

Bachelor of Public Affairs 2014-2015 Assessment Plan Summary

Learning Outcomes

- 1. Research-** To access and appropriately invoke scholarly research bearing on issues and topics.
- 2. Critical Judgment-** To apply critical judgment in assessing accounts and explanations of political phenomenon, with an appreciation of a multiplicity of perspectives.
- 3. Expression-** To communicate information and argumentation in writing in a clear, logical, and formally correct manner (with appropriate citations).

Assessment of Learning Outcomes

1.1 Research Assessment Method- The undergraduate Director, or other faculty member at his delegation, read a sample of Writing Intensive (PS5993) papers and assigned a grade from 1 to 3 on each (1 as highest in quality and 3 lowest), deriving an overall average.

- 1 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school
- 2 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate
- 3 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate.

Criteria- The paper uses sources properly and cites in accordance with a recognized system of citation.

Results: 2.0

Program Action Plan- The Undergraduate Programs Committee will meet at the end of the academic year to review results and to make recommendations for the improvement of the academic program.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation-

Goals for Spring/Summer 2016:

- 1) Average of 2.0 in each assessment category
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with an average score above 2.25

Reporting to Stakeholders- The results are inputted into Compliance Assist and posted on the Political Science Department website.

1.2 Research Assessment Method- The undergraduate Director, or other faculty member at his delegation, read a sample of Writing Intensive (PS5993) papers and assigned a grade from 1 to 3 on each (1 as highest in quality and 3 lowest), deriving an overall average.

1 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school
2 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate
3 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate.

Criteria- The paper marshals substantial evidence for the thesis and establishes logical connections, avoiding fallacious reasoning.

Results- 2.3

Program Action Plan- The Undergraduate Programs Committee will meet at the end of the academic year to review results and to make recommendations for the improvement of the academic program.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:

Goals for Spring/Summer 2016-

- 1) Average of 2.0 in each assessment category
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with an average score above 2.25

Reporting to Stakeholders- The results are inputted into Compliance Assist and posted on the Political Science Department website.

2.1 Critical Judgement Assessment Method- The undergraduate Director, or other faculty member at his delegation, read a sample of Writing Intensive (PS 5993) papers and assigned a grade from 1 to 3 on each (1 as highest in quality and 3 lowest), deriving an overall average.

1 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school
2 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate
3 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate.

Criteria- The paper does not simply summarize the contributions of one source after another, but integrates those contributions into the author's distinctive analysis.

Results- 2.2

Program Action Plan- The Undergraduate Programs Committee will meet at the end of the academic year to review results and to make recommendations for the improvement of the academic program.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation-
Goals for Spring/Summer 2016:

- 1) Average of 2.0 in each assessment category
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with an average score above 2.25

Reporting to Stakeholders- The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the Political Science Department website.

2.2 Critical Judgment Assessment Method-

The undergraduate Director, or other faculty member at his delegation, read a sample of Writing Intensive (PS 5993) papers and assigned a grade from 1 to 3 on each (1 as highest in quality and 3 lowest), deriving an overall average.

- 1 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school
- 2 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate
- 3 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate.

Criteria- The paper anticipates and counters criticisms that can be made of the thesis and supporting evidence.

Results- 2.4

Program Action Plan- The Undergraduate Programs Committee will meet at the end of the academic year to review results and to make recommendations for the improvement of the academic program.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation-
Goals for Spring/Summer 2016:

- 1) Average of 2.0 in each assessment category
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with an average score above 2.25

Reporting to Stakeholders- The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the Political Science Department website.

3.1 Expression Assessment Method- The undergraduate Director, or other faculty member at his delegation, read a sample of Writing Intensive (PS 5993) papers and assigned a grade from 1 to 3 on each (1 as highest in quality and 3 lowest), deriving an overall average.

- 1 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school
- 2 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate
- 3 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate.

Criteria- The introduction states a clear and meaningful thesis; the body of the essay is organized as an orderly progression; and a concluding section effectively sums up what the paper has demonstrated.

Results- 2.4

Program Action Plan- The Undergraduate Programs Committee will meet at the end of the academic year to review results and to make recommendations for the improvement of the academic program.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation-

Goals for Spring/Summer 2016:

- 1) Average of 2.0 in each assessment category
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with an average score above 2.25

Reporting to Stakeholders: The results are inputted into Compliance Assist and posted on the Political Science Department website.

3.2 Expression Assessment Method- The undergraduate Director, or other faculty member at his delegation, read a sample of Writing Intensive (PS 5993) papers and assigned a grade from 1 to 3 on each (1 as highest in quality and 3 lowest), deriving an overall average.

1 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school

2 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate

3 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate.

Criteria: The paper is sound in paragraph structure, sentence structure, and word choice.

Results- 2.5

Program Action Plan- The Undergraduate Programs Committee will meet at the end of the academic year to review results and to make recommendations for the improvement of the academic program.

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation-

Goals for Spring/Summer 2016:

- 1) Average of 2.0 in each assessment category
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with an average score above 2.25

Reporting to Stakeholders- The results are inputted into Compliance Assist and posted on the Political Science Department website.