

**ASSESSMENT IN A SMALL DEPARTMENT: TASKS, TIMELINES and
OUTCOMES OF EFFORT**

**Ann Beck
Murray State University**

**Presentation for the APSA Teaching and Learning Conference, Charlotte,
North Carolina, February 9-11, 2007.**

ASSESSMENT IN A SMALL DEPARTMENT: TASKS, TIMELINES and OUTCOMES OF EFFORT

Background

The Murray State University Department of Government, Law, and International affairs has four distinct undergraduate programs – political science [140 majors], international affairs [35 majors], public administration[6 majors], and legal studies [a minor only]. There is also a Masters of Public Administration graduate program [50 active students]. Eight full-time faculty members provide these programs -- 3 full professors, 1 associate, 3 assistant, 1 lecturer with a typical teaching load of four courses per semester. There is currently one vacancy to be filled with an assistant professor beginning in the fall semester of 2007 as there are two full professors who are now starting a half-time, step-down retirement programs. The associate and all of the assistants have less than five years of service in the Department. The two remaining full professors (1.5 FTE) are within 0 - 3 years of retirement.

The department has a history of assessment efforts that were concentrated in a one credit capstone course for all political science [POL] majors. The primary focus of this historical assessment effort was to gauge factual knowledge attainment by Political Science majors. The main instruments used were in-house knowledge tests in four of the sub-disciplines and a capstone instructor evaluation of a "best quality" research paper submitted by each of the senior POL majors in the class.

The formal development a University-wide strategic plan, the acquisition of a new Dean who was strongly supportive of quantitative assessment efforts, and the imposition of new assessment standards from SACS (the accreditation body for Murray State University) created the environment and impetus for revamping the department's assessment program. The College Dean provided some training for members of each department and formed a College Assessment Committee for sharing information and expertise. Each Department was expected and allowed to independently develop approximately 25 learning outcomes for each major program. A 20-25 outcomes could be at could be assessed over a five year period. After review and feedback on the outcomes and assessment measures, each Department was to plan, implement and report on curriculum and program changes because of those assessment activities each year. All assessment documents and documentation was centralized in the office of the Provost [Vice President for Academic Affairs -- VPAA] where strategic planning and accreditation efforts were coordinated by an Associate VPAA.

The Department of Government assigned these new assessment tasks to one of the faculty who also sat on the College-level Assessment Committee and communicated directly with the Dean and Associate VPAA on assessment matters [with copies to the Department Chair and discussions with the Chair as necessary]. The assessment faculty member was independently responsible for determining how to proceed on the new assessment initiative and how to gain Departmental approval and support. The selected faculty member had previous experience in

3 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

departmental and program assessment and attended about 20 hours of additional University and College training on assessment.

Basic Assigned Tasks for Assessment

1. Establish a list of learning outcomes that align with University-developed goals and “characteristics” of a Murray State graduate.
2. Establish a list of behaviorally anchored learning outcomes that could be assessed over a significant period: 5-7 years. This list of learning outcomes or goals is contained in Attachment 1.
3. Evaluate whether curricular activities in the Department courses as currently constructed by faculty address/provide the knowledge, skill, and ability development for the desired outcomes. This is typically called “conducting a curriculum scan.”
4. Evaluate whether existing and/or new sources of information about achievement of performance goals are needed. That is, determine whether the institution has other sources of information that might be useful to department assessment. Get to know the Institutional Research people.
5. Develop new sources of information as needed.
6. Collect data/information from student and institutional sources.
7. Develop/find behaviorally-anchored assessment rubrics for specific skills attainment and evaluate outcomes of student assessment activities.
8. Report/Make changes to curriculum, practices, policies, procedures, assessment protocols for the POL major within the department.
9. Implement changes and assess impact of those changes over time.

Activities, Time Requirements, and Department Meeting Agenda Items

- Establish Learning Outcomes – discussion among full faculty, analysis of objectives from historic and current syllabi by assessment faculty member(s)
40 hours for assessment faculty member to review existing outcomes and get rankings from other faculty members.
2-3 department meetings to get basic faculty input/consensus/majority agreement on goals and objectives (outcomes) desired for student learning.
- Link Learning Outcomes to Current Curriculum – Analysis of syllabi for current and historic POL courses for content, topics, methods by assessment faculty(s)
40 hours for assessment faculty member to review existing syllabi and determine where and if gaps exist between desired outcomes and curriculum.
1 department meeting to discuss possible gaps and suggest changes to outcomes or curriculum.
- Establish Methods for Assessing Outcomes – imbedded and external; current and long-term.
20 hours for assessment faculty member to suggest methods and get feedback from peers and department faculty.

