



POLITICAL SCIENCE - BA

**Cycles included in this report:**

Jul 1, 2020 to Jun 30, 2021

**Program Name: POLITICAL SCIENCE - BA**

**Reporting Cycle: Jul 1, 2020 to Jun 30, 2021**

### **1 University Mission Statement**

**UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:** We educate and empower students to understand and transform our world.

### **2 College/School Mission Statement COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCE**

**MISSION STATEMENT:** East Central University's College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences takes a student-centered approach inside and outside of the classroom, providing quality instruction and producing research and creative work that enriches our academic disciplines, our communities, and the lives of our students.

**3 Program Mission Statement POLITICAL SCIENCE MISSION STATEMENT:** The mission of the Political Science Program is to prepare students for the workforce and for fulfilling duties of citizenship.

### **4 Program Goal(s)**

**POLITICAL SCIENCE GOALS:** The Political Science Program will prepare students for future employment in government, business, law, or the academy. The Political Science Program will build political community through active learning, engaged citizenship, and the promotion of democratic values.

### **5 Assessment Across Program Statement**

There is assessment across the program. Students are assessed at multiple levels and in multiple courses.

### **6 External Instrument Availability**

There is no an external instrument available that would be appropriate for assessing the political science program.

### **7 Student Learning Outcome**

Students shall demonstrate an understanding of the "scope and methods" and content of political science so they may produce quality scholarship in subfields such as the American political and legal systems, international or regional politics, and political theory.

#### **7.1 Criterion**

Demonstration of the ability to produce social science research papers using appropriate content and use of academic literature.

##### **7.1.1 Instrument/Measurement**

Political Science Program Rubric Part I: Scope and Methods in Political Science Projects. Part I will be used to evaluate class papers. Faculty will select at least two research or term papers from each political science major. Classes change from year to year. At least four classes will be selected. The classes from which the papers are drawn will be noted in the yearly report. The rubric is found at the end of this report.

The classes for this year are LSPS 4983 Sem- Racism in the US taught by Pappas, PS 3133 Civil Rights and Liberties I taught by Webster, PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods taught by Pappas, PS 3633 US Presidency taught by Peaden,

PS 3193 Tribal Politics taught by Webster, and PS 4883 PS Capstone taught by Peaden. A total of 15 political science majors were enrolled in these classes (unduplicated headcount).

#### 7.1.1.1 Population

Political science majors in upper-division classes.

#### 7.1.1.2 Standard

Students should score at least 3.25 out of 4 on a 4-point Likert scale per the Political Science Program Rubric Part I.

#### 7.1.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Year	Class Papers	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Scope and Methods and Content (1=low and 4= high)	Percent who Meet or Exceed the Standard
2016-2017	N=21	3-4	3.48	100%
2017-2018	N=25	3-4	3.5	100%
2018-2019	N=36	2-4	3.44	97%
2019-2020	N=34	2-4	3.65	92%
2020-2021	N=4*	3-4	3.75	75%

\* The classes for this year are LSPS 4983 Sem- Racism in the US taught by Pappas, PS 3133 Civil Rights and Liberties I taught by Webster, PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods taught by Pappas, PS 3633 US Presidency taught by Peaden, PS 3193 Tribal Politics taught by Webster, and PS 4883 PS Capstone taught by Peaden. A total of 15 political science majors were enrolled in these classes (unduplicated headcount).

#### 7.1.1.4 Analysis

The standard is met. We received 4 papers from 4 different students who were political science juniors and seniors in the PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods class. Because of Covid, writing assignments across other classes were reduced to assignments such as reaction papers and wiki posts. Students are learning the scope and method well in PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods and it is being reinforced in other upper-level classes. We have multiple excellent students and a few that do not seem to grasp the material as well.

### 7.2 Criterion

Demonstration of the ability to produce social science research presentations and posters presented off campus.

#### 7.2.1 Instrument/Measurement

Political Science Rubric Part I: I. Scope and Methods and Content in Political Science Projects. Part I will be used to evaluate off-campus research presentations.

