

2013-2014 ANNUAL ASSESSMENT REPORT GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENT

Part 1: Background Information

B1. Program name: [____ Government BA and International Relations BA____]

B2. Report author(s): [___Jim Cox, Monicka Patterson-Tutschka, Mark Brown, and Andrew Hertzoff____]

B3. Fall 2012 enrollment: [_ 398 for Government and IR___]

Use the *Department Fact Book 2013* by OIR (Office of Institutional Research) to get the fall 2012 enrollment: (<http://www.csus.edu/oir/Data%20Center/Department%20Fact%20Book/Departmental%20Fact%20Book.html>).

B4. Program type: [SELECT ONLY ONE]

X	1. Undergraduate baccalaureate major
	2. Credential
	3. Master's degree
	4. Doctorate: Ph.D./E.D.D.
	5. Other, specify:

Part 2: Six Questions for the 2013-2014 Annual Assessment

Question 1 (Q1): Program Learning Outcomes (PLO) Assessed in 2013-2014.

Q1.1. Which of the following program learning outcomes (PLOs) or Sac State Baccalaureate Learning Goals did you assess in 2013-2014? (See 2013-2014 Annual Assessment Report Guidelines for more details). [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1)*
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that were assessed in 2013-2014 but not included above: a. b. c.

* One of the WASC’s new requirements is that colleges and universities report on the level of student performance at graduation in five core areas: **critical thinking, information literacy, written communication, oral communication, and quantitative literacy.**

Q1.1.1. Please provide more detailed information about the PLO(s) you checked above:

The Government Department has three goals and nine subgoals (see Appendix I). This year we are assessing subgoal 2a of our critical thinking goal. Subgoal 2a deals with analyzing competing arguments.

2a: Student identifies and evaluates the context and underlying assumptions of competing arguments or theories.

Q1.2. Are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission of the university?

X	1. Yes
	2. No
	3. Don’t know

Q1.3. Is your program externally accredited (except for WASC)?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q1.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q1.4)

Q1.3.1. If yes, are your PLOs closely aligned with the mission/goals/outcomes of the accreditation agency?

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

Q1.4. Have you used the *Degree Qualification Profile (DQP)** to develop your PLO(s)?

	1. Yes
	2. No, but I know what DQP is.
X	3. No. I don't know what DQP is.
	4. Don't know

* **Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)** – a framework funded by the Lumina Foundation that describes the kinds of learning and levels of performance that may be expected of students who have earned an associate, baccalaureate, or master's degree. Please see the links for more details:

http://www.luminafoundation.org/publications/The_Degree_Qualifications_Profile.pdf and <http://www.learningoutcomeassessment.org/DQPNew.html>.

Question 2 (Q2): Standards of Performance/Expectations for EACH PLO.

Q2.1. Has the program developed/adopted **EXPLICIT** standards of performance/expectations for the PLO(s) you assessed in **2013-2014 Academic Year**? (For example: We expect 70% of our students to achieve at least a score of 3 on the Written Communication VALUE rubric.)

X	1. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for ALL PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	2. Yes, we have developed standards/expectations for SOME PLOs assessed in 2013-14.
	3. No (If no, go to Q2.2)
	4. Don't know (Go to Q2.2)
	5. Not Applicable (Go to Q2.2)

Q2.1.1. If yes, what are the desired levels of learning, including the criteria and standards of performance/expectations, especially at or near graduation, for **EACH PLO** assessed in 2013-2014 Academic Year? (For example: what will tell you if students have achieved your expected level of performance for the learning outcome.) **Please provide the rubric and/or the expectations that you have developed for EACH PLO one at a time below.** [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]

Standards of performance and expectations: We expect the average student performance to be 2.5 or above. We also expect our seniors and students close to graduation to score higher.

