

## 2016-2017 Annual Assessment Report Template

For instructions and guidelines visit our [website](#)  
or [contact us](#) for more help.

Please begin by selecting your program name in the drop down. If the program name is not listed, please enter it below:

MA Government

OR

### Question 1: Program Learning Outcomes

#### Q1.1.

Which of the following Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs), Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals (BLGs), and emboldened Graduate Learning Goals (GLGs) did you assess? [Check all that apply]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**
- 20. Other, specify any assessed PLOs not included above:

a.

b.

c.

#### Q1.2.

Please provide more detailed background information about **EACH PLO** you checked above and other information including how your specific PLOs are **explicitly** linked to the Sac State **BLGs/GLGs**:

We have chosen three PLOs related to the University's Institutional Graduate Learning Goals. These include:

PLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of theories and debates in at least one subfield in our program. These fields include International Relations, Political Theory, and California and its Political Environment.

PLO 3: Students will demonstrate an ability to effectively communicate concepts and arguments relating to Political Science.

PLO 4: Students will demonstrate an ability to describe, integrate and analyze major controversies in the field of Political Science.

**Q1.2.1.**

Do you have rubrics for your PLOs?

1. Yes, for all PLOs

2. Yes, but for some PLOs

3. No rubrics for PLOs

4. N/A

5. Other, specify:

**Q1.3.**

Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

**Q1.4.**

Is your program externally accredited (other than through WASC Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC))?

1. Yes

2. No (skip to Q1.5)

3. Don't know (skip to Q1.5)

**Q1.4.1.**

If the answer to Q1.4 is **yes**, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

1. Yes

2. No

3. Don't know

**Q1.5.**

Did your program use the *Degree Qualification Profile* ("DQP", see <http://degreeprofile.org>) to develop your PLO(s)?

1. Yes

2. No, but I know what the DQP is

3. No, I don't know what the DQP is

4. Don't know

**Q1.6.**

Did you use action verbs to make each PLO measurable?

1. Yes

- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 2: Standard of Performance for the Selected PLO

**Q2.1.**

Select **OR** type in **ONE(1)** PLO here as an example to illustrate how you conducted assessment (be sure you *checked the correct box* for this PLO in Q1.1):

**Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**

If your PLO is **not listed**, please enter it here:

**Q2.1.1.**

Please provide more background information about the **specific PLO** you've chosen in Q2.1.

Students must demonstrate competency in one subfield on their Comprehensive exam. They must show knowledge of theories and debates in that subfield.

**Q2.2.**

Has the program developed or adopted **explicit** standards of performance for this PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know
- 4. N/A

**Q2.3.**

Please **provide the rubric(s) and standards of performance** that you have developed for this PLO here or in the appendix.

We expect 75% of our students to score 2.5 or above on the rubric scaled from 1 to 4.

No file attached

No file attached

Q2.4. PLO	Q2.5. Stdrd	Q2.6. Rubric	Please indicate where you have published the <b>PLO</b> , the <b>standard</b> of performance, and the <b>rubric</b> that was used to measure the PLO:
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1. In <b>SOME</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	2. In <b>ALL</b> course syllabi/assignments in the program that address the PLO
			3. In the student handbook/advising handbook

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	4. In the university catalogue
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	5. On the academic unit website or in newsletters
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	6. In the assessment or program review reports, plans, resources, or activities
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	7. In new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	10. Other, specify: <input type="text"/>

### Question 3: Data Collection Methods and Evaluation of Data Quality for the Selected PLO

#### Q3.1.

Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for the selected PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to Q6)
3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
4. N/A (skip to Q6)

#### Q3.1.1.

How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO?

#### Q3.2.

Was the data **scored/evaluated** for this PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to Q6)
3. Don't know (skip to Q6)
4. N/A (skip to Q6)

#### Q3.2.1.

Please describe how you collected the assessment data for the selected PLO. For example, in what course(s) or by what means were data collected:

We had the committee score each comprehensive exam using a rubric developed for this purpose. We scored all exams taken during the Fall and Spring Semester. Seven students were scored by the three people on their committee.

