

# Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-2017

Political Science Department, undergraduate political science

Contact Name: Stan Buchanan

**Contents:**

1. Part one: Summary of activities
2. Part two: Engagement and activities
3. Part three: Dr. Rashid's remarks re: PSCI 499.

**Part One: Summary of Assessment Activities**

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?	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 results?	e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?
<p>1.Oral communications skills</p> <p>a. Civil discourse</p> <p>b. Effective oral presentation</p>	<p>Class discussions and oral presentations in PSCI 499. (N=25).</p> <p>Class discussions and oral presentations in PSCI 414. Average score for PSCI majors in course is A grade (N = 21). Evaluation rubric based on AAUC guidelines. Students for Dr. Schmitt, Dr. Van Sichel, and Dr. Bergbower are required ADP event attendance. Theme for ADP during AY 2016-2017 was political civil discourse.</p>	<p>a. All students should engage in civil debates</p> <p>b. 80% of the students should score 90 or better (out of 100) on oral communication assessment rubric</p> <p>c. All students should attend at least 2 ADP events per academic year.</p>	<p>a. All debates in the course were conducted congenially, as assessed by professors who have class participation points specified in their syllabi.</p> <p>b. 90% of the students received scores of 90 or better and grades of A- to A on assessments of their ability to evaluate the ideas presented in</p>	<p>Faculty members in one of the three courses are expected to perform administer and assess these tests. This year, Dr. Rashid ran the assessments in PSCI 499, our senior seminar for political science (not legal studies) students. Other faculty with oral communication components in their courses will specify as such in their syllabi (e.g. PSCI 414 with Dr. Bergbower).</p>

			the class.	
2. Written communications skills.	PSCI 499 writing assignments primary assessment tool. All political science courses involve some written communication assignments.	At least 80% of the students should display competence in these areas by earning at least a "C" on their final paper.	90% of the students were graded "C" or better.	Instructor, PSCI 499
3. Critical thinking and analysis. a) Compare/contrast different perspectives b) Identify strengths & weaknesses of policies or behaviors c) Draw connections between scholarly works d) Apply theory to current events/policies e) Identify appropriate method to analyze issue or event	1) Use Political Science MFT score on analytical and critical thinking 2) Assess papers written in PSCI 499 for critical thinking and analysis.	1) Target mean for critical thinking sub-score on the major field test given to 499 students should be 65 below. (N=25 with 2 students not participating in the MFT.) 2) At least 80% of 499 students should pass with a grade of "C" or above.	1) Mean for critical thinking was 47% below (N=25). 2) 27 of 28 students passed the class with grades of "C" or above.	Instructor, PSCI 499
4. Qualitative and Quantitative Research Skills: a) Use theory to guide research, develop well thought-out explanations of expected findings b) Students apply appropriate methodology for research (case study, quantitative, qualitative) c) Students know and apply basic terms of empirical research d) Students demonstrate understanding of import of prior research on their topic e) Effective organization and presentation of findings	1) Use MFT score on research and methodology 2) Student grades in PSCI 245/340	1) Mean score on MFT for research and methodology should be 55% below. 2) 80% of students in PSCI 340 should earn a grade of "C" or better.	1. Mean score was 47% below. 2. Of the 19 students in PSCI 340 (Fall, 2016), 17 earned grades of "C" or better (89%).	Instructor, PSCI 499. Instructor, PSCI 340.
5. Content Knowledge in American Politics, Comparative Politics, International Relations, and Political Philosophy	Students take MFT in PSCI 499, use scores for the four areas	1) Target scores for MFT results  a) Am. Pol: Dept. Mean should be at a level with 80% below that score  b) Comp. Pol: Dept. Mean should be at a level with 75% below that score  c) IR: Dept. Mean should be at a level with 55% below that score  d) Pol Philosophy: Students should average	a. American Politics: mean score was 40 with 48% below b. Comparative politics mean was 40 with 52% below c. International relations mean was 39 with 48% below. d. Mean was 42% correct.	Instructor, PSCI 499

		at least 50% correct.		
--	--	-----------------------	--	--

## **Part Two: Engagement and Improvement:**

The Department of Political Science has concentrated its improvement on student learning in the area of civil discourse. Given the political realities of American politics over this past year (2016-2017), our discipline has been presented with multiple challenges on several fronts, including political rhetoric, political tolerance, and political correctness. These were focal points of our discussion one of our regular department meetings, since faculty had to address these challenges multiple times in the past academic year. Discussing actions of candidates Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton, President Donald Trump, racial tensions, LGBTQ rights, and immigration policies, for example, have provoked and can continue to provoke passionate and unfiltered comments from students. The department has taken steps to adjust its Political Science learning community in response to this challenge, one of which is to encourage more mature students to enroll in PSCI 107. In addition, Dr. Bergbower's NSO advising techniques have been adjusted based on civil discourse challenges; and Dr. Schmitt has directed ADP events to focus on civil discourse. One of these, Bring it to the Table, included a guest speaker.