Q2.2. Have you published the **PLO(s)/expectations/rubric(s)** you assessed in 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q3.1)

Q2.2.1. If yes, where were the **PLOs/expectations/rubrics** published? [**CHECK ALL THAT APPLY**]

	1. In SOME course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce/develop/master the PLO(s)
	2. In ALL course syllabi/assignments in the program that claim to introduce /develop/master the PLO(s)
	3. In the student handbook/advising handbook
	4. In the university catalogue
	5. On the academic unit website or in the newsletters
X	6. In the assessment or program review reports/plans/resources/activities
	7. In the new course proposal forms in the department/college/university
	8. In the department/college/university's strategic plans and other planning documents
	9. In the department/college/university's budget plans and other resource allocation documents
	10. In other places, specify:

Question 3 (Q3): Data, Results, and Conclusions for EACH PLO

Q3.1. Was assessment data/evidence **collected** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.2. If yes, was the data **scored/evaluated** for 2013-2014?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Part 3: Additional Information)
	3. Don't know (Go to Part 3)
	4. Not Applicable (Go to Part 3)

Q3.3. If yes, what **DATA** have you collected? What are the **results, findings, and CONCLUSION(s)** for EACH PLO assessed in 2013-2014? In what areas are students doing well and achieving the expectations? In what areas do students need improvement? Please provide a simple and clear summary of the key data and findings, including **tables and graphs** if applicable for EACH PLO one at a time. **[WORD LIMIT: 600 WORDS FOR EACH PLO]**

Tables: Critical Thinking Skills: Making Arguments

Table 1: Scores for All Government Students in Five Courses

Major	Excellent	Shows Competency	Needs Work	Inadequate	N	Average
Government	25.00%	29.00%	39.00%	7.00%	100	2.72
International Relations	25.93%	37.04%	29.63%	7.41%	27	2.81

Table 2: Scores for Government and IR Majors by Level in School.

	Excellent	Shows Competency	Needs Work	Inadequate	N	Average
Seniors	28.89%	35.56%	31.11%	4.44%	45	2.85
Non-Seniors	23.46%	28.40%	40.74%	7.41%	81	2.67

Table 3: Scores for Government and IR Majors by Type of Course.

	Excellent	Shows Competency	Needs Work	Inadequate	N	Average
Core	20.00%	32.50%	37.50%	10.00%	80	2.62
Advanced Course	34.78%	28.26%	36.96%	0.00%	46	2.93

Table 4: Scores for Government and IR Majors for Students Close to Graduation.

	Excellent	Shows Competency	Needs Work	Inadequate	N	Average
Applied for Graduation	30.00%	40.00%	30.00%	0.00%	20	3.0
Degree Awarded	42.86%	28.57%	28.57%	0.00%	7	3.14

Tables 1-4 show the results sub-goal 2a of our critical thinking goal listed in Appendix I. The results were drawn from papers assigned in five political theory courses taught in the Spring 2014. These courses represent both required core courses and more advanced courses. These courses were chosen because they work on the skill of analyzing competing arguments and theories. Previous analysis of our majors showed that most Government and IR students take political theory core courses early in their careers (see 2012-13 assessment report). By collecting data from both core and advanced courses we can compare students' performance as they progress through the program. We would expect student's performance to improve both during the course and as they through their major program.

Table 1 shows the overall results for Government and IR majors separately while tables 2-4 show results broken down by type of course, year in school and graduation status for Government and International Relations majors combined. We chose to combine the Government and IR results because the two

programs share some courses and have the same critical thinking goals. The results in Table 1 and further analysis show little difference in the performance of Government and IR students.

Students in both programs met our goal of an average of 2.5. Over half of the students in both programs reached a level of competency and more than 25% demonstrated excellent work. We would like to see a higher percentage demonstrate competency and excellent work. However, there is evidence students improve during their time as majors in our department and at least 70% of students at or near graduation demonstrate competency or excellence. Table 2 shows that Seniors performed better than non-seniors. Table 3 shows that students taking more advanced courses, who are likely to have taken an introductory theory course, perform better than students taking the core introductory courses. Using data from SacVault, we also determined which of the students in the sample graduated in Spring 2014 or had applied for graduation. We found these students performed at a higher level than students overall. Table 4 shows that 70% of students applying for graduation showed competency or excellent work and a slightly higher percentage of those graduating. The average score of both groups above 3.0.

