1. What student learning outcomes were assessed this year, and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Demonstrated Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include knowledge, skills, and attitudes. All outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include knowledge, skills, and attitudes. Some outcomes are linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Outcomes are written in clear, measurable terms and include knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Outcomes may be linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some outcomes may be written as general, broad, or abstract statements. Outcomes include knowledge, skills, or attitudes. Outcomes may be linked to department, college and university mission and goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Outcomes are not identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The department listed three (3) formal student learning outcomes and two (2) non-specific outcomes for the BA program.
The department should be commended again for making strides in assessing, knowledge, skills and attitudes which is evidence of assessment development and improvement.
The three formal outcomes are linked to college and university goals.
While it is understandable that attitudes may be difficult to assess, the Political Science exit survey is an excellent method and this may be aligned with the larger goals of becoming responsible citizens, stimulating intellectual thought, and lifelong learners as members of the body politic.

2. How were they assessed?
   a. What methods were used?
   b. Who was assessed?
   c. When was it assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Demonstrated Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>A variety of methods, both direct and indirect are used for assessing each outcome. Reporting of assessment method includes population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Each method has a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some outcomes may be assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. All assessment methods are described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Each method has a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some outcomes may be assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. All assessment methods are described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Some methods may have a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.

Each outcome is assessed using a single method, which may be either direct or indirect. Some assessment methods may be described in terms of population assessed, number assessed, and when applicable, survey response rate. Some methods may have a clear standard of mastery (criterion) against which results will be assessed.

Assessment methods are nonexistent, not reported, or include grades, student/faculty ratios, program evaluations, or other “non-measures” of actual student performance or satisfaction.

Comments:
The review notes that two (2) primary student learning outcomes and two (2) miscellaneous outcomes were measured. The populations and time assessment were identified. These assessments had either direct or indirect measures. Direct measures included a Senior Assessment Exit Examination and writing samples. The program should be recognized for creating both a pre test for Political Science 101. There was close alignment between these measures and the learning outcomes. Especially noteworthy are the assessing methods for the Senior Exam i.e., the instructor and two professors with expertise in the sub-fields, and the subsequent averaging between these two groups. Student written work in targeted papers was evaluated using faculty-established criteria. The attitudinal question variance perhaps could be avoided through a revision of the question wording to be more in line with university goals, as already identified. Overall, the program has made progress toward establishing an atmosphere of assessment and improvement.

3. What was learned (assessment results)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Demonstrated Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms. Results are explicitly linked to outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery. Reporting of results includes interpretation and conclusions about the results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms and are explicitly linked to outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Results are presented in specific quantitative and/or qualitative terms, although they may not all be explicitly linked to outcomes and compared to the established standard of mastery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Results are presented in general statements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Results are not reported.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The results for outcomes were presented in quantitative terms and aligned to program outcomes. The program is encouraged to continue this form of measurement in the aim of gathering additional data for further comparison. The results are linked to established standards of mastery. There is significant discussion and interpretation of results. Perhaps the assessment of other outcomes (e.g. attitudes) as they are identified by the program might even produce more material for discussion.
4. What will the department or program do as a result of that information (feedback/program improvement)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Demonstrated Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Program improvement is related to pedagogical or curricular decisions described in specific terms congruent with assessment results. The department reports the results and changes to internal and/or external constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Program improvement is related to pedagogical or curricular decisions described only in global or ambiguous terms, or plans for improvement do not match assessment results. The department may report the results and changes to internal or external constituents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Program improvement is not indicated by assessment results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Program improvement is not addressed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
The review, though highlighting generally positive results, recognizes greater needs in the area of writing. The report notes a number of actionable plans which have pedagogical or curricular results. The inclusion of a rubric for students as part of a “how to do a paper” project” is especially helpful. This is connected to communicating with internal (department) constituents as well as external (other departments) in the effort to address the general dissatisfaction with writing in upper-division courses. It is clear that a more effective program of assessment is emerging. The program is encouraged to continue to reflect on assessment results and to improve pedagogy and/or program curriculum as necessary.

5. How did the department or program make use of the feedback from last year’s assessment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Score</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Demonstrated Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Discussion of feedback indicates that assessment results and feedback from previous assessment reports are being used for long-term curricular and pedagogical decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Discussion of feedback indicates that assessment results and feedback from previous assessment reports are acknowledged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td>This is a first year report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>There is no discussion of assessment results or feedback from previous assessment reports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments:
Overall, it is evident that the department is incorporating assessment strategies and feedback from previous reviews. The department should be recognized for creating a pre-test for comparison with the Senior Exam. Also, the department’s modification of the Exit Survey is another encouraging step. The department may want to consider incorporating other indirect measures from data already existing in the assessment process. Such data may be comparisons between majors and non-majors, examining the reputation of grad programs which accept graduating students, a further refined exit surveys and/or course evaluation items related to course quality. It is clear from the report that assessment results and peripherally from previous assessment efforts are being used for long-term curricular and, to a lesser extent, pedagogical decisions.