#### 7.2.1.1 Population

Students who present research off campus. The conferences and meetings will vary from year to year. They typically include the Oklahoma Political Science Association

Annual Meeting, Oklahoma Research Day, Pi Sigma Alpha National Undergraduate Research Conference, and Alpha Chi National Convention. The forum will be specified in the yearly assessment report.

In 2020-2021 these presentations were Oklahoma Research Day (N=2), Pi Sigma Alpha National Undergraduate Research Conference (N=1), and Oklahoma Higher Education Day (N=3), Alpha Chi National Convention (N=1). The total was 6 presentations to be made by 4 different students.

### 7.2.1.2 Standard

Students should score at least 3.25 out of 4 on a 4-point Likert scale per the Political Science Program Rubric Part I.

### 7.2.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Year	Off-Campus Research Presentations	Range of Student Scores	Scope and Methods and Content (1=low and 4=high)	Percent who Meet or Exceed the Standard
2016-2017	N=22	3-4	3.64	100%
2017-2018	N=19	3-4	3.78	100%
2018-2019	N=20	3-4	3.75	100%
2019-2020	N=7	3-4	3.57	71%
2020-2021	N=6*	4-4	4.0	100%

In 2020-2021 these presentations were Oklahoma Research Day (N=2), Pi Sigma Alpha National Undergraduate Research Conference (N=1), and Oklahoma Higher Education Day (N=3), Alpha Chi National Convention (N=1). The total was 6 presentations made by 4 different students.

### 7.2.1.4 Analysis

The standard is met. We evaluated 7 different presentations from 5 different students. They were posters and individual presentations. Students were well prepared. They understand the importance of posing a hypothesis and testing it with appropriate data. Two students did not do well. One presentation was poorly researched and one research poster was elementary. There would have been more presentations but the Alpha Chi Conference was canceled and several students lost their opportunity to present research.

## 8 Student Learning Outcome

Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally.

### 8.1 Criterion

Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally through written communication as demonstrated in class papers.

### 8.1.1 Instrument/Measurement

Political Science Rubric Part II: Oral and Written Communication. Part II will be used to evaluate *class papers, especially research papers*. The rubric is found at the end of this report.

The classes for this year are LSPS 4983 Sem- Racism in the US taught by Pappas, PS 3133 Civil Rights and Liberties I taught by Webster, PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods taught by Pappas, PS 3633 US Presidency taught by Peaden, PS 3193 Tribal Politics taught by Webster, and PS 4883 PS Capstone taught by Peaden. A total of 15 political science majors were enrolled in these classes (unduplicated headcount).

#### 8.1.1.1 Population

Political Science students who are enrolled in classes with a research paper component. Papers from the classes of all Political Science faculty members will be evaluated each year. Papers from fall and spring will be evaluated.

This population is heavily juniors and seniors because there are only two lower-level courses in PS and they are both General Education courses. They do not require papers and they are mainly taken by non-majors.

#### 8.1.1.2 Standard

Students should score at least 3.25 out of 4 on a 4 point Likert scale per the Political Science Program Rubric Part II: Oral and Written Communication.

#### 8.1.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Year	Class Papers	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Written Communication (1=low and 4=high)	Percent who Meet or Exceed the Standard
2016-2017	N=21	3-4	3.42	100%
2017-2018	N=25	3-4	3.72	100%
2018-2019	N=36	2-4	3.33	100%
2019-2020	N=34	2-4	3.61	90%
2020-2021	N=4*	3-4	3.75	75%

\* The classes for this year are LSPS 4983 Sem- Racism in the US taught by Pappas, PS 3133 Civil Rights and Liberties I taught by Webster, PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods taught by Pappas, PS 3633 US Presidency taught by Peaden, PS 3193 Tribal Politics taught by Webster, and PS 4883 PS Capstone taught by Peaden. A total of 15 political science majors were enrolled in these classes (unduplicated headcount).

#### 8.1.1.4 Analysis

The standard is met. Three of the four papers met the standard. One student with particularly low ratings dragged the average down. Most students are performing very well.