Q3.4. Do students meet the expectations/standards of performance as determined by the program and achieved the learning outcomes? [PLEASE MAKE SURE THE PLO YOU SPECIFY HERE IS THE SAME ONE YOU CHECKED/SPECIFIED IN Q1.1].

Q3.4.1. First PLO: [_____ Critical Thinking _____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
X	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

[NOTE: IF YOU HAVE MORE THAN ONE PLO, YOU NEED TO REPEAT THE TABLE IN Q3.4.1 UNTIL YOU INCLUDE ALL THE PLO(S) YOU ASSESSED IN 2013-2014.]

Q3.4.2. Second PLO: [_____]

	1. Exceed expectation/standard
	2. Meet expectation/standard
	3. Do not meet expectation/standard
	4. No expectation/standard set
	5. Don't know

Question 4 (Q4): Evaluation of Data Quality: Reliability and Validity.

Q4.1. How many PLOs in total did your program assess in the 2013-2014 academic year? [1]

Q4.2. Please choose **ONE ASSESSED PLO** as an example to illustrate how you use direct, indirect, and/or other methods/measures to collect data. If you only assessed one PLO in 2013-14, YOU CAN SKIP this question. If you assessed MORE THAN ONE PLO, please check **ONLY ONE PLO BELOW EVEN IF YOU ASSESSED MORE THAN ONE PLO IN 2013-2014.**

X	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)

	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Other PLO. Specify:

Direct Measures

Q4.3. Were direct measures used to assess this PLO?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q4.4)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.4)

Q4.3.1. Which of the following **DIRECT** measures were used? [Check all that apply]

	1. Capstone projects (including theses, senior theses), courses, or experiences
X	2. Key assignments from other CORE classes
X	3. Key assignments from other classes
	4. Classroom based performance assessments such as simulations, comprehensive exams, critiques
	5. External performance assessments such as internships or other community based projects
	6. E-Portfolios
	7. Other portfolios
	8. Other measure. Specify:

Q4.3.2. Please provide the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] that you used to collect the data. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

See Appendix II

Q4.3.2.1. Was the direct measure(s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the rubric/criterion?

	1. Yes
X	2. No

	3. Don't know
--	---------------

Q4.3.3. Was the direct measure (s) [key assignment(s)/project(s)/portfolio(s)] aligned directly with the PLO?

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

Q4.3.4. How was the evidence scored/evaluated? [Select one only]

	1. No rubric is used to interpret the evidence (If checked, go to Q4.3.7)
	2. Use rubric developed/modified by the faculty who teaches the class
X	3. Use rubric developed/modified by a group of faculty
	4. Use rubric pilot-tested and refined by a group of faculty
	5. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.5. What rubric/criterion was adopted to score/evaluate the above key assignments/projects/portfolio? [Select one only]

	1. The VALUE rubric(s)
	2. Modified VALUE rubric(s)
X	3. A rubric that is totally developed by local faculty
	4. Use other means. Specify:

Q4.3.6. Was the rubric/criterion aligned directly with the PLO?

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

Q4.3.7. Were the evaluators (e.g., faculty or advising board members) who reviewed student work calibrated to apply assessment criteria in the same way?

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

Q4.3.8. Were there checks for inter-rater reliability?

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

Q4.3.9. Were the sample sizes for the direct measure adequate?

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

Q4.3.10. How did you select the sample of student work (papers, projects, portfolios, etc)? Please briefly specify here:

We decided to use papers from political theory courses because the assignments for these courses all require students to analyze competing arguments and where this developing skill is emphasized. We picked five courses including three introductory required courses and two more advanced courses.

Government students must take either Govt 110 or Govt 111 and IR students must take either Govt 111 or Govt 112. Most students taking these courses will be taking political theory for the first time. However, students are also allowed to take an additional introductory theory course as an elective. We also chose Govt 118 and Govt 123. In general, students who take these courses will have taken one of the three required theory courses before. Since 110, 111, and 112 are required courses they should represent our majors well.

Indirect Measures

Q4.4. Were indirect measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.5)

Q4.4.1. Which of the following indirect measures were used?