4 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

1 department meetings to determine which learning outcomes will be measured in which years – discussion by faculty

- Implementation – actions by specific faculty
60-90 hours for assessment faculty member(s) to implement activities for assessment and assemble findings.
- Report on Findings, Develop Recommendations for Changes, and Re-evaluate desired outcomes, assessment methods, and effort level – discussion by faculty, actions by specific faculty to implement changes because of findings, and reporting activities through University structure.
25 hours for assessment faculty member(s) to report on findings to department, college, and university.

1-2 department meetings to determine extent and nature of changes to objectives, changes to curriculum, changes to assessment methods or changes in effort levels.

The entire process from development of learning outcomes through assessment and reporting/change takes approximately two years to collectively conceive and partially or fully implement. As with many departmental activities, specialization is valued and much of the work is performed by one member with input and review by other members.

The Selected Assessment Elements

For each of the five department-selected assessment elements, I provide the element description – what the department is trying to do, the instrument(s) that are used to help us answer assessment questions, the assessment question(s) that we are trying to answer, and the specific “findings” that have been generated in the last year(s).

Element One: Comparison of impressions of POL majors on various elements of their learning and preparation in their major compared with the overall impressions for all seniors at the University.

A survey instrument of about 150 questions related to University-wide goals is completed by more than 85% of all baccalaureate graduates each calendar year. Each respondent provides his/her major in completing the questionnaire. Therefore, using that institutional-level data, we can compare the responses of POL majors to the overall senior pool. The instrument allows us to identify areas of potential strength and weakness in the POL program and major relative to other programs/majors.

5 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

Q1: How are POL students different from the typical senior in the University?

Findings: Areas of Difference

	Overall	POL
First Generation College graduates	57%	41%
Came to this University as a freshman	54%	73%
Want to pursue post-baccalaureate degree	70%	90%
Do off-campus internship or cooperative experience	38%	18%
Do faculty-directed research, scholarship, creative project	46%	27%
Satisfied with opportunities for faculty-directed research, etc.	78%	68%
Satisfied with quality of academic advising	82%	90%
Satisfied with size of classes	52%	75%
Participate in honor societies/clubs/special interest orgs	48%	72%
Satisfied with encouragement and info on post B.A. employment	81%	73%

Element Two: Assessment of perceptions about program of study and attainment of levels of knowledge and skill.

The department has used an internal survey for a number of years. Recently, this survey was updated to reflect changes based on the University-wide assessment initiative. The departmental survey is included as Attachment 2. The departmental survey asks about 100 questions. All members of the senior capstone course complete this survey. Students are asked to self-assess their level of knowledge or skill on each of the 25 departmental assessment objectives. Students are also asked about particular teaching methods that are used in classes as well as differences between levels of courses and between POL and other departments' courses at the same level. This departmental survey of seniors also identifies areas of strengths and potential weakness related to department faculty goals in content and skill level accomplishment.

Q2: What POL faculty teaching techniques are perceived as more or less helpful for student learning as assessed by the students?

Findings: Areas of Difference (one standard deviation or more)

Methods of Instruction evaluated as more or less helpful to learning	
Outlining/note-taking	more helpful than average
Out of class discussion	more helpful than average
Lecture with discussion	more helpful than average
Small group assignments	less helpful than average
Student oral presentations	less helpful than average

6 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

Q3: What POL courses added most to student learning according to the students?

Student assessment of classes that added most to curriculum and learning – ranking of highest to lowest percent of students indicating that course(s) added a little, some, or much value.

Findings: Ranking

Highest: Upper division POL electives
core introductory courses in subfields – comparative, international relations, political theory
core American national government course
Research methods course

Lowest: Capstone course

Q4: Did students perceive courses as becoming more demanding as level increased and how did POL courses compare with other departments' courses at the same level?

Findings: Percentage of agreement

About 80% of the students felt that the difficulty of the course increased as the level of the course increased, and 60% of judged POL courses as more difficult than other comparable lower or upper division courses in other departments.