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

### Question 3A: Direct Measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, etc.)

#### Q3.3.

Were direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) used to assess this PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to Q3.7)
3. Don't know (skip to Q3.7)

**Q3.3.1.**

Which of the following direct measures (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) were used? [Check all that apply]

1. Capstone project (e.g. theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
2. Key assignments from required classes in the program
3. Key assignments from elective classes
4. Classroom based performance assessment such as simulations, comprehensive exams, or critiques
5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community-based projects
6. E-Portfolios
7. Other Portfolios
8. Other, specify:

**Q3.3.2.**

Please **provide** the direct measure (key assignments, projects, portfolios, course work, student tests, etc.) you used to collect data, THEN **explain** how it assesses the PLO:

Below are examples of comprehensive exam questions. Students have three hours to answer each question.

Paul Krugman recently argued that political science has not done very well at explaining current political events. He said "Partisan divisions run deeper; establishment figures are widely distrusted; the GOP base has gone mad; and so on. History is just less of a guide than it used to be." Is this true? Are recent events and dynamics like the rise of Trump, political dysfunction in Washington, or political polarization really that unexplainable by current theories? Pick one of these dynamics and discuss how well current theories can account for it. Which theories or approaches have done well in explaining events and which have not? Some questions you might consider in answering these questions are: 1.) Can our current theories regarding political behavior or institutions account for the events we have seen recently? 2.) Have things changed in California or other states to the same extent? You should include material from 2 of the 4 courses offered. (Govt 281, 280, 250 and 270)

How well do American political institutions function? On what criteria would you evaluate the functioning of political institutions? For example, are problems being solved or made worse? Are they democratic? Are important issues addressed? Do certain types of political institutions function better than others? You might think about different states and the national government as well as different institutions like legislatures, executives or the courts. You should include material from at least 2 of the 4 courses offered. (Govt 281, 280, 250 and 270)



Attachment II rubric exam assessment 16-17.docx  
14.19 KB



No file attached

**Q3.4.**

What tool was used to evaluate the data?

1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (skip to Q3.4.4.)
2. Used rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class (skip to Q3.4.2.)
3. Used rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
4. Used rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty (skip to Q3.4.2.)
5. The VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
6. Modified VALUE rubric(s) (skip to Q3.4.2.)
7. Used other means (Answer Q3.4.1.)

**Q3.4.1.**

If you used other means, which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams (skip to Q3.4.4.)
2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.) (skip to Q3.4.4.)
4. Other, specify:  (skip to Q3.4.4.)

**Q3.4.2.**

Was the **rubric** aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.4.3.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the rubric**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.4.4.**

Was the **direct measure** (e.g. assignment, thesis, etc.) aligned directly and explicitly **with the PLO**?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.5.**

How many faculty members participated in planning the assessment data **collection** of the selected PLO?

Three on each exam committee - six total.

**Q3.5.1.**

How many faculty members participated in the **evaluation** of the assessment data for the selected PLO?

Three on each exam committe...

**Q3.5.2.**

If the data was evaluated by multiple scorers, was there a norming process (a procedure to make sure everyone was scoring similarly)?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know
4. N/A

**Q3.6.**

How did you **select** the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc.)?

All students who took the exam in the fall and spring were scored.

**Q3.6.1.**

How did you **decide** how many samples of student work to review?

Everyone who took the exam.

**Q3.6.2.**

How many students were in the class or program?

35

**Q3.6.3.**

How many samples of student work did you evaluated?

All that took the exam.

**Q3.6.4.**

Was the sample size of student work for the direct measure adequate?

1. Yes  
 2. No  
 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 3B: Indirect Measures (surveys, focus groups, interviews, etc.)

**Q3.7.**

Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes  
 2. No (skip to **Q3.8**)  
 3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8**)

**Q3.7.1.**


Which of the following indirect measures were used? [Check all that apply]


1. National student surveys (e.g. NSSE)  
 2. University conducted student surveys (e.g. OIR)

- 3. College/department/program student surveys or focus groups
- 4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
- 7. Other, specify:

**Q3.7.1.1.**

Please explain and attach the indirect measure you used to collect data:

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q3.7.2.**

If surveys were used, how was the sample size **decided**?

