CSU PUEBLO

2022 Academic Program Assessment Report

Political Science

Report Completed By:	Joel Johnson
Date Report Completed:	6/1/2022
Faculty members involved in this Assessment:	Joel Johnson

Please describe this year's assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. (Separate sheet for each undergraduate major, stand-alone minor, certificate, and graduate program in your department.) Please also submit any addenda such as rubrics which are not available in your assessment plan. The reports will be available to the Dean of your college/school and to the Executive Director for Assessment as well as faculty peer reviewers.

Brief Statement of Program Mission and Goals:

Program Goals
To prepare students majoring in the discipline to:
• Demonstrate a basic understanding of historical, philosophical and empirical foundations of political science;
• Demonstrate a general command of knowledge about the American political system, global studies, the history of political thought, and standard political science research approaches; and
• Demonstrate an ability to continue personal study and learning on an independent basis about specific subjects in the discipline.
To prepare graduates with a minor in the discipline to be able to:
• Demonstrate a basic understanding of the nature of the discipline; and,
• Demonstrate general knowledge and understanding of the American political system and comparative and world politics.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for the year based on the assessment process.

A. Your program SLOs are pasted here verbatim from your assessment plan. Please enter info in columns B-H only for those assessed during this annual cycle.	B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
Knowledge Outcome 1: Students should have factual knowledge of many aspects of politics and government that are central objects of study in each of the subfields in political science (American politics, comparative politics, international relations, and political theory).	Spring 2021	Direct measure 1: one or more ranked faculty member(s) will assess both SLOs in one (or more) course per academic year via a comparison of a pre-test and a post-test that are offered to the same students.

Indirect measure 1: From students' anonymous course evaluations of at least one core course per year. In particular, aggregate responses to Q18: "Learned from the course" will be reported.

Indirect measure 2: in a survey of seniors, students report on whether they learned in the program. | DIRECT MEASURE 1: students in three lower-division sections: 101 - Fall and Spring, 202 Spring. INDIRECT MEASURE 1: data from 15 courses are provided in sheet "2 - KOs...". INDIRECT MEASURE 2: data from N=6 seniors is provided in sheet "1 - Student evals..." | Direct measure 1: the average post-test score will exceed the average pre-test score.

Indirect measure 1: the program expects that at least 50% of enrolled students (or respondents) respond "Strongly Agree" or "Agree," and we expect that at least 75% of students respond "Strongly Agree," "Agree," or "Neutral." (The response "Neutral" may indicate to a student that a course is on par with other courses.)

Indirect measure 2: the program expects at least 80% of students to report that they were satisfied with how much they learned in the program. | All results were consistent with our program goals. See the appended sheets (1 - student evals... 2 - KO1-2...,). On Direct Measure 1 (pre-test vs. post-test), almost all students showed great knowledge improvement, and the average increase in scores was considerable in each class. On Indirect Measure 1, 28 of 30 percentages (test statistics) were consistent with our goals. On indirect measure 2 (survey of seniors), three of four test statistics were consistent with our goals. | Students are succeeding, and the program is succeeding. | None. Although there is always room for improvement, the assessment results point to no deficiencies that demand attention. |
| Knowledge Outcome 2: Students should be able to explain core debates (or scholarly theories and perspectives) in the subfields of political science. | Spring 2021 | | | | | | |
| Writing Outcome: Students should be able to write papers on topics in political science that (a) exhibit clear prose and correct grammar and (b) present a central argument in a clear and coherent structure or fashion. | (Not assessed this cycle - next assessment in Spring 2023 | | | | | | |

| Critical Thinking Outcome 1: Students should be able to identify and critique the assumptions, logic, and evidence in both scholarly and lay political arguments. | Spring 2020 | Direct measure 1: students' papers in the POLS 493 capstone are assessed according to the critical thinking assessment rubric (attached in sheet "3 - CT rubric").

 Indirect measure 1: From students' anonymous course evaluations of at least one core course per year. In particular, aggregate responses to Q11: "Encouraged critical thinking and analysis" will be reported.

