



## Annual Assessment Report 2022-2023

### BA Political Science

### Political Science

### College of Letters, Arts, & Social Sciences

#### CONTACT

Name of Program Assessment Lead Liza Taylor

Name of Person Completing Report Liza Taylor

**DISCIPLINARY ACCREDITATION** No

#### DEVELOPMENT AND DOCUMENTATION OF STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

- We developed them as a program/department using our own knowledge and expertise of the field.

Other than the [CPP Catalog](#) and the [Office of Assessment and Program Review website](#), where else are your SLOs published? Select all that apply.

- Department Website - provide URL: <https://www.cpp.edu/class/politicalscience/about/learningoutcomes.shtml>

#### ASSESSMENT ACTIVITIES IN 2022-2023

This section provides the opportunity for programs to share and discuss assessment activities conducted in **AY 2022-2023**. This includes data collection, rubric development, data analysis, discussion of findings, development or implementation of closing the loop improvement strategies, update of your assessment plan and/or curriculum matrix, etc.

How many total SLOs does your program assess according to your assessment plan?

- 3

**How many SLOs did your program assess this past year in 2022-2023?**

- My program assessed SLOs in AY 2022-2023 (e.g., artifact collection, scoring, closing the loop, etc.). May also have engaged in assessment planning activities unrelated to specific SLOs (e.g., modified curriculum matrix, assessment plan, etc.).

**Please list the SLOs examined**

- SLO #1: Students can demonstrate the ability to conduct library research on political science topics using a variety of scholarly and current resources.
- SLO #2: Students can demonstrate the ability to analyze quantitative and qualitative data.
- SLO #3: Students can effectively present arguments, both about research and political positions, orally and in writing.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO):** Students can demonstrate the ability to conduct library research on political science topics using a variety of scholarly and current resources.

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.)</li> <li>Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored indirect evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> <li>Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement</li> </ul>	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
116 (82 theses and 34 senior exit surveys)	For direct evidence (Capstone theses) we scored them on three relevant metrics: a) assessment of appropriate peer reviewed sources (average of 8 or better considered a success); b) total # of sources used (average of 8 or better considered a success); and c) appropriate citation format (average of 7 or better considered a success). For indirect evidence (senior exit surveys) students self-reported on a 1-5 scale (where 1= strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree) on the following question: "Because of the PLS program, I can conduct library research on political science topics using a variety of scholarly and current resources" (75% or more reporting a score of 1 considered a success)	According to the senior thesis results (direct evidence) a) assessment of appropriate peer reviewed sources – average score = 8.11 - YES b) total # of sources used – average score = 8.6 - YES c) appropriate citation format – average score = 7.18 – YES According to the senior exit survey (indirect evidence): 85.29% reported 1 – YES	Student-reported results closely match (only slightly elevated) the direct evidence from the theses. Students are learning how to do academic research.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Students can demonstrate the ability to analyze quantitative and qualitative data.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.)</li> <li>Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored indirect evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> <li>Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement</li> </ul>	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
116 (82 theses and 34 senior exit surveys)	For the direct evidence (theses), we scored students on a "methodology" metric and specifically on their ability to use and analyze quantitative or qualitative data (average of 8 or better considered a success) For indirect evidence (senior exit surveys), students self-reported on a 1-5 scale (where 1= strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree) on the following questions: "Because of the PLS program, I can analyze qualitative data." AND "Because of the PLS program, I can analyze quantitative data." (75% or more reporting a 1 considered a success)	According to the senior thesis results (direct evidence), where the average score = 7.93 - NO According to the senior exit survey results (indirect evidence), we met goals in relation to qualitative data but not in relation to quantitative data: 79.41% reported 1 on qualitative data – YES 73.53% reported 1 on quantitative data - NO	Students are just under what would be deemed "success," based both on how we scored them in their senior theses and based on their own self-reporting (especially in relation to quantitative data). This suggests we need to continue focusing on strengthening our methods sequence.

**Student Learning Outcome (SLO): Students can effectively present arguments, both about research and political positions, orally and in writing.**

Assessment Activities	Evidence Used	Evaluation and Interpretation of Evidence
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Created/modified/discussed assessment procedures (e.g., SLOs, curriculum matrix, mechanism to collect student work, rubric, survey, etc.)</li> </ul>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected direct evidence (e.g., student work, exam items, etc.)</li> <li>Scored direct evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for direct evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Capstone product (e.g., project, senior thesis, etc.)</li> <li>Oral performance (e.g., presentation, defense, conference presentation, etc.)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Used rubric or scoring guide</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Collected indirect evidence of student learning (e.g., surveys, interviews, focus groups, etc.)</li> <li>Scored indirect evidence of student learning</li> <li>Interpreted and made meaning of findings for indirect evidence</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student survey/interview/focus group with self-reports of SLO achievement</li> <li>Student reflective writing assignment (essay, journal entry, self-assessment) on their SLO achievement</li> </ul>	