### 8.2 Criterion

Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally through oral communication in in-class presentations.

### 8.2.1 Instrument/Measurement

Political Science Rubric Part II: Oral and Written Communication. Part II will be used to evaluate in-class research presentations. The presentation will be evaluated by a faculty member who attends the presentation. Part II of the rubric addresses both Oral and Written Communication. The rubric is found at the end of this report.

#### 8.2.1.1 Population

Political Science students who are enrolled in classes with a presentation component. Usually at least two upper-division classes per semester require a graded presentation of a student's work at the end of the semester. The presentation will be evaluated by the faculty member who teaches the course. When class schedules permit, other faculty members will participate in evaluating the presentations.

#### 8.2.1.2 Standard

Students should score at least 3.25 out of 4 on a 4-point Likert scale per the Political Science Program Rubric Part II: Oral and Written Communication.

#### 8.2.1.2 Data Table (Results)

Year	Off-Campus Research Presentations	Range of Student Scores	Scope and Methods and Content (1=low and 4=high)	Percent who Meet or Exceed the Standard
2016-2017	N=33	3-4	3.61	100%
2017-2018	N=21	2-4	3.66	90%
2018-2019	N=41	2-4	3.68	93%
2019-2020	N=26	2-4	3.65	62%
2020-2021	N=0*			

\* The classes for this year are LSPS 4983 Sem- Racism in the US taught by Pappas, PS 3133 Civil Rights and Liberties I taught by Webster, PS 3163 Political Science Research Methods taught by Pappas, PS 3633 US Presidency taught by Peaden, PS 3193 Tribal Politics taught by Webster, and PS 4883 PS Capstone taught by Peaden. A total of 15 political science majors were enrolled in these classes (unduplicated headcount).

#### 8.2.1.4 Analysis

Because of Covid data was not collected on this metric during the 2020-2021 school year.

## 9 Student Learning Outcome

Students shall demonstrate a high level of critical thinking.

## 9.1 Criterion

Students shall achieve a high level of critical thinking as demonstrated through the evaluation of *class papers*.

### 9.1.1 Instrument/Measurement

Political Science Rubric Part III: Critical Thinking. Part III will be used to evaluate class papers. The rubric is found at the end of this report.

#### 9.1.1.1 Population

Political Science students who are enrolled in classes with a research paper component. Papers from the classes of all Political Science faculty members will be evaluated each year. Papers from fall and spring will be evaluated.

#### 9.1.1.2 Standard

Students should score at least 3.25 out of 4 on a 4 point Likert scale per the Political Science Program Rubric: Part III.

#### 9.1.1.3 Data Table (Results)

Year	Class Papers	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Critical Thinking (1=low and 4= high)	Percent who Meet or Exceed the Standard
2016-2017	N=21	3-4	3.48	100%
2017-2018	N=25	3-4	3.5	100%
2018-2019	N=36	2-4	3.44	97%
2019-2020	N=34	2-4	3.65	92%
2020-2021	N=4*	3-4	3.75	75%

#### 9.1.1.3 Analysis

To meet the standard, students should score 3.25 out of 4 on the 4-point Likert scale. Most of the papers met the standard. Students showed a high level of critical thinking.

## 9.2 Criterion

Students shall achieve a high level of critical thinking as demonstrated through off-campus presentations.

### 9.2.1 Instrument/Measurement

Political Science Rubric Part III: Critical Thinking. The rubric is found at the end of this report. Part III will be used to evaluate off campus presentations.

#### 9.2.1.1 Population

Students who present research at off-campus conferences or meetings. A faculty member who attends the presentation will rate the presentation. The conferences and meetings will vary from year to year. They typically include the Oklahoma Political Science Association Annual Meeting, Oklahoma Research Day, Pi Sigma Alpha

National Undergraduate Research Conference, and Alpha Chi National Convention. The forum will be specified in the yearly assessment report.

The fora listed above are where students presented this year.

**9.2.1.2 Standard**

Students should score at least 3.25 out of 4 on a 4 point Likert scale per the Political Science Program Rubric Part III: Critical Thinking.

