Arapahoe Community College

2013-2014 Political Science Assessment Plan Data

Discipline Outcome
Students will be able to identify and explain the basic principles of American democracy.

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:
For the objective tests of student performance, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to compare pre- and post-test means for each intended learning outcome. A multiple choice test was administered to the students in first week of class. Identical test was administered in last week of class.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
46

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
The present study employed a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement (p < .05) in student performance across the pre and post-tests for each learning outcome was predicted.

In other words, benchmark for success is statistically significant improvement in performance between pre- and post-tests as measured by SPSS analysis.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ ability to identify and explain the basic principles of American democracy improved significantly after receiving instruction in those concepts.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means in a repeated-measures design. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected and entered into SPSS, with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 16 students. For the American Democracy data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 2.02$) did not significantly differ from the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 1.85$), $F(1,45) = 1.237$, $p > .05$. 
Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
   1) While improvement was not statistically significant, an improvement in the ability to identify and explain the basic principles of American democracy was observed this year on the objective assessment, with improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
   There was not a significant improvement over last year.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

   1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
      Missed benchmark

   2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational...
support unit planning, and assessment planning?

1) This data will be shared with new Political Science instructor, who can determine what direction to take with assessment effort.
2) Beginning next year, I propose the addition of a second, indirect measure, a Student Survey that measures student subjective experience in the classroom. This Survey will test all four Learning Outcomes. A questionnaire will be completed near the end of the semester. Students will be asked to evaluate their perceived level of learning, their satisfaction, their perceived ability to apply concepts, and their general level of interest in those concepts.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome
Information Management/Critical Thinking

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:
For the objective tests of student performance, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to compare pre- and post-test means for each intended learning outcome. A multiple
choice test was administered to the students in first week of class. Identical test was administered in last week of class.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
46

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
The present study employed a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement (p < .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 Information Management concepts improved significantly after receiving instruction in those concepts.

In other words, benchmark for success is statistically significant improvement in performance between pre- and post-tests as measured by SPSS analysis.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test confirm that the students’ comprehension of Information Management concepts improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.

Measure 2 Type:

Please select

Measure 2 Description:

Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Missed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means in a repeated-measures design. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected and entered into SPSS, with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 46 students. For the Critical Thinking data, the mean score of the post-test \( M = 2.91 \) did not significantly differ from the mean score of the pre-test \( M = 2.52 \), \( F(1,45) = 3.821, p > .05 \).

![POS Outcome C '13 Assessment](image)

Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?

   1) While improvement was not statistically significant, an improvement in the ability to demonstrate critical thinking was observed this year on the objective assessment, with improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?

   1) This is the fifth year this outcome has been measured and was not a significant improvement over last year.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
Missed benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
1) Objective measurements indicated improvement, not strong enough to be statistically significant.
2) This outcome will continue to be measured, with ongoing refinement of the instrument.
3) This data will be shared with new Political Science instructor, who can determine what direction to take with assessment effort.
4) Beginning next year, I propose the addition of a second, indirect measure, a Student Survey that measures student subjective experience in the classroom. This Survey will test all four Learning Outcomes. A questionnaire will be completed near the end of the semester. Students will be asked to evaluate their perceived level of learning, their satisfaction, their perceived ability to apply concepts, and their general level of interest in those concepts.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

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

Measure 1 Type:
Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:
For the objective tests of student performance, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to compare pre- and post-test means for each intended learning outcome. A multiple choice test was administered to the students in first week of class. Identical test was administered in last week of class.

Measure 1 Sample Size:
46

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.
The present study employed a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement (p < .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.

In other words, benchmark for success is statistically significant improvement in performance between pre- and post- tests as measured by SPSS analysis.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ ability to identify and explain the structure, powers and functions of the major institutions improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.

Measure 2 Type:
Please select

Measure 2 Description:
Measure 2 Sample Size:

Measure 2 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

Outcomes Met/not met
Met benchmark

Measure 1 Results:
SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means in a repeated-measures design. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected and entered into SPSS, with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 16 students. For the Government Institutions data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 3.87$) was significantly greater than the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 3.22$), $F(1,45) = 14.568$, $p < .01$.
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Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the
benchmark?
1) A statistically significant improvement in being able to identify and explain the structure, powers and functions of the major institutions was observed this year on the objective assessment, with significant improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
1) In line with results from previous years for this measure.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?
1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
   Met benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational support unit planning, and assessment planning?
   1) Measurements indicated strong student performance in increased ability in this area.
   2) This outcome will continue to be measured, with ongoing refinement of the instrument.
   3) This data will be shared with new Political Science instructor, who can determine what direction to take with assessment effort.
   4) Beginning next year, I propose the addition of a second, indirect measure, a Student Survey that measures student subjective experience in the classroom. This Survey will test all four Learning Outcomes. A questionnaire will be completed near the end of the semester. Students will be asked to evaluate their perceived level of learning, their satisfaction, their perceived ability to apply concepts, and their general level of interest in those concepts.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action
Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)

Discipline Outcome

Cultural Awareness

Measure 1 Type:

Direct

Pre-Post tests

Measure 1 Description:

For the objective tests of student performance, the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) for Windows was used to compare pre- and post-test means for each intended learning outcome. A multiple choice test was administered to the students in first week of class. Identical test was administered in last week of class.

Measure 1 Sample Size:

46

Measure 1 Benchmark

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

The present study employed a repeated-measures design, and a statistically significant improvement \( (p < .05) \) 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.

In other words, benchmark for success is statistically significant improvement in performance between pre- and post-tests as measured by SPSS analysis.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?
A significant improvement in student performance across the pre and post-test would confirm that the students’ cultural awareness improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.

**Measure 2 Type:**

Please select

**Measure 2 Description:**

**Measure 2 Sample Size:**

**Measure 2 Benchmark**

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

**Outcomes Met/not met**

Met benchmark

**Measure 1 Results:**

SPSS for Windows was used to compare pre- and posttest means in a repeated-measures design. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected and entered into SPSS, with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. Scores for both the pre-test and the post-test were collected for 46 students. For the Cultural Awareness outcome, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 3.24$) was significantly greater than the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 2.61$), $F(1,45) = 14.011$, $p < .01$. 
Measure 2 Results:

1) How did unit/department performance compare to the benchmark?
   1) A statistically significant improvement in cultural awareness was observed this year on the objective assessment, with significant improvement in demonstrated ability in this area across the semester.

2) How does the data compare to the previous year, if applicable?
   1) This was in line with previous years for this measure.

3) If multiple measures were used, how do they compare to each other?

1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses benchmark)?
   Met benchmark

2) How does this assessment affect plans for this coming year in terms of strategic planning, budget planning, administrative and educational
support unit planning, and assessment planning?
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.
3) This data will be shared with new Political Science instructor, who can determine what direction to take with assessment effort.
4) Beginning next year, I propose the addition of a second, indirect measure, a Student Survey that measures student subjective experience in the classroom. This Survey will test all four Learning Outcomes. A questionnaire will be completed near the end of the semester. Students will be asked to evaluate their perceived level of learning, their satisfaction, their perceived ability to apply concepts, and their general level of interest in those concepts.

Further Action:
Further Action Unnecessary

Describe the action plan:

Person/ Group responsible for action

Target Date for implementation of the action

Priority

Describe any additional resources needed (Leave blank if no additional resources are needed.)