

Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department: Political Science
 Department Chair: Ben Lieberman
 Department Assessment Committee Contact: Paul Weizer

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NECHE requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by **May 31** each academic year.*

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I. List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
1.	POLITICAL SCIENCE KNOWLEDGE: Demonstrates evidence of comprehension of Political Science knowledge	Annual	2018
2.	POLITICAL SCIENCE REASONING AND ARGUMENTATION: Demonstrates evidence of comprehension of Political Science reasoning and argumentation	Annual	2018
3.	POLITICAL SCIENCE METHODOLOGY: Demonstrates evidence of comprehension of Political Science methodology	Annual	2018
4.	POLITICAL SCIENCE THEORY: Demonstrates evidence of knowledge of Political Science theory	Annual	2018

II. PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the “loop closed”?
1	Assessment consists of a portfolio via the TK20 online database	4 th year	Fall 2017 Senior Seminar	100% meets or exceeds standard	The program had issues with the form as set up in TK20 which led to inter-rater reliability. Discussion by the four Political Scientists resulted in their Senior Seminar Professor (TK20) coordinator fixing data collection to become more useful/effective.
2	Assessment consists of a portfolio via the TK20 online database	4 th year	Fall 2017 Senior Seminar	100% meets or exceeds standard	The program had issues with the form as set up in TK20 which led to inter-rater reliability. Discussion by the

					four Political Scientists resulted in their Senior Seminar Professor (TK20) coordinator fixing data collection to become more useful/effective.
3	Assessment consists of a portfolio via the TK20 online database	4 th year	Fall 2017 Senior Seminar	100% meets or exceeds standard	The program had issues with the form as set up in TK20 which led to inter-rater reliability. Discussion by the four Political Scientists resulted in their Senior Seminar Professor (TK20) coordinator fixing data collection to become more useful/effective.
4	Assessment consists of a portfolio via the TK20 online database	4 th year	Fall 2017 Senior Seminar	100% meets or exceeds standard	The program had issues with the form as set up in TK20 which led to inter-rater reliability. Discussion by the four Political

					Scientists resulted in their Senior Seminar Professor (TK20) coordinator fixing data collection to become more useful/effective.
--	--	--	--	--	--

III. Summary of Findings: Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you “closing the loop”?

<p>Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? -- Required Capstone/Internship & Senior Seminar/Portfolio courses (inclusive of the Senior Seminar Portfolio) provide Political Science baselines for Majors to graduate</p>	<p>Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? -- The four Political Scientists -- The Political Science Professor who teaches both courses provides grades in both the Capstone and Senior Seminar courses. For the Senior Seminar process, as determined by the four Political Scientists in 2018, the TK20 Senior Seminar’s Portfolio assessment enables all four Political Science Faculty to assess each PLO’s data/rubric (per Sections I-II) regarding whether each student fulfills requirements. Discussion then follows where the four faculty discuss the results and make suggested programmatic changes as warranted.</p>	<p>What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop) -- The four Political Science Faculty believed that, based on data results over previous years, better, higher quality work would get submitted by each Senior Seminar student, per PLO rubric category, if students focused on one key artifact to submit in TK20 – to encompass a key Political Science course requirement spanning their FSU career. This contrasted with previous TK20 requirement for data (artifacts) to provide for each TK20 rubric in the Senior Seminar that focused on providing 1000 level course and 2000+ course artifacts.</p>
--	---	---

		<p>-- While the program made several improvements over the years stemming from this process, during this past year all four Political Scientists determined that one key artifact chosen by students for their respective four PLO portfolio rubrics would suffice for assessment.</p> <p>-- Thus, the new, simplified data gathering/submission process in Senior Seminar now provides a stronger baseline to prepare the Political Scientists for a potentially more productive 2019 Senior Seminar Portfolio assessment.</p>
--	--	---

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

- I. Insert the program or department Assessment Plan. — **Please see attached, revised per explanation above.**
- II. Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success. — **Please see attached, revised per explanation above.**
- III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?

Yes

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I. Programs that fall under Program Review:

- i. Date of most recent Review:
- ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year

- iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

Yes

II. Programs with external Accreditation:

- i. Accreditor:
- ii. Date of last review:
- iii. Date of next review and type of review:
- iv. List key performance indicators:

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.

March 2019

Campus Climate

Each department was asked to review the Campus Climate Survey information distributed by the Leading for Change Committee and determine what your department has been doing to contribute to the positive outcomes identified.

The survey data may be found through this link: <https://www.fitchburgstate.edu/offices-services-directory/institutional-research-and-planning/office-of-assessment/campus-climate-survey/>

Please list the feedback and recommendations that your department provided to the Leading for Change Committee, along with any additional plans that you might have to further explore this data.

The data was insufficient to draw any conclusions.

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</i>	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
<i>Expected Timing of Assessment</i>	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
<i>Assessment Tool Quality</i>	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
<i>PLO Assessment</i>	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assessed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	The criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but not clearly stated or is not appropriate.	Criteria for student success not provided.	

<i>Summary of Findings</i>	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	
Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Department or Program Assessment Plan</i>	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
<i>Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan</i>	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	
University Data					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>SSC Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one SSC data point. No plan implemented.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

<i>SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Only for those under Program Review Annual Reflection on Program Review</i>	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for progress discussed.	

<p><i>Only for those under External Accreditation</i> <i>Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i></p>	<p>Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.</p>	<p>Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.</p>	<p>Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.</p>	<p>Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.</p>	
<p>Comments:</p>					

NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.