**Q3.7.3.**

If surveys were used, how did you **select** your sample:

**Q3.7.4.**

If surveys were used, what was the response rate?

Question 3C: Other Measures (external benchmarking, licensing exams, standardized tests, etc.)

**Q3.8.**

Were external benchmarking data, such as licensing exams or standardized tests, used to assess the PLO?



1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q3.8.2**)
3. Don't Know (skip to **Q3.8.2**)

**Q3.8.1.**

Which of the following measures was used? [Check all that apply]

1. National disciplinary exams or state/professional licensure exams
2. General knowledge and skills measures (e.g. CLA, ETS PP, etc.)
3. Other standardized knowledge and skill exams (e.g. ETC, GRE, etc.)
4. Other, specify:

**Q3.8.2.**


Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No (skip to **Q4.1**)
3. Don't know (skip to **Q4.1**)

**Q3.8.3.**

If other measures were used, please specify:

 No file attached

 No file attached

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Question 4: Data, Findings, and Conclusions

---

**Q4.1.**

Please provide simple tables and/or graphs to summarize the assessment data, findings, and conclusions for the selected PLO in **Q2.1**:

Table 1: Scores on Comprehensive Exam for Government Graduate Students 2016/2107

PLO	Average (1-4)	Percent over 2.5
<b>PLO1: Disciplinary Knowledge</b>	3.1	85.7%
<b>PLO 3: Communication</b>	3.5	100.0%
<b>PLO 4: Critical Thinking</b>	2.9	71.4%

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q4.2.**

Are students doing well and meeting the program standard? If not, how will the program work to improve student performance of the selected PLO?

The students met two out of three standards. A couple of the students struggled with critical thinking. PLO4, critical thinking, requires students will demonstrate an ability to describe, integrate and analyze major controversies in the field of Political Science. Some students could describe the literature, but had a harder time analyzing and comparing different works. A majority of the students, 71.4%, did meet the standard.

 No file attached

 No file attached

**Q4.3.**

For the selected PLO, the student performance:

1. **Exceeded** expectation/standard
2. **Met** expectation/standard
3. **Partially** met expectation/standard
4. Did not meet expectation/standard
5. No expectation/standard has been specified
6. Don't know

## Question 4A: Alignment and Quality

**Q4.4.**

Did the data, including the direct measures, from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

1. Yes
2. No

3. Don't know

**Q4.5.**

Were **all** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures of the PLO?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

### Question 5: Use of Assessment Data (Closing the Loop)

**Q5.1.**

As a result of the assessment effort and based on prior feedback from OAPA, do you anticipate *making any changes* for your program (e.g. course structure, course content, or modification of PLOs)?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No (skip to **Q5.2**)
- 3. Don't know (skip to **Q5.2**)

**Q5.1.1.**

Please describe *what changes* you plan to make in your program as a result of your assessment of this PLO. Include a description of how you plan to assess the impact of these changes.

We have begun to meet with students as a group and talk about expectations for the exam. The Graduate Committee for the department has also discussed how we can better teach these skills in our individual courses.

**Q5.1.2.**

Do you have a plan to assess the *impact of the changes* that you anticipate making?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q5.2.**

Since your last assessment report, **how have the assessment data from then been used** so far?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a Bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Improving specific courses	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Modifying curriculum	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Improving advising and mentoring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Revising learning outcomes/goals	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Developing/updating assessment plan	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Annual assessment reports	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Program review					

	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Prospective student and family information	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
10. Alumni communication	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
11. WSCUC accreditation (regional accreditation)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
12. Program accreditation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
13. External accountability reporting requirement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
15. Strategic planning	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16. Institutional benchmarking	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
17. Academic policy development or modifications	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
18. Institutional improvement	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
19. Resource allocation and budgeting	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
20. New faculty hiring	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
21. Professional development for faculty and staff	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
22. Recruitment of new students	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

23. Other, specify:

**Q5.2.1.**

Please provide a detailed example of how you used the assessment data above:

The new Institutional Graduate Learning Goals have just been put in place. Our department is also changing graduate coordinators. We expect to discuss the goals and rubrics we have been using to better conform to these new goals.

