**Program / Discipline Assessment Report**

**Program/Discipline:** Political Science  
**Responsibility:** John Ratliff, Ph.D.

**Political Science Mission Statement**  
It is the mission of Political Science to provide students with a broad-based introduction to the concepts of the discipline in a learning centered environment. Political Science is committed to promoting critical-thinking skills, writing skills, and preparing students for successful transfer to a four-year college. Political Science is also committed to continuous assessment of classes offered.

**Program/Discipline's Assessment History:**  
By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, how has it previously affected your program's curricula and/or teaching strategies?

I only became the full time instructor in Political Science last year, so this was the first opportunity to utilize assessment for program improvement. Remarks below are by Don Melton, previous full time instructor.

In general the assessment process has not historically affected program curricula since that is prescribed by state standards. There tends to be some annual adjustment of teaching strategies based upon the results of the previous year’s assessment results. Most of the assessment measurements have tended to measure relatively narrow objectives, thus minor shifts in teaching strategies occur.

By using the assessment process as an evaluative technique, what changes to student learning have been noted?

In general the use of a course pretest has been valuable in identifying student knowledge deficiencies at the beginning of the course. As a result, significant growth in learning is identified on almost every learning outcome.

What unintended consequences, if any, have occurred because of the assessment process?

One unintended consequence is that the administration of a pretest has produced some student anxiety. Most students do not do well on the pretest, and some express anxiety about succeeding in the course due to their perception that the class might be too challenging.

Who receives information about your department's assessment and why? (Please note if you plan on altering either of these items for the coming year.)

The annual assessment report is submitted to the Assessment Committee and is available for departmental colleagues and Chair to review. Beginning this year, the assessment will be sent to all adjuncts, as well as to Don Walker, Department Chair.
Outcome #: 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Title: Identification of principles of democracy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Description: Students will be able to identify and explain the basic principles of American democracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Benchmark for success

1) Please specify
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1.) The pretest/posttest benchmark is that 75% of students will correctly answer each question of the posttest. The benchmark for the capstone writing assignment concerning the learning objective is that 70% of students will score 80% or better.
2.) This is considered a reasonable expectation for students enrolled in a freshman level class. Most students are taking the class to fulfill degree requirements.

Description of assessment process:

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) Two methods were used to measure the outcome. A pre/post test and capstone writing project were used.
2) The pre/post test measures growth in student learning. The capstone writing assignment is a more broad assessment of student knowledge after completing most of the course.
3) The outcome is measured fall and spring semesters.
4) The sample size is 51 students.

Results

What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

1) For the pre/post test the following table captures the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Question Pre Test #</th>
<th>Exam/Q#</th>
<th>Pre Test % Correct</th>
<th>Post Test % Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>(1/24)</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>98%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1/3)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>62.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>(4/6)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) For the capstone writing project measuring objective 1, 90.6% of the students scored 80% or better.

What did the department learn?

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) The group exceeded the benchmark on 2 of the 3 questions. While the benchmark was that 75% of students would answer the post test questions correctly, 90.7% and 98% answered two of the questions correctly. Only 62.7% answered a third question correctly. However, this was a very significant amount of improvement from the pretest results (16%) to the post test (62.7%).

For the capstone writing project related to Objective 1, 90.6% exceeded the score of 80%. The
1) The benchmark for the capstone writing assignment was that 70% of the students would score 80% or better.
2) The data is very similar to the data for 2006-07.
3) The results of the capstone writing project were very similar to student performance on 2 out of three objective questions.

| Student performance summary | 1) Overall, the student performance was considered strong. While students performed beneath the benchmark standard on one pre/post test question, the most growth in learning was measured on that particular item.
2) The assessment does not mandate any significant changes in curricula or teaching strategies. |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?  
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? | 1) Overall, the student performance was considered strong. While students performed beneath the benchmark standard on one pre/post test question, the most growth in learning was measured on that particular item.
2) The assessment does not mandate any significant changes in curricula or teaching strategies. |
### Outcome Title: Identification of powers and functions of institutions.

**Outcome Description:**
Students will be able to identify and explain the structure, powers and functions of the major institutions (Congress, the Executive and judicial branches).

**Benchmark for success**
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) The pretest/posttest benchmark is that 75% of students will correctly answer each question of the posttest. The benchmark for the capstone writing assignment concerning the learning objective is that 70% of students will score 80% or better.
2) This is considered a reasonable expectation for students enrolled in a freshman level class. Most students are taking the class to fulfill degree requirements.

**Description of assessment process:**
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) Two methods were used to measure the outcome. A pre/post test and capstone writing project were used.
2) The pre/post test measures growth in student learning. The capstone writing assignment is a more broad assessment of student knowledge after completing most of the course.
3) The outcome is measured fall and spring semesters.
4) The sample size is 47 students.

