculty member, but services more actual majors and minors than several other CAS free-standing departments.

If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.

Appendix material can be found on the Departmental Share Drive:

L:\College of Arts and Sciences\Political Science\PolySci Faculty\Student success report AY 2015-16

Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University

Degree Program: BS in Legal Studies Date: 8.12.16

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed. <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization). <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.) <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders. <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
2. Measures & Performance Goals	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided. <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.	<input type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome. <input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct. <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified. <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure. <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.) <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course. <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure

				<p>provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
3. Results	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
4. Engagement & Improvement	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ?</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. ?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to</p>

	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<p>specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<p>established timelines.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
Overall Rating	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped +	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

I would be happy to meet with you individually to explain my expectations for this report. In general, what I hope to see (and what I don't see here) is that learning outcomes are explicitly identified; that assessment methods clearly align with the outcomes and result in evidence of what students know and can do (and don't know and can't do); that results are sufficiently detailed so that programs can develop and implement relevant plans for improvement; and that there is a broad commitment to understanding and improving student learning.

Let's talk about how you can develop a simpler, more effective plan.