

**Review of Assessment Report
Assessment Review Committee (ARC)**

Academic Program: **POLITICAL SCIENCE AND INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS**

Date: **September 2016**

Criteria for Evaluating Assessment Reports

| Criteria | Description of Criteria | Beginning | Developing | Accomplished | Exemplary | Comments from Assessment Review Committee |
|-------------------------------------|---|-----------|------------|--------------|-----------|---|
| SLOs | The Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) establish the critical components of student learning that define the program and articulate the knowledge and abilities expected of program graduates in ways that are observable and measurable. | | | X | | Good, clear and meaningful LOs. One small concern: LO one asks students to “have substantial familiarity” with the knowledge in the field, and we think that language can be stronger to reflect the dynamic activity involved in mastering disciplinary knowledge. One might be <i>familiar</i> with Mozart, but <i>how do they demonstrate that they really get</i> Mozart? |
| Evidence of Student Learning | Results are based upon evidence of student learning, and evidence can be provided to both internal and external reviewers (preferably in electronic form) | | X | X | | We are really pleased to see you assessing student writing at various levels and would like to see you separate those out, so we can clearly see how 100- and 200-level students do in comparison with 300- and 400-level students. |
| Meaningful Rubrics | Criteria for successful performance are provided through rubrics or other specific descriptions. | | | X | | Well-developed rubrics. |

**Review of Political Science and International Affairs Assessment Report
September 2016**

Additional Comments:

We are pleased with the assessment work Political Science and International Affairs has done and want to encourage you to continue to move in this direction. Your department has identified a really significant issue that all departments need to address: how do we help students become better at synthesis, or go beyond “merely restating arguments of other authors”? This observation can lead to terrific conversations among your colleagues, especially about how you might do things differently at lower levels (100- and 200-level courses) so that students develop abilities over time that make them outstanding thinkers at the upper levels.

For the 2016-17 Assessment Report (due in June), please include one or more key assessment results, and a corresponding recommendation for action. See the “Program Assessment Report Worksheet” for a detailed explanation of this guideline at <http://www.drury.edu/academicaffairs/pdf/biannual.pdf>.

Next Steps:

- 1—Please discuss your assessment report and the ARC review with your department so all faculty are contributing to the assessment of student learning.
- 2—Continue to collect evidence of student learning (preferably in electronic form) according to your LO Matrix.
- 3—Based on recommendations from Program Assessment Committees, the next Assessment Report will be due June 2017 (rather than in January 2017 as originally planned). Departments should continue to collect and assess student learning (as described in your LO Matrix), but ARC will ask for just one annual Assessment Report instead of two.