**Major Assessment Report Template**

Please download this document and provide a response to each question in the appropriate section. Send your assessment reports to Dr. Angel Sanchez ([aansanchez@csufresno.edu](mailto:aansanchez@csufresno.edu)) in the Office of Institutional Effectiveness and copy Dr. Melissa Jordine ([mjordine@csufresno.edu](mailto:mjordine@csufresno.edu)). Please complete a separate report for each Bachelors and Masters program offered by the department.

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **What learning outcome(s) did you assess this year?** List all program outcomes you assessed (if you assessed an outcome not listed on your department SOAP please indicate explain). Do not describe the measures or benchmarks in this section Also please only describe major assessment activities in this report. No GE assessment was required for the 2016-2017 academic year.   We used two of our assessment methods this year. First, we conducted our annual pre-test / post-test measuring student knowledge relevant to the discipline of political science, a direct measure assessing learning outcomes 1, 3, and 4 in our SOAP. The other was our alumni survey, which we administer every few years, an indirect measure that allows us to gage how well our curriculum has served our students after graduation. |
| 1. **What assignment or survey did you use to assess the outcomes and what method (criteria or rubric) did you use to evaluate the assignment?** If the assignment (activity, survey, etc.) does not correspond to the activities indicated in the timeline on the SOAP, please indicate why. Please clearly indicate how the assignment/survey is able to measure a specific outcome. If after evaluating the assessment you concluded that the measure was not clearly aligned or did not adequately measure the outcome please discuss this in your report. Please include the benchmark or standard for student performance in your assessment report (if it is stated in your SOAP then this information can just be copied into the report). An example of an expectation or standard would be “On outcome 2.3 we expected at least 80% of students to achieve a score of 3 or above on the rubric.”   The knowledge of political science outcome measure is assessed with our pre-test / post-test. This is a quiz that asks six fundamental questions regarding knowledge that should be acquired as part of a political science degree. The quiz was developed by the political science department faculty in 2007, with a revision done in 2010. (We do not use benchmarks of student performance).  Our alumni survey was originally developed in 2007 by the department and remain unchanged so that we can compare results over time. |
| 1. **What did you discover from the data?** Discuss the student performance in relation to your standards or expectations. Be sure to clearly indicate how many students did (or did not) meet the standard for each outcome measured. Where possible, indicate the relative strengths and weaknesses in student performance on the outcome(s).   Pre-test / post-test knowledge assessment  As laid out in our SOAP, the knowledge measure is assessed with pre-test and post-test quizzes. The pre-test is always given in our introductory course, PLSI 1. We then administer the exact same quiz to all graduating seniors. The results presented here are the results of the post-test administered this year compared with pre-test from four years ago, which is more or less the time when these same students likely took PLSI 1. In 2010-11 the average pre-test grade was 3.75 on a scale of 1 to 6 (the highest possible average score is 6). This is the base-line against which we assess student knowledge when they graduate. The 2016-17 post-test average was 5.5, our highest score ever and well above last year’s score of 5.41. We still feel that students are acquiring knowledge relevant to the major. It is also worth noting that few students got the wrong answer on any of the post-test questions, indicating that there is no particular piece of knowledge that was systematically lacking.  Alumni survey  While the survey suffered from a low response rate, even after being issued a second time, a few things do come through:   * Our students wish they had even more writing practice * Students had a hard time getting the classes they wanted because of a shortage of faculty * More analytical research skills would have been helpful * More internships were desired * More advising would have been helpful |
| 1. **What changes did you make as a result of the data?** Describe how the information from the assessment activity was reviewed and what action was taken based on the analysis of the assessment data.   Here are some of the modifications the Department is making in response to this data and data from previous assessments:   * Last year the department launched a full scale review of its curriculum, both required and electives. That work is ongoing. * At the end of last year a formal curriculum committee was established in the department * We have now transferred all of our lower division advising to the college’s advising center, but major advising will remain with the faculty * The knowledge assessment from the pre-test / post-test showed strength in student learning, so no changes are necessary there * The writing assessment showed a significant improvement, so we will continue to emphasize a variety of writing assignments in our courses * To help students better focus their efforts based on their interests, we reorganized our courses into four unofficial “tracks”: American politics, public administration, public law, and international relations * One of our faculty members, Jeff Cummins, is now co-director of the college’s Institute for Public Leadership, which offers even more internship opportunities to students * We are in an ongoing discussion about whether to create a capstone course for seniors, one that would heavily emphasize research and writing. Students are somewhat interested in this, and we recognize that this is a good practice in the discipline of political science. Our concerns is merely over how to go about doing it in a manner that is not too overwhelming for the faculty and where students can receive a lot of personal attention   Overall, the faculty in the Political Science department will continue improving the program student learning outcome assessment activities and initiate assessment of core competencies in areas of oral and written communication, critical thinking, information literary and quantitative reasoning. This core competency assessment of core competencies can be infused with the existing SOAP as it evolves and develops, or as part of a university-wide evaluation process. |
| 1. **What assessment activities will you be conducting in the 2016-2017 AY?** List the outcomes and measures or assessment activities you will use to evaluate them. These activities should be the same as those indicated on your current SOAP timeline; if they are not please explain.   We will most likely be returning to some of the assessment measures we have not used in the last couple of years, namely the writing evaluation and the public policy memos. We will, of course, continue to administer our usual pre-test to the PLSI 1 classes early in the fall semester to get baseline data on our undergraduates. In the spring semester we will give the post-test to the graduating seniors. Data and other results will be presented to the department for discussion in the spring semester of 2018. We will also analyze our latest graduation and retention data as soon as that data becomes available from the office of institutional effectiveness. |
| 1. **What progress have you made on items from your last program review action plan?** Please provide a brief description of progress made on each item listed in the action plan. If no progress has been made on an action item, simply state “no progress.”   Our last program review found our department to be very strong. There were only a few weak areas. One was in advising, we simply did not do enough of it for the undergraduate students. We are continuing to re-evaluate and change the way we do advising with much of it being now transferred to the college advising center.  The review team felt that our primary method of assessment at the time, analyzing research papers, did not capture all aspects of learning and that we needed more assessment tools. Since then we have added a more knowledge-oriented component in our pre-test / post-test approach, and have also added the analysis of policy memoranda, which is a very different type of writing than research papers.  The lack of diversity was also noted in our review. Since that time we have had two searches and two hires. One new hire was female, and the other was of non-Caucasian ethnic background. We are conducting another search this year and will likely have a large, diverse pool of candidates.  **Additional Guidelines:** If you have not fully described the assignment then please attach a copy of the questions or assignment guidelines. If you are using a rubric and did not fully describe this rubric (or the criteria being used) than please attach a copy of the rubric. If you administered a survey please consider attaching a copy of the survey so that the Learning Assessment Team (LAT) can review the questions. |