Findings			
N of Artifacts	Criterion Used	Goal Met	Eye-opening Result
116 (82 theses and 34 senior exit surveys)	For direct evidence (related to written theses), we scored students based on a few relevant metrics: a) Argumentation (average score of 9 or better considered a success) b) Organization (average score of 8 or better considered a success) c) Writing Fluency (average score of 6 or better considered a success) For direct evidence (related to oral presentation of theses), we scored students based on a few relevant metrics: a) Clarity and Organization (average score of 4 or better considered a success) b) Style (average score of 4 or better considered a success) c) Evidence and Findings (average score of 4 or better considered a success) For indirect evidence (senior exit surveys), students self-reported on a 1-5 scale (where 1= strongly agree and 5 = strongly disagree) on the following questions: a) "Because of the PLS program, I can effectively present oral arguments about research and political positions" (75% or more reporting a 1 considered a success) b) "Because of the PLS program, I can effectively present written arguments about research and political positions" (75% or more reporting a 1 considered a success) c) "Because of the PLS program, I can think critically about the processes and institutions of public department and agencies" (75% or more reporting a 1 considered a success)	According to the written theses results (direct evidence): a) Argumentation – average score = 8.25 - NO b) Organization – average score = 8.60 - YES c) Writing Fluency – average score = 6.78 - YES According to the oral theses results (direct evidence) a) Clarity and Organization – average score = 4.18 - YES b) Style – average score = 4.21 - YES c) Findings and Evidence – average score = 3.79 - NO According to the senior exit survey results (indirect evidence): a) 76.47% reported 1 on effectively present oral / arguments and research - YES b) 88.24% reported 1 on effectively present written arguments and research - YES c) 85.29% reported 1 on think critically about the processes and institutions of public department and agencies - YES	Students are mostly meeting department goals on this SLO. According to our scores, they are developing clear written arguments and while they are mostly proving them, there is room for improvement there. They perform better orally than in the written form. They do well with the organization and style of presentation, but still struggle with relaying their evidence/findings. This would track with the slightly lower score on "argumentation" in their written projects.

## IMPROVING THROUGH ASSESSMENT

**Overall, what best describes how the program used the results in 2022-2023? Select all that apply.**

- Course-level changes (e.g., syllabus, content, pedagogy)
- Program curricular changes (e.g., course sequencing, changes to required curriculum, added or deleted courses)

**Ideas to improve student learning can come from different constituents. With whom did the program discuss assessment planning and/or share results during AY 2021-2022? Select all that apply.**

- Program/department faculty as whole
- A committee of program/department faculty
- Program/department assessment committee

**The past academic year posed both challenges and opportunities. Please share any assessment discoveries (e.g., insights about assessment procedures, great achievements, etc.) regarding program assessment in 2022-2023 so that others may learn from your experiences.**

As indicated in our 2021-2022 report, we are in the process of revamping our methods sequence (two semester-long required courses). While students report that they are learning how to analyze and use qualitative data, they report lower scores for quantitative data and our own scoring of them on this metric (methodology) shows that they are falling just below what we deem “success.” This is likely because we are still in the process of making the changes reported on in our 2021-2022 report. Shifting the content of some courses and developing entirely new courses (two separate advanced qualitative and advanced quantitative courses) takes time. We hope to see concrete changes in the coming year or so.

**Please share how the program triangulates various data sources to determine student success. Consider assessment findings, [CPP’s GI2025 markers](#), [CSU Dashboard](#), [CPP’s Student Success Dashboard on Tableau](#), course evaluations, etc.**

The senior Capstone project (thesis or internship) is the crowning experience for our majors and therefore the main focus of our assessment efforts. Building competency in the skills necessary to complete either project (as reflected in our department SLOs) as well as enthusiasm for substantial political science research and/or practical experience working in a political science related field, we believe, strengthens retention rates and shortens time to graduation. In recent years, we received the SPICE grant to create a free software manual for the program “R,” which will help all students (and especially underprivileged students who may not have access to this expensive software) pursuing quantitative research projects. Currently, we are in the process of revamping our methods sequence to offer more tailored instruction on the variety of methods necessary for the full range of political science research projects (including quantitative, qualitative, critical interpretive, and theory methods). This will position us to better nurture the variety of interests of our majors (including those drawn to critical projects reflecting Area F commitments and content), and to build enthusiasm toward the Capstone project.

**Does the program offer a certificate or credential (e.g., teaching credential)?**

- No

The most current assessment plan and curriculum matrix we have on file for your program may be found [here](#). To ensure we have the most updated assessment plan and curriculum matrix for your program, and for posting on our website, please upload the following documents:

**Assessment Plan - No**

**Curriculum Matrix - No**