One of the most notable assessment accomplishments for the Department of Political Science has been the reduction of DWF rates in PSCI 340 (previously identified as PSCI 245). The evidence shows that in the DWF rate for the Fall 2015 semester was 27.5% while the DWF rate for the Fall 2016 semester was 18.7%. This effect was produced by moving the course to an upper division designation and adding prerequisites to enrollment. Prerequisites are also being entertained by the faculty for 400 level courses in global politics and American politics. We believe that this will be another major change, brought about in the main by our assessment efforts. In addition, the department plans to bring back in 2017-18 the student self-assessment survey as well, to provide us with a better understanding of how students rate their academic experiences in the political science major at ISU.

Beyond that, the department will discuss the results from the Major Field Tests (ETS) taken by our PSCI 499 students over the past couple of years and take action based on our conclusions. We have several choices. First, we could bring our teaching into alignment with the MFT for political science. Second, we could develop our own examination from questions submitted by faculty who cover material relevant to the three sub-fields of the test (American government, comparative government, and international relations). Or third, we could engage in a pre- and post-test sequence. This would require us to designate one course—PSCI 201, for example—in which to administer the pre-test. We would then deploy the MFT as a post-test in PSCI 499 and compare the results. This could provide us with a fairly sound measure of student growth, although we anticipate some logistical problems were we to adopt this approach.

In sum, we hope to continue improvement of our political science undergraduate major, based in part on our recent assessment results.

### Part three: Comments Subjective Expectations of Students

PSCI 499

What follows are comments by Dr. Samory Rashid on his expectation for his 499 students. He briefly outlines observations he made in the class toward the end of the semester. His remarks cover a number of topics outside the assessment rubric, but complementary to it.

**Evaluating ideas:** Students were expected to provide accurate, critical and intelligent renderings of the ideas presented in the class lectures and readings. At least 90% of the students received scores of 90 or better and grades of “A-“ to “A” on assessments of their ability to evaluate the ideas presented in the class.

**Understanding diversity:** Students were challenged to understand diversity emanating from distinctly different-world settings. This understanding would include cultural and learning diversity on display in the classroom setting itself. Students were expected to demonstrate varying degrees of tolerance, respect for others and a willingness to appreciate the humanity of others. Students actually did well in this area, but assignments had to be carefully delineated; course materials had to be provocative; and class lectures had to stimulate robust class discussions.

**Acting as global citizens:** Students were encouraged to reach out to others. Students were expected to stretch their understanding beyond their own cultural backgrounds. The results this semester were positive. The hope is what accrues from this learning outcome may stem far beyond the classroom and the semester at hand, to such things as future study abroad activities.

**Embracing civic duties:** Students were encouraged to undertake a more active involvement in politics through avenue(s) of their own choosing. Students were expected to be open to new ideas derived from diverse international and cultural settings. The classroom is often a microcosm of international society at-large, as perhaps it should be, given the broadly diverse study body at ISU.

**Acting as global citizens:** Students are encouraged to travel and engage outside their immediate social group and beyond their cultural backgrounds. Student views typically form, re-form and change over the course of a four-year undergraduate education. Students were encouraged to be accepting of change.

**Behaving ethically:** Students judgements were critically evaluated and students were encouraged to be open to regular self-critiques. Each student was encouraged to develop a clear moral compass. Discussions of actual real world challenges were examined, discussed and compared in pursuit of that goal.

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

Degree Program:

Date:

	<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 were 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 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 important, 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 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 type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.	<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"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <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"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided

				<p>to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<b>3. Results</b>	<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 type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input 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>
<b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b>	<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 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</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"/> 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</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.  <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<p>whole on a regular basis.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results.  <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.  <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>performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to 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.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 - Developing</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

Revised 02.01.17