**Results**
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

1) For the pre/post test the following table captures the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Question Pre Test #</th>
<th>Exam/Q#</th>
<th>Pre Test % Correct</th>
<th>Post Test % Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(4/27)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>(4/47)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>(4/22)</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) For the capstone writing project measuring objective 2 97.6% of the students scored better than 80%.

**What did the department learn?**
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they

1) The group performance exceeded the benchmarks on all measures.
2) The data is very similar to the data for 2006-07. If there was any difference it was that student performance was slightly better.
3) Student performance on the pre test/ post test measurement compared to performance on the capstone writing assignment was parallel.
| **Student performance summary** | 1) Student performance on this objective would be rated strong.  
2) Based upon student performance curricula and teaching strategies would not be changed. |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?  
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods? | 1) Student performance on this objective would be rated strong.  
2) Based upon student performance curricula and teaching strategies would not be changed. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome Type</th>
<th>Outcome Title</th>
<th>Outcome Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Program; General Ed; Other</td>
<td>Evaluate importance of participation, parties, and interest groups.</td>
<td>Students will be able to identify and evaluate the importance of political participation, political parties, and interest groups.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.  
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) The pretest/posttest benchmark is that 75% of students will correctly answer each question of the posttest. The benchmark for the capstone writing assignment concerning the learning objective is that 70% of students will score 80% or better.  
2) This is considered a reasonable expectation for students enrolled in a freshman level class. Most students are taking the class to fulfill degree requirements.

**Description of assessment process**
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?  
2) How do these methods show students are learning?  
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?  
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) Two methods were used to measure the outcome. A pre/post test and capstone writing project were used.  
2) The pre/post test measures growth in student learning. The capstone writing assignment is a more broad assessment of student knowledge after completing most of the course.  
3) The outcome is measured fall and spring semesters.  
4) The sample size is 40 students.

**Results**
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

1) For the pre/post test the following table captures the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Question Pre Test #</th>
<th>Exam/Q#</th>
<th>Pre Test % Correct</th>
<th>Post Test % Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3/1)</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3/2)</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>(3/42)</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) For the capstone writing project measuring objective 3, 88.37% of the students scored better than 80%.

**What did the department learn?**
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?  
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?  
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they

1) The group performance exceeded the benchmark goal for 2 of the 3 measured items on the pre test/post test items. On one item, the group underperformed the benchmark expectation very slightly (72.5%). For the capstone writing assignment, the group performance exceeded the benchmark expectations. While the benchmark was that 70% of students will score 80% or better, 88.37% of students scored better than 80%.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student performance summary</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?</td>
<td>1) Student performance, based upon the findings would be considered strong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?</td>
<td>2) No changes in curricula or teaching strategies are anticipated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome #: 4

**Outcome Title:** Identify and evaluate Supreme court rulings.

**Outcome Description:**
Students will be able to identify and evaluate major controversies and important Supreme Court rulings, based on the Constitution and its Amendments, which affect civil rights and civil liberties, including problems of women and minorities.

#### Benchmark for success
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) The pretest/posttest benchmark is that 75% of students will correctly answer each question of the posttest. The benchmark for the capstone writing assignment concerning the learning objective is that 70% of students will score 80% or better.
2) This is considered a reasonable expectation for students enrolled in a freshman level class. Most students are taking the class to fulfill degree requirements.

#### Description of assessment process:
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) Two methods were used to measure the outcome. A pre/post test and capstone writing project were used.
2) The pre/post test measures growth in student learning. The capstone writing assignment is a more broad assessment of student knowledge after completing most of the course.
3) The outcome is measured fall and spring semesters.
4) The sample size is 43 students.

#### Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

1) For the pre/post test the following table captures the results.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>Question Pre Test #</th>
<th>Exam/Q#</th>
<th>Pre Test % Correct</th>
<th>Post Test % Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>(2/47)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>(2/50)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>89.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(2/20)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) For the capstone writing project measuring objective 4, 97.6% of the students scored better than 80%.

#### What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) The group performance exceeded the benchmark standards for both the pre test/post test and capstone writing assignment measurements.
2) The data is extremely consistent with the previous year.
3) Comparing the results of the pre test/post test to the results of the capstone writing assignment reveals no significant differences.

#### Student performance summary
1) Results concerning this objective were both consistent and strong.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?</th>
<th>2) The assessment will not result in any changes related to curricula or teaching strategies.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome #: 5</strong></td>
<td><strong>Outcome Title:</strong> Ability to write clearly and concisely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong></td>
<td>Choose by bolding: <strong>General Ed</strong>; Other Others.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>If General Education outcome</strong></td>
<td>Choose by bolding: Communication; Critical Thinking; Quantitative Reasoning; Use of Technology; Diversity and Global Awareness; Leadership and Teamwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Description</strong></td>
<td>Students will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and concisely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

1) It is expected that 70% of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed the benchmark standard score of 80% or better on each portion of the writing assignment that correlates with each learning outcome.
2) This is viewed as a reasonable level of competence for freshman students.