Q5: How well do the students think they achieved specific knowledge and skill development?

Students self-evaluated their achievement of desired faculty outcomes. The students were asked to rate the accomplishment of the educational objective on a scale of one to ten. This assessment allows faculty to gauge what students think both about their level of achievement and also how student rankings on each item compare with each other item. In general, students tended to rate themselves relatively high across all items as the mean score on all items was at about 8/10. To identify areas of student-perceived strength and weakness, we specifically evaluated items that were one standard deviation below or above the mean of student responses are reported to compare one item to another.

Findings: Areas of Difference (one standard deviation or more)

Knowledge of approaches to the discipline	below
Qualitative and Quantitative techniques	below
Ability to state a testable hypothesis	below
Ability to detect threats to validity	below
Ability to detect threats to reliability	below
Clarity of oral presentations	below
Willingness to engage in extra-curricular activities	below
Ability to locate good POL sources	above
Ability to discern author's key points/logic	above
Ability to cite properly	above
Ability to logically organize material	above
Ability to apply acceptable writing mechanics	above

7 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

Element Three: Use of internal and external tests to assess knowledge levels. Students in the capstone course are required to take, at departmental expense, the Educational Testing Service Field test (ETS) for POL majors as part of the capstone experience. The students also take a department-constructed multiple choice test. Each faculty member who is responsible for various upper-division POL courses is asked to review/submit test questions and the internal test is updated every two years.

Findings: Correlation of scores on ETS test with Internal Test and between the ETS and students' entering ACT scores.

The Pearson correlation coefficient for the ETS score and the DEPT test score was + 0.55. The Pearson correlation coefficient for the students' ACT scores at admission and the ETS score was +0.75.

Q6: How do POL majors knowledge test scores compare to POL majors at other schools and MSU Faculty expectations?

Findings: Percentage Correct or Percentile Standing

<i>Faculty Expectations</i> ETS (2006)	<i>Actual Student Outcomes</i> ETS (2006)
At least 50% correct answers in subfields	Theory 50%; U.S. 53%; Comparative 52%; IR 48%
At least 50 th percentile in subfields	Theory 55%ile; U.S. 50%ile; Comparative 60%ile; IR 30%ile.
At least 50% correct answers in critical thinking & methodology	Critical Thinking 53%; Methods 51%
At least 50 th percentile in critical thinking & methodology	Critical Thinking 15%ile; Methods 15%ile.

Q7: How do POL majors knowledge test scores on the internally-generated POL test compare to departmental faculty expectations?

Findings: Percent Correct

Faculty Expectation: Mean for class of 75% correct and at least 80% of students score 75% correct or higher.

Actual Performance:

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005*	2006
Number of majors	18	20	25	21	28	24	28
Mean Score	83%	85%	84%	85%	87%	68%	83%
% score 75 or >	94%	95%	68%	81%	96%	25%	79%

* students told that their performance would have no impact on grade

8 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

Element Four: Use of rubric to assess level of seniors' knowledge and skill/ability attained in writing. One or two faculty members in the department annually review the senior capstone papers to assess how well students meet various elements related to both the content and mechanics of scholarly writing in the discipline.

Q8: How do senior writing project activities compare to department faculty expectations?

Findings: Percentage Acceptable

Faculty Expectation: 70% acceptable (score of 3 or higher) on each of three elements (2005 & 2006) after final submission.

Actual Performance: Using a rubric, the two faculty members had very divergent scores. One faculty member evaluated 70-85% acceptable on each of the three elements. The other faculty member evaluated only 25-60% acceptable on each of the three elements.

Faculty Expectation: 70% acceptable upon first submission

<i>Actual Performance:</i>	2004	2005	2006
Initial submission acceptable	7%	22%	54%

ELEMENT FIVE: Use of pre-test/post-test in American government to assess knowledge of American national government and politics added over the study period.

Q9: How much additional knowledge about American national government and politics has been learned and retained across the POL curriculum?

Findings: Comparison of percent correct

The department has administered the same "test" about American national government and politics to all entering students of POL 140 and all seniors in the capstone course for about five years. The percent of correct answers for beginning students hovers around 34% while the percent correct answers for the seniors across four years is 72%.

Generating Changes to Curriculum

After the assessment activities for a yearly cycle have been completed and reported to the members of the POL faculty, the Department engages in a discussion of what might be modified to achieve greater student learning. At the beginning of academic year 2006-2007, the Department members who teach in political science met and agreed to a number of changes to the curriculum.