	1. National student surveys (e.g., NSSE, etc.)
	2. University conducted student surveys (OIR surveys)
	3. College/Department/program conducted student surveys
	4. Alumni surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	5. Employer surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	6. Advisory board surveys, focus groups, or interviews
	7. Others, specify:

Q4.4.2. If surveys were used, were the sample sizes adequate?

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

Q4.4.3. If surveys were used, please briefly specify how you select your sample? What is the response rate?

Other Measures

Q4.5. Were external benchmarking data used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
X	2. No (If no, go to Q4.6)

Q4.5.1. Which of the following measures was used?

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

Q4.6. Were other measures used to assess the PLO?

	1. Yes
	2. No (Go to Q4.7)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q4.7)

Q4.6.1. If yes, please specify: [_____]

Alignment and Quality

Q4.7. Please describe how you collected the data? For example, in what course(s) (or by what means) were data collected? How reliable and valid is the data? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

The data were collected as part of course grading. Three faculty members who specialize in political theory applied the rubric while they were grading papers for their course. The rubric was developed and discussed by all faculty to align with our program goal 2a. Political theory courses were chosen because the goal coincides closely to the types of assignments and skills taught in political theory courses. We also found that the average scores in core courses were very close as were those in the advanced courses. We checked inter-rater reliability by having a person who did not teach the courses examine a small sample of papers from two of the courses to see if instructors were coding similarly. There were not large differences.

The scores also seemed to be related to other variables in predictable ways. Using data from MySacState, we compared the scores with the Sacramento State GPA of Seniors in the sample and found that it was .67. The scores also follow predictable patterns like being higher for seniors and students in advanced course.

Q4.8. How many assessment tools/methods/measures **in total** did you use to assess this PLO? [__1__]

NOTE: IF IT IS ONLY ONE, GO TO Q5.1.

Q4.8.1. Did the data (including all the assignments/projects/portfolios) from all the different assessment tools/measures/methods directly align with the PLO?

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

Q4.8.2. Were **ALL** the assessment tools/measures/methods that were used good measures for the PLO?

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

Question 5 (Q5): Use of Assessment Data.

Q5.1. To what extent have the assessment results **from 2012-2013** been used for? [CHECK ALL THAT APPLY]

	Very Much (1)	Quite a Bit (2)	Some (3)	Not at all (4)	Not Applicable (9)
1. Improving specific courses	X				
2. Modifying curriculum			X		
3. Improving advising and mentoring	X				

4. Revising learning outcomes/goals		X			
5. Revising rubrics and/or expectations			X		
6. Developing/updating assessment plan			X		
7. Annual assessment reports			X		
8. Program review					X
9. Prospective student and family information			X		
10. Alumni communication				X	
11. WASC accreditation (regional accreditation)					X
12. Program accreditation					X
13. External accountability reporting requirement					X
14. Trustee/Governing Board deliberations					X
15. Strategic planning					X
16. Institutional benchmarking					X
17. Academic policy development or modification					X
18. Institutional Improvement					X
19. Resource allocation and budgeting					X
20. New faculty hiring			X		
21. Professional development for faculty and staff			X		
22. Other Specify:					

Q5.1.1. Please provide one or two best examples to show how you have used the assessment data above.

In last year's assessment, we examined the order that students took courses and the goal of using evidence to make arguments. We found that the vast majority of students took courses in the order we suggested but some did not. We also found that students did a pretty good job using evidence, but they were weak in finding quality sources to make arguments. One change we have made is to create a Govt 1 course for incoming freshman who have declared Govt or IR as their major. This is usually the first course students take in the department, but it is often in a large course with non-majors. We created a learning community combining Gov1 and English 5 and during orientation we have advised students to enroll in these courses. We hope to improve advising and critical thinking skills through this course. We also discussed ways we can improve student's research skills so they can incorporate more quality sources in their research papers.

Q5.2. As a result of the **assessment effort in 2013-2014** and based on the prior feedbacks from OAPA, do you anticipate making any changes for your program (e.g., course structure, course content, or modification of program learning outcomes)?