**9.2.1.3 Data Table (Results)**

Year	Off-Campus Research Presentations	Range of Student Scores	Mean of Critical Thinking (1=low and 4=high)	Percent who Meet or Exceed the Standard
2016-2017	N=22	3-4	3.64	100%
2017-2018	N=19	3-4	3.78	100%
2018-2019	N=20	3-4	3.75	100%
2019-2020	N=7	3-4	3.57	71%
2020-2021	N=6*	4-4	4.0	100%

\*In 2020-2021 these presentations were Oklahoma Research Day (N=2), Pi Sigma Alpha National Undergraduate Research Conference (N=1), and Oklahoma Higher Education Day (N=3), Alpha Chi National Convention (N=1). The total was 6 presentations made by 4 different students.

**9.2.1.4 Analysis**

To meet the standard, students should score 3.25 out of 4 on the 4-point Likert scale. Requiring students to present their research off campus continues to be an excellent way to generate top-level performance. All students met the standard.

**10 Student Information for this Academic Year**

<b>Student Information for this Academic Year</b>	
Total, <i>unduplicated</i> number of students assessed this academic year	15
Program census for Fall	17
Program census for Spring	16
Total number of Summer/Fall Program graduates	0
Total number of Spring graduates	2
Mean major GPA of Summer/Fall graduates	NA
Mean major GPA of Spring graduates	3.22

**11 Interpretation of Student Information for this Academic Year**

1. There were 17 political science majors enrolled in the fall and 16 in the spring. Our assessment plan focuses on students who are enrolled in junior and senior level classes.



We catch the majority of our majors in these classes. Our plan assessed 15 students this year.

2. The number of political science graduates is two. We would like to see more graduates.

## 12 Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria

Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria			
Student Learning Outcomes	Criteria	Met	Not Met
SLO1: Students shall demonstrate an understanding of the “scope and methods” and content of political science so they may produce quality scholarship in subfields such as the American political and legal systems, international or regional politics, and political theory.	1.1: Demonstration of the ability to produce social science research papers using appropriate content and use of academic literature as demonstrated in <b>class papers</b> .	X	
	1.2: Demonstration of the ability to produce social science <b>research presentations and posters presented off campus</b> .	X	
SLO2: Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professional communication as demonstrated in class papers and in-class presentations.	2.1: Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally through written communication as demonstrated in <b>class papers</b> .	X	
	2.2: Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally through oral communication in <b>in-class presentations</b> .	X	
SLO3: Students shall demonstrate a high level of critical thinking.	3.1: Students shall achieve a high level of critical thinking as demonstrated through the evaluation of <i>class papers</i> .	X	
	3.2: Students shall achieve a high level of critical thinking as demonstrated through <b>off- campus presentations</b> .	X	

## 13 Faculty Meeting

Political Science faculty met sporadically during the 2020-2021 school year as a part of the Department of Politics, Law, and Society regular meetings. Assessment was discussed in the context of organizing the collection of artifacts as well as sharing the results of the analysis. All meetings were held on Zoom.

## 14 Sharing with Stakeholders

The assessment results are shared with faculty members. They are also available to students.

## 15 Summary of Actions Related to Assessment Data

### 15.1 Current Actions and/or Changes

- The 2020-2021 school year was characterized by our approach to Covid. It was a very difficult year and as a result no generalizations will be made about the work that students completed. Under the circumstances, they did the best that they could.

### 15.2 Summary of Latest UAC Review and Status Update

**STRENGTHS:** Clear evidence of changes made based on data and past UAC suggestions. Consistency across the plan. Good information provided under tables to clarify data.

**AREAS OF CONCERN:** Need to identify if standard was met or not met. Rigor of standard needs to be raised. Population needs to include the courses from which the students are being measured. Need to identify reasoning why assessment is heavily upper students. Need to provide rubric for transparency of scoring. Identify who is assessing presentation/posters to determine if it is direct or indirect measure. Need to provide note "see under table" in population to identify courses in which students were assessed.