Among these changes were:

- (a) Work with the faculty in English composition to develop a specific course in writing in the social sciences that would be offered at least once a year and be taken by majors who should deficiencies in writing during the Freshman Year Experience course for majors.

9 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

- (b) Reinstate the requirement for a mathematics class on probability and statistics for POL majors that they take as part of their general University Study requirements.
- (c) Require more oral presentations by students in POL 500 level classes [seniors or graduate standing].
- (d) Eliminate the internal department examination in the capstone course.
- (e) Expand opportunities from the research methods core course to allow students to complete a full research paper in an upper-division course.
- (f) Redesign the capstone course to use additional methods of assessment for specific learning outcomes related to critical thinking, reading comprehension, use of disciplinary vocabulary, etc.
- (g) Create new requirements for all POL majors and minors to complete at least one lower division course (200 level) in each of the subfields -- International Relations, Comparative Politics, and normative Political Theory.
- (h) Redesign the capstone course to provide more specific assistance on job searching/exploration/internships.
- (i) Gather information on post-graduate employment, graduate school, and professional achievement of POL majors.

The Department Chair took lead responsibility for any changes related to the requirements for majors and minors and new course development in the English department. Changes related to the capstone course were implemented in the next offering by the new instructor of the capstone course. The changes related to research and oral presentations by students in upper-division POL courses were to be voluntarily implemented by faculty members who teach upper-division courses.

AREAS OF DIFFICULTY AND FRICTION

One of the blessings and curses of departmental assessment activities is that it requires faculty to collectively address what is important to them. Assessment activities can both bond and fissure departmental relationships. The all-member discussions about assessment do get us talking more to one another about what we are doing. It also opens areas of contention among colleagues that were traditionally smoothed through the practices of academic freedom and “don’t ask, don’t tell.” There are a number of issues that have emerged as rubbing spots among faculty members as a result of this “assessment” process.

First, some faculty believe that assessment should focus more on attainment of specific factual knowledge while other faculty members believe that the focus should be on the attainment of particular skills – e.g., clear oral and written presentation. These differences can spill over into assessment activities and consensus on outcomes. In our case, we overcame much of this tension by including multiple learning outcomes that incorporated both knowledge and skill or ability outcomes.

Second, faculty members’ deeply held tenets about academic freedom are put to the test in programmatic assessment where the focus is on collective attainment of objectives (overall program design) rather than individual control over the content

10 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

and process elements of a particular class. Faculty members may resist efforts to be “controlled” in what they do in “their” classrooms in order to achieve some overall program or department outcome. We continue to rely on standard decision-rule practices that we use for other departmental decisions to avoid stalemate; and we identify how we can voluntarily support each other’s teaching efforts.

Third, paradigmatic differences do re-emerge in the process of determining outcomes and methods of assessing those outcomes. Depending on the faculty member’s own preferences, conflicts do arise about what students should learn and how they should demonstrate that they have learned it. Some members want impressions about outcomes while others want statistical analyses. In addition, changes in administrative leadership result in less or more emphasis on various elements of assessment. Here, we use the collective political skills of department members, particularly the chair, to help us chart a course that allows us to keep the eyes on the prize, not the process of measuring.

Fourth, it is difficult to blend idealized outcomes (What would we want to be the best outcome for all our majors?) with the great variation in preparation and native abilities of our students (What is reasonable to expect from our cadre of undergraduates?). There is always a tendency to set goals so that the department can be seen as meeting them rather than setting higher goals that would require much more hard work from faculty members. Faculty already see themselves as torn in too many directions and programmatic assessment can become an end in itself. Again, the chair is instrumental in helping identify resources that can be applied to assessment efforts to reduce faculty burden. For example, now that the basic assessment framework is in place, we have decided to involve an MPA graduate assistant in some of the annual assessment analysis and reporting efforts.

Finally, most of my colleagues prefer short, but meaningful group discussions about which outcomes are most meaningful and what the report on assessment may indicate about the success or failure of our collective efforts. Longer dyadic discussions about assessment issues specific to each individual faculty member were undertaken by the “Assessment” faculty member to determine intensity of opinion and to explore possible areas of flexibility. Specialization and concentration of the assessment activities into one faculty member significantly reduced the anxiety that every faculty member would be asked to do more in this area. In the end, the prize is the discussion among us and the agreement on ways to improve our program. The specifics of the assessment activities become less technical and more a matter of administrative compliance.