 Indirect measure 2: in a survey of seniors, students report whether the program improved their critical thinking abilities as they relate to the SLOs. | Direct measure 1: 4 students in POLS 493 during Spring 2022

 Indirect measure 1: data from 15 course evaluations is provided in sheet "1 - Student evals..."
 Indirect measure 2: data from 6 surveys is provided in sheet "1 - Student evals" | Direct measure 1: At least 80% of students will receive an average score of 2.5 or above, signifying that they are proficient across the various categories in the rubric.

 Indirect measure 1: the program expects that at least 50% of enrolled students (or respondents) respond "Strongly Agree" or "Agree," and we expect that at least 75% of students respond "Strongly Agree," "Agree," or "Neutral." (The response "Neutral" may indicate to a student that a course is on par with other courses.)

 Indirect measure 2: the program expects at least 80% of students to report improvement in critical thinking abilities as they relate to the SLOs | All results were consistent with our program goals. See the appended sheets (1 - student evals... 2 - KO1-2...,). On the direct measure, three of four students scored over 2.5; the fourth scored below. So, the 80% measure was not met, but with an N=4, one miss made us miss the mark. On Indirect measure 1: 29 of 30 percentages (test statistics) were consistent with our goals. On indirect measure 2, all four survey results were consistent with our goals. | Students are succeeding, and the program is succeeding. On the direct measure, we hit 75% proficient rather than 80%, but we only had an N=4. | None. Although there is always room for improvement, the assessment results point to no deficiencies that demand attention. | |
| Critical Thinking Outcome 2: Students should be able to use empirical observations and analytical reasoning to articulate and defend compelling, non-fallacious arguments. | Spring 2020 | | | | | | | |

| Comments on part I: | | | | | | | | |

| II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the year cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles. | | | | | | | | |

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include SLOs verbatim from the assessment plan, as above.	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?				
None		See comments below.						

| Comments on part II: | Previous reviews of our assessments have made constructive suggestions, including the idea of adding to our SLOs because we are meeting them well. We have not pursued that and other ideas, but we are always trying to improve. For example, a look at our previous assessments will show that we provide more data for each annual assessment. Also, this academic year, we offered our new writing seminar for the first time. Our writing outcomes will be assessed next cycle. | | | | | | | |

CSU-Pueblo Political Science Program

WRITING RUBRIC

Writing Outcome: Students should be able to write papers on topics in political science that (a) exhibit clear prose and correct grammar and (b) present a central argument in a clear and coherent structure or fashion.

The following rubric is to assess papers submitted in courses, especially in POLSC 493 Senior Seminar.

Criteria	1. Needs Improvement	2. Acceptable	3 - Proficient	4 –Advanced	Score
Central message - clarity	Central message may be deduced, but it is difficult to discern, not prominent, or unclear.	Central message is discernible, but it is not sufficiently prominent or clear.	Central message is prominent and precisely stated.	Central message is prominent and precisely stated, as well as compelling and well-situated.	
Essay organization	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is poorly constructed. The flow of points across and within paragraphs is rarely logical or artful.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is adequately constructed. The flow of points across and within paragraphs is somewhat logical or artful.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is well constructed. The flow of points across and within paragraphs is logical or artful.	Organizational pattern (specific introduction and conclusion, sequenced material within the body, and transitions) is very well constructed. The flow of points across and within paragraphs is highly skilled and artful.	
Clear prose	Many sentences are difficult to understand, or the writing style is basic and unsophisticated, with little variance in structure.	Some sentences are poorly constructed and difficult to understand, or the writing style is not very sophisticated, with only some variance in structure.	Sentences are well constructed and convey a clear meaning, and the writing style is engaging, with a good degree of variance in sentence structure.	Sentences are very well constructed and convey a clear meaning, and the writing style is very engaging and artful.	
Grammar	The paper contains several grammatical or punctuation errors	The paper contains a small number of grammatical or punctuation errors.	The paper contains no egregious grammatical or punctuation errors.	The paper contains no grammatical or punctuation errors.	