**Q5.3.**

To what extent did you apply **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in the following areas?

	1. Very Much	2. Quite a bit	3. Some	4. Not at All	5. N/A
1. Program Learning Outcomes	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2. Standards of Performance	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
3. Measures	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
4. Rubrics	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5. Alignment	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
6. Data Collection	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
7. Data Analysis and Presentation	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
8. Use of Assessment Data	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
9. Other, please specify: <input type="text"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q5.3.1.**

Please share with us an example of how you applied **last year's feedback** from the Office of Academic Program Assessment in any of the areas above:


We spent our time aligning our PLOs with the new graduate goals and thinking about how to implement a new assessment plan.


(Remember: **Save your progress**)

## Additional Assessment Activities

### Q6.

Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspect of their program *that are not related to the PLOs* (i.e. impacts of an advising center, etc.). **If** your program/academic unit has collected data on program *elements*, please briefly report your results here:

 No file attached

 No file attached

### Q7.

What PLO(s) do you plan to assess next year? [Check all that apply]

- 1. **Critical Thinking**
- 2. **Information Literacy**
- 3. **Written Communication**
- 4. **Oral Communication**
- 5. Quantitative Literacy
- 6. **Inquiry and Analysis**
- 7. Creative Thinking
- 8. Reading
- 9. Team Work
- 10. Problem Solving
- 11. Civic Knowledge and Engagement
- 12. **Intercultural Knowledge, Competency, and Perspectives**
- 13. Ethical Reasoning
- 14. Foundations and Skills for Lifelong Learning
- 15. **Global Learning and Perspectives**
- 16. Integrative and Applied Learning
- 17. Overall Competencies for GE Knowledge
- 18. **Overall Disciplinary Knowledge**
- 19. **Professionalism**

20. Other, specify any PLOs not included above:

- a.
- b.
- c.

**Q8.** Please attach any additional files here:

**Q8.1.**

Have you attached any files to this form? If yes, please list every attached file here:

## Program Information (**Required**)

**Program:**

(If you typed your program name at the beginning, please skip to Q10)

**Q9.**

Program/Concentration Name: [skip if program name appears above]

MA Government

**Q10.**

Report Author(s):

Jim Cox

**Q10.1.**

Department Chair/Program Director:

Nancy Lapp

**Q10.2.**

Assessment Coordinator:

Jim Cox

**Q11.**

Department/Division/Program of Academic Unit

Government

**Q12.**

College:

College of Social Sciences & Interdisciplinary Studies

**Q13.**

Total enrollment for Academic Unit during assessment semester (see Departmental Fact Book):

27

**Q14.**

Program Type:

- 1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
- 2. Credential
- 3. Master's Degree
- 4. Doctorate (Ph.D./Ed.D./Ed.S./D.P.T./etc.)
- 5. Other, specify:

**Q15.** Number of **undergraduate degree programs** the academic unit has?

3

**Q15.1.** List all the names:

**Government, Government- International Relations, Government Journalism**

**Q15.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program?

0

**Q16.** Number of **master's degree programs** the academic unit has?

1

**Q16.1.** List all the names:

Government MA

**Q16.2.** How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master's program?

0

**Q17.** Number of **credential programs** the academic unit has?

0

**Q17.1.** List all the names:

**Q18.** Number of **doctorate degree programs** the academic unit has?

0

**Q18.1.** List all the names:

When was your <b>assessment plan...</b>	1. Before 2011-12	2. 2012-13	3. 2013-14	4. 2014-15	5. 2015-16	6. 2016-17	7. No Plan	8. Don't know
<b>Q19.</b> developed?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>
<b>Q19.1.</b> last updated?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

**Q19.2. (REQUIRED)**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **assessment plan**:



**Attachment I Graduate Learning Goals Report Government 2017 .docx**  
33.79 KB

**Q20.**

Has your program developed a **curriculum map**?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q20.1.**

Please **obtain** and **attach** your latest **curriculum map**:



No file attached

**Q21.**

Has your program indicated in the curriculum map where assessment **of student learning** occurs?

