Studets will be able to identify and explain the basic principles of American democracy.

Assessment Author(s) Tami Bertelsen

Measure 1 Type: Direct

Measure 1 Description: Students will demonstrate a significantly improved comprehension of the basic principles of American democratic government. In terms of the basic goals of Political Science, this outcome is one of the central goals in American Government.

Measure 1 Sample Size: 30

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

For the objective tests of student performance, the department will compare pre- and post-test means in a repeated-measures design to determine if students' scores improve. In order to meet this benchmark, the department expects a 50% improvement in student performance.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

The pre-post tests allow the department to gage whether the students are developing in this learning objective over the semester. The benchmark confirms that the students' comprehension of Political Science concepts improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.

Please select

Measure 1 The department compared pre- and posttest means. Data from both the
Results:

Methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. For the American Democracy data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 3.6$) increased 50.83% from the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 2.77$).

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

The mean increase between the pre and post tests showed a 50.83% increase which just meets the benchmark of a 50% increase in student performance.

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

As the benchmark changed from last year, the percentage change is not relevant. However, we can compare the means of the pre/post tests. Last year, the mean for the pre-test was 1.85 and the mean for the post-test was 2.02. This year, the mean for the pre-test was 2.77 and the mean for the post-test was 3.60. This shows an overall improvement in student performance on both tests.

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

N/A

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?

The department chair will be looking at the questions in the pre/post tests to ensure that the questions reflect the learning objectives of the course and this specific assessment measure.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

The department will work to close the gap by discussing strategies at the department meeting.

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Tami Bertelsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>In terms of the basic goals of Political Science, this outcome is one of the central goals in American Government.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Sample Size:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

For the objective tests of student performance, the department will compare pre- and post-test means in a repeated-measures design to determine if students’ scores improve. In order to meet this benchmark, the department expects a 50% improvement in student performance.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

The pre-post tests allow the department to gage whether the students are developing in this learning objective over the semester. The benchmark confirms that the students’ comprehension of Political Science concepts improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.
### Measure 1

**Results:**

The department compared pre- and posttest means. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. For the structure, powers and functions of government data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 4.2$) increased 25.61% from the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 3.8$).

![Bar chart showing pre-test and post-test scores](chart.png)

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

The mean increase between the pre and post tests showed a 25.61% increase which is below the benchmark of a 50% increase in student performance. As the pre-test scores were high, it was difficult to meet the benchmark with a significant percentage increase in student scores.

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

As the benchmark changed from last year, the percentage change is not relevant. However, we can compare the means of the pre/post tests. Last year, the mean for the pre-test was 3.22 and the mean for the post-test was 3.87. This year, the mean for the pre-test was 3.80 and the mean for the post-test was 4.20. This shows an overall improvement in student performance on both tests.

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

NA

### 1) Based on the findings, how does the unit/department rate performance in regards to this outcome (strong – exceeds benchmark, missed benchmark, etc.)?

Missed benchmark
neutral – meets benchmark, or weak – misses 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?

The department chair will be looking at the questions in the pre/post tests to ensure that the questions reflect the learning objectives of the course and this specific assessment measure.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

The department will work to close the gap in by discussing strategies at the department meeting.

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

FEEDBACK

No Data

INFORMATION MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Tami Bertelsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate a significantly improved ability in information management, most specifically critical thinking. This General Education outcome should naturally flow out of instruction in Political Science.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Sample Size:</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.

For the objective tests of student performance, the department will compare pre- and post-test means in a repeated-measures design to determine if students’ scores improve. In order to meet this benchmark, the department expects a 50% improvement in student performance.

2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?

The pre-post tests allow the department to gage whether the students are developing in this learning objective over the semester. The benchmark confirms that the students’ comprehension of Political Science concepts improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.

Please select

This Learning Outcome was: Surpassed benchmark

Measure 1 Results:

The department compared pre- and post test means. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. For the Information Management data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 2.7$) increased 66.94% from the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 2.03$).

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

The mean increase between the pre and post tests showed a 66.94% increase which exceeds the benchmark of a 50% increase in student performance.

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

As the benchmark changed from last year, the percentage change is not relevant. However, we can compare the means of the pre/post tests. Last year, the mean for the pre-test was 2.52 and the mean for the post-test was 2.91. This year, the mean for the pre-test was 2.03 and the mean for the post-test was 2.7. This shows an overall improvement in student performance on both tests.

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

NA
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)?

Surpassed 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?

The department chair will be looking at the questions in the pre/post tests to ensure that the questions reflect the learning objectives of the course and this specific assessment measure.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

The department will work to close the gap in by discussing strategies at the department meeting.

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary

CULTURAL AWARENESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment Author(s)</th>
<th>Tami Bertelsen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Type:</td>
<td>Direct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre-Post tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure 1 Description:</td>
<td>Students will demonstrate a significantly improved level of cultural awareness. This basic education goal fits well</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Measure 1  
Sample Size: 30  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure 1</th>
<th>Results:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Describe the benchmark for this measure.</td>
<td>For the objective tests of student performance, the department will compare pre- and post-test means in a repeated-measures design to determine if students’ scores improve. In order to meet this benchmark, the department expects a 50% improvement in student performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) What is the rationale for choosing this benchmark?</td>
<td>The pre-post tests allow the department to gage whether the students are developing in this learning objective over the semester. The benchmark confirms that the students’ comprehension of Political Science concepts improved after receiving instruction in those concepts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The department compared pre- and post test means. Data from both the methodology pre-test and the methodology post-test were collected with data included for analysis only if scores for both tests were available. Students with missing data were disregarded for analysis. For the cultural awareness data, the mean score of the post-test ($M = 3.83$) increased 59.50% from the mean score of the pre-test ($M = 3.0$).

![Pre-test vs Post-test Cultural Awareness](image)

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

The mean increase between the pre and post tests showed a 59.5% increase which surpasses the benchmark of a 50% increase in student performance.

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

As the benchmark changed from last year, the percentage change is not relevant. However, we can compare the means of the pre/post tests. Last year, the mean for the pre-test was 2.61 and the mean for the post-test was 3.24. This year, the mean for the pre-test was 3.0 and the mean for the post-test was 3.83. This shows an overall improvement in student performance on both tests.

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

NA
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)?

Surpassed 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?

The department chair will be looking at the questions in the pre/post tests to ensure that the questions reflect the learning objectives of the course and this specific assessment measure.

3) How will your assessment results enable you to improve institutional processes or academic instruction in order to support, facilitate and/or stimulate student learning?

The department will work to close the gap in by discussing strategies at the department meeting.

Further Action: Further Action Unnecessary