**SUGGESTIONS:** Addition of courses assessed listed and semesters identified to course list would be helpful. Consider removing duplicate students within one measure. Consider assessing core courses but removing non-majors. Consider stating "not enough data to conduct a longitudinal study". Opportunity to list scores per course then average scores (tables 2.1 & 2.2) to identify which score below to which course. Clarification of term "portfolio" would be helpful (individual assignment or collection of assignments throughout program).

**UAC CONCLUSION:** ? **Approved with Condition (follow-up in some areas required as delineated in Areas of Concern)**

**No new review since 2016.**

### 15.3 Summary of Last 5 Years' Actions/Changes and Updates

- We raised the standard from 3.00 to 3.25 because our students were consistently meeting it. This change is the most major one we made based on last year's review of our assessment plan.
- The most major change to the program as a result of the assessment process was the addition of PS 4883 Political Science Capstone. Because of our difficulty in assessing the major in a consistent way we added this class so that every student would have the same capstone experience.
- Based on assessment data, we wrote a guide to writing research papers in our department. This guide has standardized the information that students have available to them as they write papers.
- Based on assessment data, we are careful to make sure students are engaging in the important activities of presenting research at conferences and writing papers. In the past, a lower percentage of students were presenting papers or posters off campus. Now all of our upper-division students have the opportunity and most of them take advantage of it.

## Political Science Program Rubrics

### I. Rubric: “general understanding of the American political and legal systems, international or regional politics, and political theory”

4: top score	The desired learning outcomes for the class clearly have been achieved. The student has gained a significant understanding of the concepts and applications.	
3	Most of the desired learning outcomes for the class clearly have been achieved. The student has gained a general (or basic) understanding of the concepts and applications.	
2	Some of the desired learning outcomes for the class have been achieved. The student has gained some understanding of the concepts and attempts to apply them.	
1	Items do not demonstrate basic learning outcomes for the term. The student has limited understanding of the concepts.	

### II. Rubric: “Students shall demonstrate the ability to communicate professionally in both oral and written communications”

4: top score	<b>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</b> Uses professional grammar. Spells accurately. Expresses complicated ideas or arguments in complex sentences. Provides citation and references in proper form Uses sources and evidence appropriately	
3	<b>Does many of the following:</b> Uses professional grammar and uses words correctly. Spells accurately. Expresses complicated ideas or arguments in complex sentences. Provides citation and references in proper form (APSA format) Uses sources and evidence appropriately	
2	<b>Does many of the following:</b> Uses poor or unprofessional grammar; misuses words Makes spelling mistakes Writes in simple sentences Uses inconsistent form in citation and references Fails to incorporate sources and evidence appropriately	
1	<b>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</b> Uses poor or unprofessional grammar; misuses words Makes spelling mistakes Writes in simple sentences Uses inconsistent form in citation and references Fails to incorporate sources and evidence appropriately	

### III. Students shall exhibit a high level of critical thinking

4: top score	<b>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</b> Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc.	
--------------	---	--

	<p>Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view. Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.</p>	
3	<p><b>Does most or many of the following:</b> Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view. Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons. Fair-mindedly follows where evidence and reasons lead.</p>	
2	<p><b>Does most or many of the following:</b> Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions.</p>	
1	<p><b>Consistently does all or almost all of the following:</b> Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons. Regardless of the evidence or reasons, maintains or defends views based on self-interest or preconceptions. Exhibits close-mindedness or hostility to reason.</p>	

\*Criteria for critical thinking rubric drawn from Peter A. Facione, Noreen C. Facione, and The California Academic Press 2004. "Permission is hereby granted to students, faculty, staff, or administrators at public or nonprofit educational institutions for unlimited duplication of the critical thinking scoring rubric, rating form, or instructions herein for local teaching, assessment, research, or other educational and noncommercial uses, provided that no part of the scoring rubric is altered and that 'Facione and Facione' are cited as authors."  
[http://www.insightassessment.com/pdf\\_files/rubric.pdf](http://www.insightassessment.com/pdf_files/rubric.pdf)