11 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

ATTACHMENT 1: Desired Learning Goals/Objectives (Outcomes) for Political Science Majors [Faculty Generated]

GOAL 1 : Understand and interrelate leading theories, literature, and approaches in Political Science

- (1) demonstrate skill of accurately comprehending & summarizing undergraduate-level texts, articles, and related material in Political Science.
- (2) demonstrate knowledge of principal concepts/approaches/facts in Political Science in each of the sub-disciplines – United States Government and Politics, Comparative Political Systems, International Relations, Political Theory and History of Political Thought, and Methodology.
- (3) demonstrate ability to connect ideas in one sub-discipline to another sub-discipline in Political Science.
- (4) demonstrate ability to use both qualitative and quantitative approaches within one or more sub-disciplines of Political Science.

GOAL 2: Understand and apply the critical and scientific methods of Political Science to discover knowledge and ascertain its validity.

- (1) demonstrate ability to develop a testable hypothesis grounded in Political Science.
- (2) demonstrate ability to locate, select, and apply an appropriate (high quality) mix of books, journals, web-sites, newspapers of record, and other documents to the topic, thesis, or hypothesis.
- (3) demonstrate skill in summarizing/detecting central purpose, thesis, or hypothesis of author(s) and accurately citing the evidence provided by the author(s).
- (4) demonstrate skill in documenting and citing sources consistent with the American Political Science Association Manual.
- (5) demonstrate knowledge of when to use quotations and paraphrases in written work.
- (6) demonstrate knowledge of threats to validity of various types of information/data.
- (7) demonstrate knowledge of threats to reliability of various types of information/data.
- (8) demonstrate ability to reach accurate and logical conclusion based on analysis and evaluation of information/data collected from disciplinary sources.

GOAL 3: Effectively express complex ideas orally and in writing that accurately represent authors' meaning or data, demonstrate appropriate vocabulary of Political Science, and persuade through logic, clarity, and convincing evidence.

- (1) demonstrate ability to express ideas using accurate Political Science vocabulary.
- (2) demonstrate ability to logically organize ideas.
- (3) demonstrate ability to indicate subject, scope and purpose of work in introduction.
- (4) demonstrate ability to support ideas with variety of types evidence from many authorities.
- (5) demonstrate ability to follow grammatical and mechanical conventions of standard written English.
- (6) demonstrate skill in using language so that essay/paper/presentation is understandable to reader/listener on first reading/hearing.
- (7) demonstrate skill in drawing meaningful and appropriate conclusions, implications of research.
- (8) demonstrate ability to engage others in audience in discussion of ideas.

GOAL 4: Understand the importance of and engage in extra-curricular experiences that enhance Political Science classroom learning.

- (1) demonstrate willingness to engage in enhancing extra-curricular experiences related to Political Science within the department, the college, the university, or community.

GOAL 5: Understand the importance of and engage in ethical behavior and responsible citizenship.

- (1) demonstrate knowledge of ethical behavior related to Political Science.
- (2) demonstrate knowledge of democratic theory and its requirements for citizens.
- (3) demonstrate willingness to engage in ethical behavior and responsible citizenship.

12 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

ATTACHMENT 2: Departmental Questionnaire for Political Science Majors

Deciding upon your major

At what point did you decide to major in political science (POL) (e.g., in high school, after coming to Murray State in sophomore year)?

What attracted you to the POL major?

What area of POL were you most interested in when you began majoring in political science?
Circle One

American Comparative International Theory Behavior Public Administration

Did that preference change during your study in the major? Circle One: YES NO

What are your present career plans?

Teaching Methods and Curriculum Requirements

What were the teaching methods in the POL courses you have taken that best helped you learn? Place an **X** if the method was extremely helpful, a **VG** if the method was very helpful, a **G** if the method was helpful, a **F** if the method neither helped or harmed your learning, a **P** if the method interfered with your learning, or an **NA** if you never observed this method.

