

**Degree Program: BA/BS in Political Science**  
 Spring 2016 – **PRELIMINARY RESULTS**

*12 students in PSCI 499, one of them was an international student who was not adequately prepared to take the course but refused to drop it.*

***Preliminary Results: Five students had incompletes as of the end of May 2016.***

<b>a. What learning outcomes were assessed this year?</b>	<b>b. What methods were used to determine outcomes? In what course or other experience did assessment occur?</b>	<b>c. What expectations were established for achievement of the outcome?</b>	<b>d. What results were attained</b>	<b>e. Who was responsible for collecting &amp; analyzing the results? How were they shared with the department?</b>
1. Oral Communication Skills:  a) Civil discourse b) Effective oral presentations	a) Class discussions  b) Oral presentations of research projects in PSCI 499 following rubric provided to students (based on AAC&U rubric)	a) 100% of students in debate should discuss issue with civility  b) 80% of students at 12 points or higher (out of 20) on AAC&U rubric	a) 11 of 12 students regularly participated in discussion and engaged in civil discussion; 12 <sup>th</sup> student did not participate enough to assess this outcome.  b) Two students did not present their research projects. Of the remaining 10 students, nine were evaluated at 12 points or higher; the 10 <sup>th</sup> student received only 7 points.	Instructor of PSCI 499 responsible for collecting and analyzing data on the debate.  Data and analysis will be shared with department faculty at dept. meeting, results analyzed by the faculty.
2. Written Communication Skills:  a) Write a persuasive argument supported by relevant evidence b) Write essay/paper with minimal	1) In PSCI 499 (2016), students write a major research paper and 3 “thought papers” in which they discuss and explore a topic related to readings. Papers are assessed using ISU’s	1) Students should score an average of 12 points or higher (out of 20 points) on each paper in PSCI 499 using the AAC&U rubric.	1) Of the 7 students who completed the papers, 6 had an average of 12 points or better on the four papers. The seventh had an average of 6 points.	Instructor of PSCI 499 responsible for collecting and analyzing data.  Data and analysis will be shared with department faculty at dept. meeting,

<p>grammatical &amp; spelling errors</p> <p>c) Use appropriate citation method</p> <p>d) Ability to write different styles of papers</p>	<p>UDIE Written Communication Rubric (is modified version of AAC&amp;U Rubric).</p> <p>2) Students complete self-assessment; questions #10 &amp; 11 assesses self-perception of improved writing ability.</p>	<p>2) 80% of students should answer 4 (agree) or higher on self-assessment survey.</p>	<p>2) Of the 10 students who completed the self-assessment survey, 100% answered “agree” or “strongly agree” on both questions #10 and 11.</p>	<p>results analyzed by the faculty.</p>
<p>3. Critical Thinking &amp; Analysis:</p> <p>a) Compare/contrast different perspectives</p> <p>b) Identify strengths &amp; weaknesses of policies or behaviors</p> <p>c) Draw connections between scholarly works</p> <p>d) Apply theory to current events/policies</p> <p>e) Identify appropriate method to analyze issue or event</p>	<p>1) Use Political Science MFT score on analytical and critical thinking</p> <p>2) Assess papers written in PSCI 499 for critical thinking and analysis using AAC&amp;U Critical Thinking Rubric and department’s SLO’s</p> <p>3) Question #15 on student self-assessment survey</p>	<p>1) Target score for MFT results = Dept. mean should be 65</p> <p>2) Using rubric that combines AAC&amp;U CT Rubric and Dept. SLO’s, students should average 24 out of 40 points or 25 out of 44 points</p> <p>3) 80% of students should answer 4 or higher on self-assessment survey.</p>	<p>1) Department mean was 63, with 65% of department means below our department’s mean.</p> <p>2) Of the 7 students who completed the assignments, four students averaged 24 or more points (out of 40) on the Thought Papers and scored 25 or more points on the Research Paper. The other three were below the thresholds for both categories of papers.</p> <p>3) 8 out of 9 students answered “agree” or “strongly agree” on question # 15 in the survey (1 student did not answer).</p>	<p>Instructor of PSCI 499 responsible for collecting and analyzing data.</p> <p>Data and analysis will be shared with department faculty at dept. meeting, results analyzed by the faculty.</p>