X	1. Yes
	2. No (If no, go to Q5.3)
	3. Don't know (Go to Q5.3)

Q5.2.1. What changes are anticipated? By what mechanism will the changes be implemented? How and when will you assess the impact of proposed modifications? [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

We have just finished the assessment. We are going to discuss the results with our faculty during an upcoming meeting.

Q5.2.2. Is there a follow-up assessment on these areas that need improvement?

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

Q5.3. Many academic units have collected assessment data on aspects of a program that are not related to program learning outcomes (i.e., impacts of an advising center, etc.). If your program/academic unit has collected assessment data in this way, please briefly report your results here. [WORD LIMIT: 300 WORDS]

Question 6 (Q6). Which program learning outcome(s) do you plan to assess next year?

	1. Critical thinking (WASC 1) ¹
	2. Information literacy (WASC 2)
	3. Written communication (WASC 3)
	4. Oral communication (WASC 4)
X	5. Quantitative literacy (WASC 5)
	6. Inquiry and analysis
	7. Creative thinking
	8. Reading
	9. Team work
	10. Problem solving
	11. Civic knowledge and engagement – local and global
	12. Intercultural knowledge and competency
	13. Ethical reasoning
	14. Foundations and skills for lifelong learning
	15. Global learning
	16. Integrative and applied learning
	17. Overall competencies for GE Knowledge
	18. Overall competencies in the major/discipline
	19. Others. Specify any PLOs that the program is going to assess but not included above: a. b. c.

Part 3: Additional Information

A1. In which academic year did you **develop** the current assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet developed a formal assessment plan

A2. In which academic year did you last **update** your assessment plan?

	1. Before 2007-2008
	2. 2007-2008
	3. 2008-2009
	4. 2009-2010
	5. 2010-2011
	6. 2011-2012
X	7. 2012-2013
	8. 2013-2014
	9. Have not yet updated the assessment plan

A3. Have you developed a curriculum map for this program?

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

A4. Has the program indicated explicitly where the assessment **of student learning** occurs in the curriculum?

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

A5. Does the program have any capstone class?

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

A5.1. If yes, please list the course number for each capstone class: [_____]

A6. Does the program have **ANY** capstone project?

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

A7. Name of the academic unit: [__Govt and IR_ ____]

A8. Department in which the academic unit is located: [____ Govt____]

A9. Department Chair's Name: [____Fozouni____]

A10. Total number of annual assessment reports submitted by your academic unit for 2013-2014: [__1__]

A11. College in which the academic unit is located:

	1. Arts and Letters
	2. Business Administration
	3. Education
	4. Engineering and Computer Science
	5. Health and Human Services
	6. Natural Science and Mathematics
X	7. Social Sciences and Interdisciplinary Studies
	8. Continuing Education (CCE)
	9. Other, specify:

Undergraduate Degree Program(s):

A12. Number of undergraduate degree programs the academic unit has: [__3_ ____]

A12.1. List all the name(s): [__Government, International Relations, Government and Journalism____]

A12.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this undergraduate program? [__0 ____]

Master Degree Program(s):

A13. Number of Master's degree programs the academic unit has: [__ 1__]

A13.1. List all the name(s): [____Government Masters____]

A13.2. How many concentrations appear on the diploma for this master program? [__0____]

Credential Program(s):

A14. Number of credential degree programs the academic unit has: [__0__]

A14.1. List all the names: [____]

Doctorate Program(s)

A15. Number of doctorate degree programs the academic unit has: [__0____]

A15.1. List the name(s): [____]

A16. Would this assessment report apply to other program(s) and/or diploma concentration(s) in your academic unit*?

X	1. Yes
	2. No

*If the assessment conducted for this program (including the PLO(s), the criteria and standards of performance/expectations you established, the data you collected and analyzed, the conclusions of the assessment) is the same as the assessment conducted for other programs within the academic unit, you only need to submit one assessment report.

16.1. If yes, please specify the name of each program: ____Government and International Relations_majors____

16.2. If yes, please specify the name of each diploma concentration: _____