Semester	Course	N (no data pulled when N<3)	Prof.	Q18 – for KOs		Q11 – for CTOs	
				Q18 Percent > Neutral (50% expected)	Q18 Percent >= Neutral (75% expected)	Q11 Percent > Neutral (50% expected)	Q11 Percent >= Neutral (75% expected)
S 22	271	4	Liebel	75	100	100	100
S 22	201	3	Liebel	100	100	100	100
S 22	101	9	Carter	78	89	89	100
S 22	360	4	Strickler	100	100	100	100
F 21	340	3	Carter	67	100	100	100
F 21	101	3	Carter	67	67	67	67
F 21	201	4	Liebel	100	100	75	100
F 21	306	4	Liebel	75	100	100	100
F 21	350	5	Strickler	100	100	100	100
F 21	101	5	Strickler	100	100	100	100
F 21	101	4	Johnson	100	100	100	100
F 21	202	3	Johnson	100	100	100	100
F 21	250	3	Johnson	67	67	100	100
S 22	101	4	Johnson	100	100	100	100
S 22	440	4	Johnson	100	100	100	100
Results from senior survey (N=6)				First column = Percent "agree" or "strongly agree" that program met its SLO goals. Second column = percent that were better than neutral.			
KO1				100	100		
KO2				67	67		
CTO1				83	100		
CTO2				100	100		

Grey highlighted cells are those that program did NOT meet its goal

2022-Spring-101				2021-Fall-101				2021-Fall-202		
pre-test	post-test	improvement		pre-test	post-test	improvement		pre-test	post-test	improvement
86.667	100	13.33334		86.6667		.		25	100	75
73.333		.		73.3333	86.66666	13.33333		75	100	25
86.667	86.6667	0		43.3333	76.66666	33.33333		62.5	100	37.5
71.667	100	28.33334		66.6667		.		31.25	100	68.75
90	86.6667	-3.33334		70	100	30		68.75	87.5	18.75
69.167	100	30.83334		86.6667	93.33333	6.66667		62.5		.
49.167	69.1667	20		77.5		.		87.5	100	12.5
43.333	100	56.66667		85.8333	80	-5.83333		50	100	50
90	86.7	-3.3		40.8333	100	59.16667				.
86.667	100	13.33334		49.1667		.		50	50	0
60		.		66.6667	100	33.33334		50		.
67.5	100	32.5		60	100	40		18.75		.
93.333	100	6.66667		100	100	0				
86.667		.		78.3333	100	21.66667		**Average improvement**		**35.9375**
		.		80		.				
66.667	100	33.33334		93.3333	100	6.66667				
86.667	86.6667	0		85	100	15				
80	68.3333	-11.66667		93.3333	100	6.66667				
83.333	100	16.66667		42.5	73.33333	30.83333				
80	73.3333	-6.66667		86.6667		.				
68.333	93.3333	25		80	99.16666	19.16666				
				80	85.83333	5.83333				
	Average improvement	**14.80588412**		86.6667		.				
				66.6667	92.5	25.83334				
				Average improvement		**20.09804**				

Criteria	1. Needs Improvement	2. Acceptable	3 - Proficient	4 –Advanced	Score
Identify and critique the assumptions, logic, and evidence in arguments	The analysis or critique of arguments does not recognize, identify, or critique their assumptions, logic, or supporting evidence.	The analysis or critique of arguments provides some focused attention to their assumptions, logic, or supporting evidence.	The analysis or critique of arguments clearly and correctly analyzes their assumptions, logic, or supporting evidence.	There is cogent analysis of the assumptions, logic, and/or supporting evidence of arguments.	
Use empirical observations and analytical reasoning to articulate and defend arguments	An argument is not supported by relevant evidence, and the reasoning is unclear or muddled.	An argument is supported by some relevant evidence, and the analysis is reasonably well defended and articulated.	An argument is supported by relevant evidence, and the analytical reasoning is logical and well defended and articulated.	An argument is supported by relevant evidence, and the student explains its strengths and/or weaknesses. The analytical reasoning is logical and cogent, and its limitations may be discussed.	