Discipline	Course Number	Title
Political Science	250	PLS 250 03/19/2024- Campaigns and Elections
College	Division	Department
Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Humanities, Social and Behavioral Sciences	Social Sciences
Faculty Preparer		Lauren Foley
Date of Last Filed Assessment Report		

I. Review previous assessment reports submitted for this course and provide the following information.

1. Was this course previously assessed and if so, when?

   No

2. Briefly describe the results of previous assessment report(s).

   3.

4. Briefly describe the Action Plan/Intended Changes from the previous report(s), when and how changes were implemented.

   5.

II. Assessment Results per Student Learning Outcome

Outcome 1: Students will understand basic election laws governing nominations, general elections, campaign finance and election administration.

- Assessment Plan

  o Assessment Tool: Colleague evaluated pre-post test

  o Assessment Date: Winter

  o Course section(s)/other population:

  o Number students to be assessed:

  o How the assessment will be scored:

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

- Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2012		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	17

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

In the Fall 2012 term, one in-person section ran at WCC. All of the students in the section were assessed: 17 students total.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

In the assessment, all of the 17 students enrolled in the one in-person section were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Outcome #1 was assessed using an exam ("Exam 1"). The exam was given in class and consisted of five short-answer questions and one essay question.

The short-answer questions covered the nomination process; campaign and elections (e.g., campaign finance, primaries, the national party convention); the election administration (e.g., delegates, superdelegates); and the historical development of political parties, third parties, and the two-party system in the United States.

The essay question inquired about the changes in the presidential nominating process since the 1960s, specifically the creation of the McGovern-Fraser Commission, and how those changes are connected to the 2012 presidential nominating process for the Republican Party.

The exam was scored using an answer key and departmentally-developed rubric.

***Note: Exam 1 was used to assess Outcome #1 and Outcome #2.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes
All of the students (17 out of 17) took the exam ("Exam 1"). 70.59% (12/17) scored 70% or higher. The average score on the exam was 78.09 out of 100 points, or 78.09%. The highest score was a 96.50% and the lowest score was a 57.50%. The standard of success is that 70% of students will score 70% or higher; therefore, the standard of success for Outcome #1 was achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

In general, the students performed well in defining and describing the campaigns and election process, such as explaining how a presidential candidate is nominated (e.g., primary elections, general elections, national party convention, delegates). Moreover, the students excelled in explaining the advantages and disadvantages of front-loading the primaries.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Although the standard of success was met for Outcome #1, there are areas for continuous improvement. In particular, the students struggled with the essay portion of the exam. While all of the students were able to describe the historical development of the presidential nominating process, some of them were unable to apply the historical development (e.g., reforms in the 1960s) to the 2012 presidential nominating process for the Republican Party.

Future instructors will want to spend more time going beyond the definitions, and applying the contextual material to current scenarios. Future instructors will need to provide more specific examples of the campaign and election process.

Outcome 2: Students will trace the historical development of political parties and the two party system in the United States.

- Assessment Plan

  o   Assessment Tool: Colleague evaluated pre-post test

  o   Assessment Date: Winter

  o   Course section(s)/other population:

  o   Number students to be assessed:

  o   How the assessment will be scored:

  o   Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

  o   Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2012		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	17

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

In the Fall 2012 term, one in-person section ran at WCC. All of the students in the section were assessed: 17 students total.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

In the assessment, all of the 17 students enrolled in the one in-person section were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Outcome #1 was assessed using an exam ("Exam 1"). The exam was given in class and consisted of five short-answer questions and one essay question.

The short-answer questions covered the nomination process; campaign and elections (e.g., campaign finance, primaries, the national party convention); the

election administration (e.g., delegates, superdelegates); and the historical development of political parties, third parties, and the two-party system in the United States.

The essay question inquired about the changes in the presidential nominating process since the 1960s, specifically the creation of the McGovern-Fraser Commission, and how those changes are connected to the 2012 presidential nominating process for the Republican Party.

The exam was scored using an answer key and departmentally-developed rubric.

***Note: Exam 1 was used to assess Outcome #1 and Outcome #2.

***Note: Exam 1 was used to assess Outcome #1 and Outcome #2.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

All of the students (17 out of 17) took the exam ("Exam 1"). 70.59% (12/17) scored 70% or higher. The average score on the exam was 78.09 out of 100 points, or 78.09%. The highest score was a 96.50% and the lowest score was a 57.50%.

