**Student Learning Assessment Program**

## Response to Summary Form

**Undergraduate Programs 2018**

Department: Political Science

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Category** | **Level[[1]](#footnote-1)\*** | Comments |
| Learning Objectives | Level 3, B.A. Political Science | Most objectives are clear, measurable, and programmatic. The following undergraduate goals have been adopted by the department: writing, critical thinking, speaking, and responsible citizenship. Are there any opportunities for including quantitative reasoning in your program? |
| **How, Where, and When Assessed** | Level 2, B.A. Political Science | As you know, assessment ideally will have multiple measures for each objective, so that is something to consider as you continue making changes to your curriculum and your assessment plan. The rubric you are using for the research paper in PLS 4600 seems to be working well. And, you have a survey given in this course which provides you with some indirect data as well. But, all of your assessment seems to come from this one course and the data provided by the University, so you really have one direct measure that is summative. Ideally, assessment plans will include multiple measures across the curriculum. |
| **Expectations** | Level 2-3, B.A. Political Science | You have clear expectations for scores and criteria used to judge whether students are attaining the outcomes you seek. The criteria for critical thinking is not as specific as for writing political science knowledge, so you will want to try to elaborate on what you are looking for in students writing related to critical thinking. You have critical thinking and writing together on your rubric, so you receive one score for both skills, so you may want to consider separating them, so you can get a clearer picture of each skill. |
| **Results** | Level 3, B.A. Political Science | Results are collected, reported, and used.  |
| **How Results Will be Used** | Level 3, B.A. Political Science | The feedback loop is in place and appears to be working well. All the faculty appear to be involved in the assessment analysis and discussion, which is good.  |

1. \* Levels should not be interpreted as grades or scores; they are stages of implementation based on patterns of characteristics described by North Central Association/Higher Learning Commission. These levels are approximations based on the information provided in the summaries. Please refer to the checklist on the assessment web site ([www.eiu.edu/~assess](http://www.eiu.edu/~assess)) for the Primary Traits listed for each level. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)