<p>4. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Skills:</p> <p>a) Use theory to guide research, develop well thought-out explanations of expected findings</p> <p>b) Students apply appropriate methodology for research (case study, quantitative, qualitative)</p> <p>c) Students know and apply basic terms of empirical research</p> <p>d) Students demonstrate understanding of import of prior research on their topic</p> <p>e) Effective organization and presentation of findings</p>	<p>1) Use MFT score on research/methodology skills</p> <p>2) Assess student research paper in PSCI 499 using rubric based on department SLO's rubric</p> <p>3) Question #12 on student self-assessment</p> <p>4) Student grades in PSCI 245/340</p>	<p>1) Target score for MFT results = Dept. Mean score on MFT should be at 55% below (equivalent mean changes each year)</p> <p>2) Acceptable score using rubrics 80% of students should achieve rating of "Moderate degree of achievement" on rubric</p> <p>3) 80% of students should answer 4 or higher on self-assessment survey.</p> <p>4) 80% of students earn C or higher in 245/340 during the current year</p>	<p>1) Department mean was 38, with 19% of other institutions with a lower mean.</p> <p>2) Only 4 out of 7 students earned a "Moderate" level or higher.</p> <p>3) 8 out of 10 students answered "agree" or "strongly agree" on question #12 in the survey.</p> <p>4) 29 students registered for PSCI 245 in Fall 2015. 6 of those students dropped the course. Of the remaining 23 students, 18 earned a C or better (78.3%).</p>	<p>Instructors of PSCI 499 and PSCI 245/340 responsible for collecting and analyzing data.</p> <p>Data and analysis will be shared with department faculty at dept. meeting, results analyzed by the faculty.</p>
<p>5. Content Knowledge in American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Philosophy</p>	<p>Students take MFT in PSCI 499, use scores for the four areas</p>	<p><i>1) Target scores for MFT results</i></p> <p>a) Am. Pol: Dept. Mean should be at a level with 80% below that score</p> <p>b) Comp. Pol: Dept. Mean should be at a level with 75% below that score</p> <p>c) IR: Dept. Mean should be at a level with</p>	<p>a) Am. Pol. – Dept. mean = 56, with 69% of other institutions below our mean</p> <p>b) Comp. Pol. – Dept. mean = 54, with 60% below</p> <p>c) IR – Dept. mean = 53, with 55% below</p>	<p>Instructor of PSCI 499 responsible for collecting and analyzing data.</p> <p>Data and analysis shared with department faculty at dept. meeting, results analyzed by the faculty.</p>

		55% below that score  d) Pol Thought: Dept. Mean should be at a level with 35% below that score	d) Pol Thought – Dept. mean = 46, with 18% below.	
--	--	--	---	--

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

Degree Program: BA in Political Science Date: 8.12.16

	<b>Level 0 - Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 - Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 - Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified.  <input checked="" 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 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 checked="" 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.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input 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 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided that demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what students know/can do.  <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.
<b>3. Results</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.  <input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.  <input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.	<input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.  <input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.	<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.  <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.  <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.
<b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.  <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.  <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.  <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <b>Will be</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.  <input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on

	<p>program chair.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p>a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.</p>	<p>students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p> <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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 - Undeveloped</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 - Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 - Exemplary</b>



## **COMMENTS**

### **Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement**

The learning outcomes need some work. Some identify categories of learning (oral communication, etc.) and others conflate methods with outcomes (write a persuasive argument). So recast them. For example, the first might read, "Demonstrate effective oral communication skills through civil discourse and presentations." Better yet, use the outcomes developed for the program's Outcomes Library.

You've identified multiple measures that include presentations, papers, the Major Field Test, and an indirect measure (self-assessment). I am very pleased to see that you are assessing several of these using the VALUE rubrics. It is not clear to me how you assess civil discourse, however, and nor do I know how grades in PSCI 245 measure students' attainment of the associated outcomes.

Results were identified for fifteen measures/sub-measures, and they show that students met six of them (please do the math for me the next time!). There is nothing wrong with this so long as there is evidence that means of improving student performance are being planned and implemented. This is something I look for in Part Two (which was not included in this report). I also will be looking for evidence that the larger faculty is engaged in assessing and improving student learning, particularly since all the work of collecting and analyzing data is the responsibility of a single person. Given that results at the senior level are not particularly positive, is it time to assess some lower-level courses to determine where improvements could be made?

I look forward to receiving your updates about this year's assessment activities in the 2017 report.