The standard of success is that 70% of students will score 70% or higher; therefore, the standard of success for Outcome #2 was achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

In general, the students did well in defining key concepts (e.g., the purpose of political parties, party identification, party in the electorate), and summarizing the historical development of political parties, specifically the two-party system, in the United States.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Although the standard of success was met for Outcome #2, there are areas for continuous improvement. In particular, the students struggled with the essay portion of the exam. While all of the students were able to describe the historical development of the presidential nominating process, some of them were unable to

apply the historical development (e.g., reforms in the 1960s) to the 2012
presidential nominating process for the Republican Party.

Future instructors will need to invest more time in teaching students how to apply
what they have learned beyond the definitions and descriptions.

Outcome 3: Students will describe how elections shape individual behavior, specifically the
behavior of candidates, political parties, interest groups, the media and voters.

- Assessment Plan

    o Assessment Tool: Colleague evaluated pre-post test

    o Assessment Date: Winter

    o Course section(s)/other population:

    o Number students to be assessed:

    o How the assessment will be scored:

    o Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

    o Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2012		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	17

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled,
   please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal,
   or did not complete activity.

In the Fall 2012 term, one in-person section ran at WCC. All of the students in the
section were assessed: 17 students total.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM,
   evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your
   selection criteria.

In the assessment, all of the 17 students enrolled in the one in-person section were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Outcome #3 was assessed using an exam ("Exam 2"). The exam was a take-home exam and consisted of seven short-answer/short-essay questions and one essay question.

The short-answer/short-essay questions covered gerrymandering, redistricting, predictors and preferences in voting in local and national elections, the Electoral College system, and the power of incumbency.

The essay question inquired about the variables that influence voter turnout in the United States, such as the media, interest groups, and political parties. In addition, the question asked about how low turnout rates impact elections results in the United States political system.

The exam was scored using an answer key and departmentally-developed rubric.

***Note: Exam 2 was used to assess Outcome #3 and Outcome #4.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: Yes

14 out of the 17 students took the exam ("Exam 2"). 100% (14/14) scored 70% or higher. The average score on the exam was 91.79 out of 100 points, or 91.79%. The highest score was 100% and the lowest score was 81%.

The standard of success is that 70% of students will score 70% or higher; therefore, the standard of success for Outcome #3 was achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

As evident with the high scores (including two students who received 100% and one student who received 99.5%), the students excelled in describing and defining key concepts (e.g., congressional elections, gerrymandering, redistricting).

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Although the standard of success was met for Outcome #3, there are areas for continuous improvement. In particular, the short-answer/essay questions could be reworded to encourage a higher level of thinking.

At the moment, the short-answer/essay questions require the students to "identify and define and explain the significance" of each concept in relation to "congressional elections." This is a fairly straightforward question that does not compel the students to think beyond the scope of what was reviewed in the readings.

In order to push the students to think more critically, future instructors will have to rephrase the short-answer/essay questions to have the students apply the key concepts from the readings to current examples of campaigns and elections.

Outcome 4: Students will explain the connections between elections, voter turnout, representation and policy outcomes.

- Assessment Plan

    o   Assessment Tool: Colleague evaluated pre-post test

    o   Assessment Date: Winter

    o   Course section(s)/other population:

    o   Number students to be assessed:

    o   How the assessment will be scored:

    o   Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

    o   Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2012		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	17

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

> In the Fall 2012 term, one in-person section ran at WCC. All of the students in the section were assessed: 17 students total.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

> In the assessment, all of the 17 students enrolled in the one in-person section were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

> Outcome #3 was assessed using an exam ("Exam 2"). The exam was a take-home exam and consisted of seven short-answer/short-essay questions and one essay question.
>
> The short-answer/short-essay questions covered gerrymandering, redistricting, predictors and preferences in voting in local and national elections, the Electoral College system, and the power of incumbency.
>
> The essay question inquired about the variables that influence voter turnout in the United States, such as the media, interest groups, and political parties. In addition, the question asked about how low turnout rates impact elections results in the United States political system.
>
> The exam was scored using an answer key and departmentally-developed rubric.
>
> ***Note: Exam 2 was used to assess Outcome #3 and Outcome #4.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

> Met Standard of Success: Yes
>
> 14 out of the 17 students took the exam ("Exam 2"). 100% (14/14) scored 70% or higher. The average score on the exam was 91.79 out of 100 points, or 91.79%. The highest score was 100% and the lowest score was 81%.

> The standard of success is that 70% of students will score 70% or higher; therefore, the standard of success for Outcome #4 was achieved.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

> As evident with the high scores (including two students who received 100% and one student who received 99.5%), the students excelled in answering questions about how campaigns and elections shape the behavior of candidates, voters, etc. Moreover, the students did very well in explaining the variables that influence voter turnout rates in the United States political system.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

> Although the standard of success was met for Outcome #4, there are areas for continuous improvement. In particular, the short-answer/essay questions could be reworded to encourage a higher level of thinking.
>
> At the moment, the short-answer/essay questions ask the students to "compare and contrast the 'sociological,' 'Michigan,' and 'rational choice' approaches." This is a fairly straightforward question that does not force the students to think beyond the scope of what was reviewed in the textbooks. One significant limitation of compare-and-contrast questions is that it does not allow for or encourage a comprehensive exploration of a topic.
>
> In order to push the students to think more critically, future instructors will have to rephrase the short-answer/essay questions to have the students apply the key concepts from the textbooks to current examples of campaigns and elections.

Outcome 5: Students will develop critical thinking skills with regards to controversial issues and communicate one's own political views in a respectful yet persuasive manner while demonstrating empathy for differing points of view.

- Assessment Plan
    - Assessment Tool: Student peer-evaluated discussions and debates
    - Assessment Date: Winter
    - Course section(s)/other population:
    - Number students to be assessed:
    - How the assessment will be scored:

- o Standard of success to be used for this assessment:

- o Who will score and analyze the data:

1. Indicate the Semester(s) and year(s) assessment data were collected for this report.

Fall (indicate years below)	Winter (indicate years below)	SP/SU (indicate years below)
2012		

2. Provide assessment sample size data in the table below.

# of students enrolled	# of students assessed
19	17

3. If the number of students assessed differs from the number of students enrolled, please explain why all enrolled students were not assessed, e.g. absence, withdrawal, or did not complete activity.

In the Fall 2012 term, one in-person section ran at WCC. All of the students in the section were assessed: 17 students total.

4. Describe how students from all populations (day students on campus, DL, MM, evening, extension center sites, etc.) were included in the assessment based on your selection criteria.

In the assessment, all of the 17 students enrolled in the one in-person section were included.

5. Describe the process used to assess this outcome. Include a brief description of this tool and how it was scored.

Outcome #5 was assessed using an exam ("Exam 3") and a paper. This does not match the original assessment plan, and I am not sure why the decision was made to go another direction. However, for future assessments, I believe that a written paper assignment is the best way to assess this outcome. I will be making that change on the master syllabus.

The exam was a take-home exam and consisted of four short answer questions and one essay question.

The short-answer questions covered the differences between controlled and uncontrolled media, "dirty tricks", and hard money, soft money, and dark money in election campaigns. The students had to critically think about these terms and consider their application in the context of election campaigns, especially in presidential elections.

The essay question asked the students to write a memo for a United States Senator about the intricacies of federal election campaign finance regulations, specifically, about legislation passed in the 1970s, the Bipartisan Campaign Finance Reform Act of 2002, and current rules on contributions and spending. Then the students had to recommend fundraising and spending strategies, including loopholes!

The paper required the students to conduct interviews with at least five people to determine how they think about the candidates and the issues in the 2012 presidential election. The paper allowed the students to apply concepts on voting behavior and develop critical thinking skills about presidential vote choice and controversial issues. The students had to summarize their own political views in a respectful and persuasive manner as well as review alternative perspectives.

The exam and paper were scored using an answer key and departmentally-developed rubric.

6. Briefly describe assessment results based on data collected for this outcome and tool during the course assessment. Discuss the extent to which students achieved this learning outcome and indicate whether the standard of success was met for this outcome and tool.

Met Standard of Success: <u>Yes</u>

13 out of the 17 students took the exam ("Exam 3"). 92.31% (12/13) scored 70% or higher. The average score on the exam was 88.92 out of 100 points, or 88.92%. The highest score was 98% and the lowest score was 69%.

13 out of the 17 students submitted the paper. 84.62% (11/13) scored 70% or higher. The average score on the paper was 85.46 out of 100 points, or 85.46%. The highest score was 96% and the lowest score was 60%.

The standard of success is that 70% of students will score 70% or higher; therefore, the standard of success for Outcome #5 was achieved for both the exam and the paper.

7. Based on your interpretation of the assessment results, describe the areas of strength in student achievement of this learning outcome.

In regard to the exam, the students did well in critically thinking about and analyzing controversial issues from a multitude of perspectives, such as the role of media in election campaigns. In particular, for the essay question, the students succeeded in applying the concepts of campaign finance to contemporary debates about fundraising and spending strategies.