**Description of assessment process:**

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1) The assessment was a take-home capstone writing project related to Learning Outcomes 1-4.
2) This assessment was concerned with students demonstrating writing clearly and concisely.
3) This outcome was measured each semester in one section of POS 111.
4) The sample size was 42.

**Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcome</th>
<th>% Students Above Benchmark N = 42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>76.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>76.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>88.88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What did the department learn?**

1) In 3 of the 4 measures (learning outcomes 2-4) the group exceeded the benchmark. For learning outcome 1, the group performance was slightly below the benchmark.
2) This is the first year that this outcome was measured.

**Student performance summary**

1) Overall, the performance of students was neutral, or acceptable.
2) This outcome is a competence (ability to write clearly and concisely) that students are expected to already have or are concurrently working on in other classes. The assessment plan related to this outcome does not directly affect curricula or teaching strategies.
### Part 1: Previous Academic Year Assessment Summary

Previous Academic Year: Academic year 2008-09.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 1</th>
<th>Outcome Title: “Students will be able to identify and explain the basic principles of American democracy.”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose by bolding): Program</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description</strong>: In terms of the basic goals of Political Science, this outcome is one of the central goals in the most important course, American Democracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

**Description of assessment process:**
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e., pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

1. The ’08-’09 Assessment Plan called for the analysis of this learning outcome with only one distinct method, the objective measurement of student performance based on a pre and post test of student learning. This year assessment data was collected from students in POS 111 (American Democracy).
2. A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ comprehension of concepts related to the scientific method improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.
3. This was the first year this measure was used. For the foreseeable future, this outcome will be measured in what amounts to an efficient research cycle, with data collected in the spring and analyzed in the fall.
4. 27 students from SOC 101 completed both the pre- and post-test.

**Results**
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means of student performance in a repeated-measures design. Data from pre- and posttest were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 27 students. For Outcome 1, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 3.74$) did not significantly differ ($p > .05$) from the mean score of the pre-test ($M =$...
In addition, the change in score from pretest to posttest was in the wrong direction, indicating that performance declined slightly at posttest relative to pretest.

**POS Learning Outcome 1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Postest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What did the department learn?**

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) A statistically significant improvement in identifying the basic principles of democracy was not observed this year on the objective assessment, with significant improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.
2) This is the first year this outcome has been measured.
3) The objective measure did not support the conclusion that there was significant improvement.

**Student performance summary**

1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1) Objective measurements did not indicate strong student performance.
2) In that this is the first year this outcome has been measured, a fundamental reevaluation of the design of the assessment instrument will be undertaken.

**Outcome #:** 2  
**Outcome Title:** “Students will be able to identify and explain the structure, powers and functions...”
of the major institutions (Congress, the Executive and judicial branches).”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose by bolding): Program</th>
<th><strong>Outcome Description:</strong> In terms of the basic goals of Political Science, this outcome is one of the central goals in the most important course, American Democracy.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Benchmark for success**

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

| **Description of assessment process:** | 1. The ’08-’09 Assessment Plan called for the analysis of this learning outcome with only one distinct method, the objective measurement of student performance based on a pre and post test of student learning. This year assessment data was collected from students in POS 111 (American Democracy).
2. A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ comprehension of concepts related to the scientific method improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.
3. This was the first year this measure was used. For the foreseeable future, this outcome will be measured in what amounts to an efficient research cycle, with data collected in the spring and analyzed in the fall.
4. 27 students from SOC 101 completed both the pre- and post-test. |

| **Results** | SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means of student performance in a repeated-measures design. Data from pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 27 students. For Outcome 2, the mean score of the post-test (M = 3.07) was significantly greater than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 2.48), F(1,26) = 8.08, p < .01. |

| 1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size? | 1. The '08-'09 Assessment Plan called for the analysis of this learning outcome with only one distinct method, the objective measurement of student performance based on a pre and post test of student learning. This year assessment data was collected from students in POS 111 (American Democracy).
2. A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ comprehension of concepts related to the scientific method improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.
3. This was the first year this measure was used. For the foreseeable future, this outcome will be measured in what amounts to an efficient research cycle, with data collected in the spring and analyzed in the fall.
4. 27 students from SOC 101 completed both the pre- and post-test. |
What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) A statistically significant improvement in critical thinking was observed this year on the objective assessment, with significant improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.
2) First year for this measure.
3) The objective measures supported the conclusion that there was significant improvement.

Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

1) Measurements indicated strong student performance in increased ability in critical thinking.
2) This outcome will continue to be measured, with ongoing refinement of the instrument.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome #: 3</th>
<th>Outcome Title: “Students will demonstrate increased ability in critical thinking”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome Type</strong> (choose by bolding): Program</td>
<td><strong>Outcome Description</strong>: This General Education outcome should naturally flow out of instruction in Political Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Benchmark for success</strong></td>
<td>For the objective tests of student performance, SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

POS Learning Outcome 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

Description of assessment process:
1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

Description of assessment process:
1. The '08-'09 Assessment Plan called for the analysis of this learning outcome with only one distinct method, the objective measurement of student performance based on a pre and post test of student learning. This year assessment data was collected from students in POS 111 (American Democracy).
2. A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ comprehension of concepts related to the scientific method improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.
3. This was the first year this measure was used. For the foreseeable future, this outcome will be measured in what amounts to an efficient research cycle, with data collected in the spring and analyzed in the fall.
4. 27 students from SOC 101 completed both the pre- and post-test.

Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means of student performance in a repeated-measures design. Data from pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 27 students. For Outcome 3, the mean score of the post-test (M = 3.70) did not significantly differ (p > .05) from the mean score of the pre-test (M = 3.59).
### What did the department learn?

1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>A statistically significant improvement in identifying the basic principles of democracy was not observed this year on the objective assessment, with significant improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>This is the first year this outcome has been measured.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>The objective measure did not support the conclusion that there was significant improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student performance summary

1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of curricula, teaching strategies, and assessment methods?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Objective measurements did not indicate strong student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>In that this is the first year this outcome has been measured, a fundamental reevaluation of the design of the assessment instrument will be undertaken.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome #: 4

#### Outcome Title: “Students will demonstrate increased respect for diversity and global awareness.”

#### Outcome Type (choose by bolding): Program

#### Outcome Description: This Basic Education goal fits well with the basic thrust of political science.

#### Benchmark for success

1) Please specify what percentage of the sample size is expected to meet or exceed your benchmark.
2) What is the rationale for choosing this measure?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For the objective tests of student performance, SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and post-test means for each intended learning outcome. The present study employed a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement ($p &lt; .05$) in student performance across the pre and post-tests for each learning outcome was predicted. This result would confirm that the students’ comprehension of Sociology concepts improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Description of assessment process:

1) What assessment methods were used to measure this outcome (i.e. pre/post test, portfolio review, etc.)?
2) How do these methods show students are learning?
3) What frequency is this outcome being measured (i.e.: each semester, yearly, every other year, etc.) and why?
4) How many students made up the sample size?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The '08-'09 Assessment Plan called for the analysis of this learning outcome with only one distinct method, the objective measurement of student performance based on a pre and post test of student learning. This year assessment data was collected from students in POS 111 (American Democracy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ comprehension of concepts related to the scientific method improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>This was the first year this measure was used. For the foreseeable future, this outcome will be measured in what amounts to an efficient research cycle, with data collected in the spring and analyzed in the fall.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results
What were the results of the assessment process? (List results for each method, if more than one were used.)

SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means of student performance in a repeated-measures design. Data from pre- and post-tests were collected and entered into SPSS, with scores included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 27 students. For Outcome 4, the mean score of the post-test (M = 3.04) was significantly greater than the mean score of the pre-test (M = 2.56), F(1,26) = 7.85, p < .01.

What did the department learn?
1) How did group performance compare to the benchmark?
2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
4) First year for this measure.
6) The objective measures supported the conclusion that there was significant improvement.

Student performance summary
1) Based on the findings, how does the department rate student performance in regards to this outcome (strong, weak, or neutral)?
2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming
3) Measurements indicated strong student performance in increased ability in critical thinking.
4) This outcome will continue to be measured, with ongoing refinement of the instrument.
Part 2: Current Academic Year Assessment Plan

Current Academic Year: 2009-2010

Intended Learning Outcomes (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)

1) The same 4 Learning Outcomes will be measured this year.

Assessment Method(s) (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)

As an objective test of student performance, SPSS for Windows will be used to compare pre- and post-test means for each intended learning outcome. The study will employ a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement ($p < .05$) in student performance across the pre and post-tests for each learning outcome is predicted. This result would confirm that the students’ comprehension of Political Science concepts and the General Education goals improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.

As noted above, the problematic results on Outcomes 1 and 3 motivate a basic reexamination of the assessment instruments to try to get a more reliable result.

Benchmarks (only include if they differ from those noted in Part 1)

1. For each of the outcomes, statistically significant improvement across the pre-post tests will be the benchmark.

Have you submitted a separate budget worksheet? (Choose by bolding; for information about this worksheet, please refer to the specific budgeting e-mail sent by the committee chairperson.)

Yes  No

Please submit this report (including both last year's summary and this year's plan) in a Word document to the Program Assessment committee chairperson (Tom DeMoulin: tom.demoulin@arapahoe.edu). If you have any questions about the process, please contact the chairperson.