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> lecture only | <input type="checkbox"/> lecture with recitation/discussion |
| <input type="checkbox"/> discussion only | <input type="checkbox"/> oral presentation by students |
| <input type="checkbox"/> independent study | <input type="checkbox"/> small group discussions |
| <input type="checkbox"/> small group assignments | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> individual research for project, paper or presentation | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> presentations by guests in class or in University/community | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> outlining of or note-taking on texts/materials | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> preparing/studying for examinations or quizzes | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> internship or service learning experiences related to POL | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> discussing material with students or professors outside of class | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> working in student or local/state/national government and politics as volunteer | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> films, videos, plays, recordings about POL topics | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list) _____ | |

In your judgment, do you find the faculty in the Department as well prepared and skilled as teachers/scholars you have had for courses in other departments? Circle One: YES NO

13 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

The Murray State political science major consists of a number of components. Below please CIRCLE the **value added** to your education/learning for each part of the curriculum for your major.

University Studies: general education courses such as CIV, HUM, ENG, Science/Math, Arts

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

American National Government:

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

Core Content Courses in Major : POL 240, 250, 252, 260, 370

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

Required Research Methods Course: POL 360

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

Electives in POL at the 300, 400 and 500 level

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

Capstone Course: POL 499

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

Internship, Cooperative Education, Service Learning, Volunteer Experience in areas related to POL

added much added some added little added none can't evaluate

Comments:

For each of the POL courses you took as a major, circle the amount of work required relative to other courses in other departments at a similar level.

POL 140: less than others about same more than can't recall

POL 200-300: less than others about same more than can't recall

POL 400-500: less than others about same more than can't recall

Did you find that your POL classes became more challenging, with a noticeable difference between each level. Circle one. YES NO

Did you take any political science courses at another institution? ____yes ____no

If yes, were they lower division (100 & 200) ____, upper division (300 – 500) ____, both ____?

15 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

Overall, if you could make a single change designed to improve the political science major at Murray State, what would that be?

Overall, what do you think is the best feature of the political science major at Murray State?

Do you feel that your preparation within the major has prepared you for the next step in your life?

(Circle One) very confident confident neutral unconfident very unconfident

In the column on the right, please rate yourself from 0 -10 on how well you think you **have achieved the stated outcome**. Use 0 if you never learned or applied the ability. Use from 1 to 10 to score your current ability. A "1" would mean that you would have very little competence on the outcome. A "10" would mean you possess excellent skill, knowledge, or ability in the outcome.

1. accurate comprehension & summary of undergraduate-level texts, articles, and related material in Political Science (POL) LEVEL _____
2. knowledge of principal approaches/facts in POL LEVEL _____
3. able to connect ideas in one sub-discipline to another LEVEL _____
4. able to use both qualitative and quantitative approaches within POL LEVEL _____
5. able to develop a testable hypothesis grounded in POL LEVEL _____
6. able to use appropriate books, journals, web-sites, newspapers, and other documents appropriate to the topic in POL LEVEL _____
7. able to summarize/detect central purpose, thesis, or hypothesis of the creator and the evidence provided by the creator LEVEL _____
8. able to use documentation style appropriate to POL LEVEL _____
9. knowledge of when to use quotations and paraphrases in written work LEVEL _____
10. knowledge of threats to validity of various types of information/data LEVEL _____
11. knowledge of threats to reliability of various types of information/data LEVEL _____
12. able to reach accurate and logical conclusion based on analysis and evaluation of information/data collected from POL sources LEVEL _____
13. able to express ideas using correct POL vocabulary LEVEL _____
14. able to logically organize ideas LEVEL _____

16 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

15. able to indicate subject, scope and purpose of work in introduction LEVEL _____
16. able to support ideas with variety of thoughts of others LEVEL _____
17. able to follow grammatical and mechanical conventions of standard written English LEVEL _____
18. skill in using language so that work is understandable to reader on first reading LEVEL _____
19. skill in pacing and rate of speed so that work is understandable to listener on first hearing LEVEL _____
20. able to draw appropriate conclusions in presentation LEVEL _____
21. able to engage others in audience in discussion of ideas LEVEL _____
22. willingness to engage in enhancing extra-curricular experiences for POL in the department, college, university, community LEVEL _____
23. knowledge of ethical behavior related to the Political Science discipline LEVEL _____
24. knowledge of democratic theory and its requirements for citizens LEVEL _____
25. willingness to engage in ethical behavior and responsible citizenship LEVEL _____

17 APSA Teaching and Learning Conference Presentation

ATTACHMENT 2: