

## Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016

**Program:** Political Science

**Date:** June 1, 2016

**Completed by:** Gayle K. Berardi (Program Coordinator) and Colette Carter (Chair)

**Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment):** Joel Johnson and Steve Liebel (Program Faculty members)

Please describe the 2015-2016 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2016-2017 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2015-2016 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2014-2015. Thank you.

### I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO last assessed? <b>Please indicate the semester and year.</b>	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
Communication "Students should be able to clearly and concisely present their ideas as participants in classroom discussions and in presenting their research."	Spring 2012	The objective of the 2016 assessment was to evaluate graduating majors on the assessment dimension of communication. Our	10 Senior seminar students were assessed. The seminar is required for political science majors and is only offered during the	It is the expectation of the program that 80% of students will score at the proficient level.	70% of students scored at the acceptable level.(Scores between 2.6-2.83) 30% of students scored at the proficient level (Scores	It is clear from the findings that a majority of the students did not score at the proficient level. With only 30% at that level, the discreet categories helped the program to evaluate where	The Political Science program has always incorporated verbal presentation into its curriculum. This has varied from informal class discussion to formal, graded discussions and class presentations. In addition, the program has been incorporating debates into its curriculum in an effort to prepare students for the senior seminar format of writing papers that provide the

		communication rubric is attached as a separate file.	<p>spring semester.</p> <p>Students were required to participate in several mini-debates and major debates throughout the semester. The debates were used for assessment purposes.</p>		<p>between 3-3.25).</p> <p>On each rubric category the students scored:</p> <p><b>Language:</b> 90% proficient</p> <p><b>Audience:</b> 80% proficient</p> <p><b>Nonverbal:</b> 70% proficient</p> <p><b>Vocal:</b> 70% proficient</p> <p><b>Content:</b> 60% proficient</p> <p><b>Organization</b> 50% Proficient</p>	<p>students need improvement and where they are succeeding. For example, students are proficient at presenting without errors, with correct grammar and pronunciation, with content and style appropriate to the audience, and with appropriate vocal and nonvocal delivery (while being at high acceptable).</p> <p>However, students scored in the acceptable category for content and organization. The percentages in each category ranged from 90% proficient to 50% proficient.</p>	<p>foundation for class debates. However, we are in the early stages of doing this and in determining which classes will incorporate debates in addition to other forms of presentations.</p> <p>The assessment shows that steps must be taken so that fewer students fall into the acceptable category. Thus the program proposes to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(1) Emphasize in each course the level of expectation for each verbal presentation. The assessment rubric will be shared with students so they know exactly what is expected by the program.</li> <li>(2) Work specifically on the areas of content and organization with students.</li> <li>(3) Encourage students to utilize University resources to improve their communication skills. For example, work with the forensic team or attend forensic events.</li> <li>(4) Encourage students who are having communication problems to work with faculty and other students to improve their skills.</li> </ol>
--	--	--	--	--	---	---	---

Comments:

**II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.**

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
Writing "Students should be able to write complex prose, with correct grammar. They should be able to present a coherent and persuasive argument on a political science topic utilizing discipline research methods."	Spring 2015	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Emphasize in each course the level of expectation for each writing assessment. This will be based on the writing rubric used for assessment.</li> <li>2. Work specifically on the area of documentation and language and mechanics with students.</li> <li>3. Encourage students to utilize the Writing Center to improve their writing competency.</li> </ol>	<p>Yes, the program faculty have implemented the recommendations in class assignments. Specifically, the faculty are working with our majors in all classes, but especially in upper division classes to ensure that students understand our expectations of them and to help them in the areas of language usage and documentation.</p> <p>Students have also been encouraged to utilize the writing center.</p> <p>In addition, since we have students working at the Writing Center we have encouraged them to work with their fellow students on writing projects.</p>	<p>The assessment of writing skills for our majors showed that most of our students performed at a high proficiency or proficiency level. With the proposed recommendations we hope to see improvement for all our students, but especially for those in the acceptable category. We are now sharing with our students our writing rubric, which has increased their understanding of our expectations of them.</p> <p>In addition, it was decided to incorporate more (short) papers in the Senior Seminar to support the debate format. This worked quite well, with students improving their writing skills while increasing content for the debates.</p>

Comments: Communication Rubric is attached below.

## Political Science Communications Rubric 2016

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>1 – Needs Improvement</b>	<b>2. Acceptable</b>	<b>3 - Proficient</b>	<b>4 – Highly Advanced</b>	<b>Score</b>
<b>Content</b>	Central idea/purpose is not stated; content is erroneous or irrelevant; support for assertions is largely absent.	Central idea/purpose is stated; content is accurate but not always relevant; support is offered but inadequate for some assertions.	Central idea/purpose is clearly stated; content is accurate and relevant; credible support is provided for each assertion.	Central idea/purpose is vividly stated; content is accurate, thorough, and directly on point; strong support is provided for each assertion.	Score:
<b>Organization (Intro, Body, Conclusion)</b>	Little or no structure present. Presentation is confusing to the audience; no logical sequence of ideas; frequently off-topic.	Identifiable structure is present but inconsistently executed; may contain several statements out of place and occasionally deviate from topic.	Identifiable structure is present and consistently executed with few statements out of place.	Identifiable structure is presented in a purposeful, interesting, and effective sequence and remains focused.	Score:
<b>Language</b>	Grammar, pronunciation, and/or word choice are severely deficient.	Isolated errors in grammar, pronunciation, and/or word choice reduce clarity and credibility.	Presentation is free of errors in grammar, pronunciation, and/or word usage.	Presentation is free of errors in grammar and pronunciation; word choice aids clarity and vividness.	Score:
<b>Adaptation to Audience and Context</b>	Content and/or style are frequently inappropriate to the audience and/or context. Presentation falls well outside set time parameters.	Content and/or style are occasionally inappropriate to the audience and/or context. Presentation falls slightly outside set time parameters.	Content and/or style are consistently appropriate to the audience, and/or context. Presentation meets set time parameters.	Content and/or style are consistently appropriate and targeted to audience and context. Presentation makes full, effective use of time and stays within	

				time parameters.	Score:
<b>Vocal Delivery</b>	Vocal delivery is too soft to hear, too fast to understand and/or long, unintended silences and speech disruptions (repetitions; filled pauses, e.g., "um") frequently distract audience.	Vocal delivery is audible. Rate, volume, or speech disruptions only occasionally distract from audience comprehension.	Vocal delivery is clear and distinct. Rate, volume, and tone facilitate audience comprehension.	Vocal delivery is varied and dynamic. Speech rate, volume, and tone enhance listener interest and understanding.	Score:
<b>Nonverbal Delivery</b>	Eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement, and/or facial expressions are inappropriate and significantly distracting.	Eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement, and facial expressions neither enhance nor hinder effectiveness significantly.	Some but not all of the following apply: eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement or facial expressions enhance the presentation.	Most or all of the following apply: eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement or facial expressions enhance the presentation.	Score: