

**Assessment Plan****Wayne State University****Academic Programs****College of Liberal Arts and Sciences****Political Science****Bachelor of Public Affairs** **Mission Statement -- BPA****Providing Department:** Bachelor of Public Affairs**Mission Statement**

The Bachelor of Public Affairs (B.P.A.) prepares qualified students for professional and technical careers in the public service or for advanced study in public affairs and administration, the social sciences and related disciplines. The program is a structured professional curriculum that builds on the foundation of a general liberal arts education. The curriculum incorporates fundamentals of social science theory and applications of that theory to public management and policy analysis. The B.P.A. provides students with skills needed for working in city, county, state and national government, in other public and non-profit agencies, and in positions in private enterprise that deal with governmental relations.

**Progress:****Related Items***There are no related items.* **1: Research****Start:** 9/1/2015**End:** 8/31/2016**Learning Outcome Description**

To access and appropriately invoke scholarly research bearing on issues and topics.

**Progress:****Related Items***There are no related items.* **2: Appreciation of Multiple Perspectives****Start:** 9/1/2015**End:** 8/31/2016**Learning Outcome Description**

To demonstrate appreciation of competing conceptual approaches to the subject matter.

**Progress:****Related Items***There are no related items.* **3: Critical Judgment****Start:** 9/1/2015**End:** 8/31/2016**Learning Outcome Description**

To apply critical judgment in assessing accounts and explanations of political phenomena.

**Progress:****Related Items***There are no related items.*

**4: Expression****Start:** 9/1/2015**End:** 8/31/2016**Learning Outcome Description**

To communicate information and argumentation in writing in a clear, logical, and formally correct manner (with appropriate citations).

**Progress:****Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

---

**BPA Major Map****Start:** 9/1/2015**End:** 8/31/2016**Providing Department:** Bachelor of Public Affairs**Attach Curriculum Map Here**

BPA Curriculum Map

BPA Major Map

**Progress:****Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

---

**1.1: Assessment: Research****Start:** 9/1/2015**End:** 8/31/2016**Progress:****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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

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

**Results**

2.80 (2.1 on the scale previously used for assessment)

**Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline****Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Direct faculty attention to the following problems: Journalistic rather than scholarly sources; incomplete citations; inadequate linking of factual assertions to sources.
- 4) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

**Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 1.1 assessment outcome.

2) No more than 35% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 1.1 assessment outcome (50% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 1.1 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

#### **Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

#### **Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

---

### **1.2: Assessment: Research**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

#### **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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

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

#### **Results**

3.0 (2.0 on the scale previously used for assessment)

#### **Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline**

#### **Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.

2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.

3) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

#### **Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 1.2 assessment outcome.

2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 1.2 assessment outcome (30% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 1.2 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

#### **Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

#### **Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

---

### **2.1: Assessment: Appreciation of Multiple Perspectives**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

**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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

Criteria: The paper accurately identifies competing ways of understanding the phenomenon being studied.

**Results**

3.0 (2.0 on the scale previously used for assessment)

**Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline****Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

**Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

- 1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 2.1 assessment outcome.
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 2.1 assessment outcome (40% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 2.1 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

**Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

**Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

**2.2: Assessment: Appreciation of Multiple Perspectives**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

**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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

Criteria: The paper gives a fair account of the strengths of alternative approaches.

**Results**

2.6 (2.2 on the scale previously used for assessment)

**Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline**

**Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Direct faculty attention to the following problems: Difficulty in fairly confronting and convincingly rebutting contrary positions.
- 4) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

**Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

- 1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 2.2 assessment outcome.
- 2) No more than 35% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 2.2 assessment outcome (60% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 2.2 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

**Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

**Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

**3.1: Assessment: Critical Judgement**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

**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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

- 5 = proficient, appropriate to candidate for graduate or professional school
- 4 = strong
- 3 = satisfactory, appropriate to entry into the workforce as a college graduate
- 2 = marginal
- 1 = 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**

3.4 (1.8 on the scale previously used for assessment)

**Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline****Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

**Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

- 1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 3.1 assessment outcome.

2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 3.1 assessment outcome (20% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 3.1 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

#### **Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

#### **Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

---

### **3.2: Assessment: Critical Judgment**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

#### **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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

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

#### **Results**

2.1 (2.45 on the scale previously used for assessment)

#### **Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline**

#### **Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Direct faculty attention to the following problems: Difficulty in fairly confronting and convincingly rebutting contrary positions.
- 4) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

#### **Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

- 1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 3.2 assessment outcome.
- 2) No more than 35% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 3.2 assessment outcome (60% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 3.2 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

#### **Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

#### **Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

---

### **4.1: Assessment: Expression**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

**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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

Criteria: The paper's introduction states a clear and meaningful thesis; the body of the essay is organized in writing a clear, logical, and formally correct manner (with appropriate citations).

**Results**

3.7 (1.65 on the scale previously used for assessment)

**Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline****Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

**Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

- 1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 4.1 assessment outcome.
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 4.1 assessment outcome (20% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 4.1 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

**Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are inputted into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

**Related Items**

*There are no related items.*

**4.2: Assessment: Expression**

**Start:** 9/1/2015

**End:** 8/31/2016

**Progress:**

**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 5 on each (5 as highest in quality and 1 lowest), deriving an overall average.

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

4 = strong

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

2 = marginal

1 = unsatisfactory for a college graduate

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

**Results**

3.6 (1.7 on the scale previously used for assessment)

**Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline****Program Action Plan**

The Undergraduate Programs Committee and the full departmental faculty met and decided on the following action plan:

- 1) Confirmed a change in assessment rubric scoring from a 1-3 high to low scale to a 1-5 low to high scale.
- 2) Disseminate to all instructors the new assessment rubric and an account of the strengths and weaknesses of students' papers by the above criterion.
- 3) Require all majors to complete at least one major course at the 4000 level or above.

**Timeline for Action Plan Implementation**

Goals for Spring/Summer 2018

- 1) Average of 3.0 or better of writing intensive papers for the 4.2 assessment outcome.
- 2) No more than 25% of writing intensive papers with a score below 2.5 for the 4.2 assessment outcome (20% of students scored below a 2.5 on the 4.2 assessment outcome in the 2015-2016 assessment period).

**Reporting to Stakeholders**

The results are imputed into Compliance Assist and posted on the department website.

**Related Items**

*There are no related items.*