- 1. Yes
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q22.**

Does your program have a capstone class?

- 1. Yes, indicate:
- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

**Q22.1.**

Does your program have **any** capstone project?

- 1. Yes



- 2. No
- 3. Don't know

(Remember: **Save your progress**)

ver. 5.15/17

Graduate Learning Goals Report

The Graduate Learning Goals policy can be found at: <http://www.csus.edu/acaf/academic%20resources/policies%20and%20procedures/15-16fs-115%20graduate%20learning%20goals.pdf>

Curriculum Map						
Coursework	PLO 1 & 2	PLO 3	PLO 4	PLO 5	PLO 6	PLO 7
Govt 200	X	X	X	X	X	
Govt 280 and 270	X	X	X	X	X	
Govt 230 and 240	X	X	X	X	X	X
Govt 210 and 219	X	X	X		X	
Govt Electives	X	X	X	X	X	
Govt 500	X	X	X	x		

Institutional Graduate Learning Goal	Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Assessment Plan			Action Plan
		Lines of Evidence			
		Direct	Indirect	Evaluation Parameters	
<i>Disciplinary Knowledge</i>	PLO 1: Students will demonstrate knowledge of theories and debates in at least one subfield in our program. These fields include International Relations, Political Theory, and California and its Political Environment. PLO 2: Students will also demonstrate knowledge of methods in Political Science.	Assignments in courses. Culminating experience	Alumni Survey	On-going, culminating experience, Follow up with Alumni	In progress
<i>Communication</i>	PLO 3: Students will demonstrate an ability to effectively communicate concepts and arguments relating to Political Science.	Assignments in courses. Culminating experience	Alumni Survey Communication between instructors and Grad. Coordinator.	Admission, On-going, culminating experience, Follow up with Alumni	In progress

Institutional Graduate Learning Goal	Program Learning Outcome (PLO)	Assessment Plan			Action Plan
		Lines of Evidence		Evaluation Parameters	
		Direct	Indirect		
<i>Critical Thinking / Analysis</i>	PLO 4: Students will demonstrate an ability to describe, integrate and analyze major controversies in the field of Political Science.	Assignments in courses. Culminating experience	Alumni Survey	On-going, culminating experience, Follow up with Alumni	In progress
<i>Information Literacy</i>	PLO 5: Students will be able to obtain and analyze relevant information relating to Political Science and politics	Assignments in courses. Culminating experience	Alumni Survey	On-going, culminating experience, Follow up with Alumni	In progress
<i>Professionalism</i>	PLO 6: Students will demonstrate an understanding of the ethics of research in Political Science	Assignments in courses. Culminating experience	Communication between instructors and Grad. Coordinator.	On-going	In progress
<i>Intercultural / Global Perspectives</i>	PLO 7: Students will demonstrate and understanding of global political issues.	Assignments in courses.		On-going	In progress
<i>Research*</i>					

\*Required for Doctoral Programs

**Attachment II: Rubric for Government Program Learning Goals**

<b>Goal and Definition</b>	Does not meet expectations (1)	Mostly Meets Expectations (2)	Meets Expectations (3)	Exceeds Expectations (4)
<b>PLO 1: Disciplinary Knowledge.</b>	Student does not show an understanding of a historical debate in Political Science.	Student shows some understanding of debate, but some issues are left out.	Student adequately demonstrates understanding of subfield,	Student demonstrates deep understanding of subfield and places it in larger debates within political science.
<b>PLO 3: Communication</b>	Student's answer is poorly written and hard to follow the argument. Concepts are not clearly explained or answer does not address the question.	Student's answer is mostly clear. Some problems of organization and clarity. Answer may not address the question.	Student's answer has a clear argument and is well organized. Student explains concepts adequately and addresses the question.	Student has a clear argument and answers the questions clearly.
<b>PLO 4: Critical Thinking</b>	Student missing major argument or theories. Little or no analysis provided of controversies.	Student lists relevant literature, but there is not enough integration or analysis different points of view.	Student provides adequate review of literature and also discusses different assumptions and evidence of competing approaches.	Student provides a thorough review of the literature and an extensive analysis of competing approaches.