In regard to the paper, the students performed well in conducting interviews, compiling and analyzing the data, and communicating their political views and the political views of the interviewees in a respectful and persuasive way. This was

not an easy paper, but the students were able to push themselves in skills involving collecting and evaluating qualitative data, and presenting their findings in a professional format.

8. Based on your analysis of student performance, discuss the areas in which student achievement of this learning outcome could be improved. If student met standard of success, you may wish to identify your plans for continuous improvement.

Although the standard of success was met for Outcome #5, there are areas for continuous improvement, especially with the exam. For example, some of the short answer questions on the exam could be reworded to encourage a higher level of thinking.

At the moment, the short answer questions ask the students to "compare and contrast the terms 'hard money,' 'soft money,' and 'dark money" as well as "discuss the differences between controlled and uncontrolled media in election campaigns." This is a fairly straightforward question that does not require the students to think beyond the scope of what was reviewed in the readings.

Future instructors will have to rephrase the short answer questions to have the students apply the key concepts from the readings to current examples of election campaigns.

Seeing that the other outcomes are assessed using exam questions, I believe it would be best to drop the exam questions from outcome 5, and assess this outcome using only a paper. I believe that would make the assessment more manageable and yield more helpful results.

III. Course Summary and Intended Changes Based on Assessment Results

1. Based on the previous report's Intended Change(s) identified in Section I above, please discuss how effective the changes were in improving student learning.

N/A. Unfortunately, due to health reasons, the Lead Instructor, Dr. Donna Wasserman, was unable to conduct an assessment report.

2. Describe your overall impression of how this course is meeting the needs of students. Did the assessment process bring to light anything about student achievement of learning outcomes that surprised you?

The assessment data indicated that PLS-250 is meeting the needs of the students since the standards of success for each outcome were met. The students who pass the course are well-prepared to go on to upper-level courses in Political Science and related disciplines.

In particular, the students knocked the paper (via Outcome #5) out of the water, so to speak. It was impressive that the students conducted interviews and communicated the results in a constructive way. The students who did well on the paper developed critical thinking and communication skills that will benefit them in an academic setting and beyond.

That said, there is room for improvement. Future instructors should focus on applying the course concepts and definitions to current events, especially during campaign and elections years, and reword some of the short-answer/essay questions to encourage a higher level of critical thinking.

3. Describe when and how this information, including the action plan, was or will be shared with Departmental Faculty.

Assessment data and information, including any action plans, will be shared with all full-time, part-time, and adjunct political science faculty at department meetings and via email.

4.

Intended Change(s)

Intended Change	Description of the change	Rationale	Implementation Date
Outcome Language	Bringing the language in the outcomes up to current requirements	Removing things like "students will" from the beginning of the outcomes. Adjusting some of the verbs.	2024
Assessment Tool	Add, delete, or reword the exam questions.	I recommend that the short-answer/essay questions on the second exam (via Outcome #3 and #4) and the short answer questions on the third exam (Outcome #5) be reworded to encourage a higher level of thinking. At the moment, the questions ask the students to define and/or compare and contrast concepts. These are fairly straightforward	2025

		questions that do not compel the students to think beyond the scope of what was reviewed in the readings; nothing new is explored. The short answer/essay questions should push the students to think critically about contemporary political debates.	
Assessment Tool	Outcome 5 assessment tool will be an Outcome-related paper	This outcome would be best assessed through a written paper assignment graded by a rubric.	2024
Course Assignments	Add, delete, or update the Discussion Boards and the homework assignments.	I recommend that some of the Discussion Boards and homework assignments be exchanged, replaced, and/or updated in order to strengthen the student achievement in the learning outcomes (especially Outcome #1 and #2). The Discussion Boards and homework assignments should encourage the students to apply the contextual material to current campaign and election events. At the moment, some of the Discussion Boards and homework assignments are outdated. This is problematic when considering the longevity of the course material. For example,	2025

		one of the Discussion Board questions asks the students to consider the news reporting of the 2000 presidential campaign, specifically about President George Bush. Instead, the question should be replaced with one that asks the students to look at the current news reporting of campaigns and elections and/or to provide an example of poor news reporting. This is much more sustainable and permits for a wide range of answers, and hopefully, sparks an enriching discourse. Likewise, one of the Discussion Board questions asks the students to share their thoughts on President Barack Obama's 2012 Democratic Presidential Nomination acceptance speech. Instead, the question should be reworded to push the students to think about what content is important to cover in acceptance speeches.	
Course Materials (e.g. textbooks, handouts, on-line ancillaries)	Condense the course materials, and incorporate online learning activities.	At the moment, PLS-250 requires the students to look over at least one news source on a weekly basis (e.g., *The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, The*	2025

		Washington Post), read non-textbook materials (e.g., handouts, internet articles), and purchase three textbooks (*The Road to the White House 2012* by Stephen J. Wayne (2012), *The Elections of 2008* by Michael Nelson ed. (2010), and *Is This Any Way to Run a Democratic Election?* by Stephen J. Wayne (2011)). This is a lot of content for one course. The course materials should be condensed to ensure that the students are absorbing the content without becoming discouraged or overwhelmed. This will strengthen the student achievement in all of the learning outcomes, but specifically Outcome #1, Outcome #2, and Outcome #5, which require the students to apply the course concepts and definitions to current events. I recommend that the course material be condensed by transitioning to Open Education Resources (OER), which would permit the combination and customization of educational materials, internet articles, and	

		textbooks. It would also reduce, if not eliminate, any repetitive content. I would encourage the students to look over at least one news source a week in order to apply the course content to real-world situations and scenarios. One idea would be to have the students keep a journal with weekly news stories, and submit the journal at the end of the semester for credit. In addition, at the moment, PLS-250 does not have any online learning activities. I would recommend replacing some of the non-textbook readings with online learning activities in order to confirm that the content is being retained and address the areas identified for "continuous improvement." The importance of learning activities cannot be understated. Learning activities give students the opportunity to make decisions, solve problems, and test what has been taught (and hopefully learned) in new settings. Based on the assessment data, the following learning	

		activities should be introduced:	
		o A learning activity that helps the students remember election laws, especially laws related to campaign finance. For example, a matching game.	
		o A learning activity that allows the students apply the historical development of the presidential nominating process to elections in the twenty-first century. For example, a timeline game.	
		o A learning activity that enables the students to identify the variables that influence the behavior of candidates, interest groups, the media, political parties, and voters. For example, a	

		concept mapping game.	
		o A learning activity that helps the students to gain a better understanding of the redistricting process, as well as the potential ramifications of gerrymandering. For instance, a game to put the State of Michigan back together.	

5. Is there anything that you would like to mention that was not already captured?

In the Fall 2025 term, I would like to work with CiTL and revise the "PLS-250: Campaigns and Elections" Canvas Mastershell. I intend to incorporate the changes listed in the "Intended Change(s)" section of the 2024 Assessment Report, including but not limited to, revising the exam questions, editing the syllabus, and updating learning activities.

In addition, I would like to run "PLS-250: Campaigns and Elections" in the even-numbered election years (e.g., Fall 2026, Fall 2028, Fall 2030). In the even-numbered election years, there will be more current examples (e.g., presidential elections, Congressional elections) for the students to draw on. Then, eventually, I would like to run the course in both even-and-odd numbered years, contingent on interest.

It is important to point out that the "Assessment Plan" for each of the learning outcomes was incomplete. Each "Assessment Plan" included the "Assessment Tool" and "Assessment Date," but not the "Course Section(s)/Other Population," "Number of Students to be Assessed," or "Standard of Success." Therefore, I referred to the "Assessment Plan" from other political science courses, such as "PLS-112: Introduction to American Government." See example below.

- o Assessment Plan
  - ▪ Assessment Tool: Departmental exam.

- Assessment Date: Winter.

- Course section(s)/other population: Random sample of one-half of all sections including all teaching modalities.

- Number students to be assessed: All students in selected sections.

- How the assessment will be scored: Answer key and departmentally-developed rubric.

- Standard of success to be used for this assessment: 70% of the students will score 70% or higher on the outcome related questions.

- Who will score and analyze the data: Departmental faculty will score and analyze the data.

III. Attached Files

PLS-250 Assessment Report (2024)
Exam 1_Outcomes #1 and 2 Statistics
Exam 2_Outcomes #3 and 4 Statistics
Exam 3_Outcome #5 Statistics
Paper_Outcome #5 Statistics

Faculty/Preparer:	Lauren Foley	**Date:** 03/19/2024
Department Chair:	Christopher Barrett	**Date:** 03/20/2024
Dean:	Anne Nichols	**Date:** 03/26/2024
Assessment Committee Chair:	Jessica Hale	**Date:** 01/13/2025