

# Assessment: Course Four Column

FALL 2015



## El Camino: Course SLOs (BSS) - Political Science

### ECC: POLI 1: Governments of the United States and California

Course SLOs	Assessment Method Description	Results	Actions
<p><b>SLO #2 Linkage Mechanisms</b> - In a multiple choice or written essay test, students will demonstrate an understanding of how political parties and interest groups serve as channels for popular participation, and compare/contrast the techniques they use to do so.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active  <b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)  <b>Input Date:</b> 11/08/2013</p>	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - Two multiple choice tests were used for this assessment. One focusing on Political Parties and the other focusing on the end product, political participation. There were eight questions covering the test on political participation and 13 questions covering political parties.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b>  The target for success will be met if 75 % of the students are able to answer each question correctly.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Linkage Mechanisms Test II.doc</a>  <a href="#">Linkage Mechanisms Test I.docx</a></p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Not Met  Three sections of Pol Sci 1 from Instructor Munoz were assessed as well as two sections from Instructor Houske. All five sections included a total of 157 students. The following percentages were computed based on the number of correct responses per each question.</p> <p>Test I (Participation)</p> <p>#1 65%  #2 75%  #3 4%  #4 18%  #5 55%  #6 46%  #7 20%  #8 46%</p> <p>Test II (Political Parties)</p> <p>#1 81%  #2 88%  #3 88%  #4 95%  #5 100%</p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Spent more time discussing and bring in up more examples during the section of the course discussing Political Participation (02/05/2017)  <b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>#6 95 %</p> <p>#7 94%</p> <p>#8 78%</p> <p>#9 89%</p> <p>#10 98%</p> <p>#11 92%</p> <p>#12 100%</p> <p>#13 100%</p>	
		<p>After analyzing the data for the participation test, one can see that the standard was met on one of the questions while the remaining seven questions fell short of the 75% threshold. Data results also show a wide range in terms of students' performance in answering some of the questions. The range of correct responses were from a low of 4% on question #3 to a high of 75% on question #2. Overall though these were good results as 3 out of the 8 questions at least were responded correctly by more than 50% of the students. This indicates that the students are understanding the material yet more substantial work needs to be done for improvement.</p>	
		<p>Analyzing the data for the Political Parties test, it shows somewhat different results by comparison. The standard was met on all 13 questions with a high of 100% correct responses in three of the questions and a low of 78% in one question (yet meeting the 75% standard) This is interesting since that last semester and this semester both are heavily focusing on campaigns given the presidential election coming up. From both test results one can see that students failed (in the former while succeeding in the latter) at making the connection of civic participation, political parties as linkage mechanisms within the political system.</p>	
		<p>Based on the findings, faculty in our department discussed and agreed that we need to focus and spend more time going over the material pertaining to political participation. Consistent with our department goals of enhancing the quality of education and better preparing students to understand Civic engagement issues, we will continue to</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
--------------------	--------------------------------------	----------------	----------------

discuss among the faculty the different teaching strategies/practices covering such topics. It would also be interesting if this same assessment were to be conducted next semester at the height of campaign politics for the presidential election. Perhaps that is something that will be done even though a different SLO will be assessed.

(02/05/2016)

**Faculty Assessment Leader:** Eduardo Munoz

**Faculty Contributing to Assessment:** Laurie Houske and Eduardo Munoz

# ECC: POLI 3: Introduction to Principles and Methods of Political Science

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #2 Presidential and Parliamentary Systems</b> - In a written essay students will demonstrate knowledge and analyze the differences between presidential and parliamentary systems found in democracies today.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active  <b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)  <b>Input Date:</b> 11/08/2013</p>	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - As part of their final exam, students were given a written essay question designed to assess this SLO. The essay question was: "How do political executives in presidential and parliamentary systems differ? Describe at least three differences in their functioning."</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b>            BASED ON DEPARTMENT RUBRIC (see attached) and PERCENTAGE: The Political Science Department rubric for this SLO consisted of a three-by-three matrix based on three measures: (1) Organization, (2) Content Knowledge, and (3) Supporting Arguments and Examples. Students were scored on a scale of three through one on each measure, three being the highest possible score on the given measure, two being a good but not perfect score on the given measure, and one being the lowest score on the given measure. Their scores for each section were then added to determine a total score; nine constituting the highest possible score and three constituting the lowest possible score.</p> <p>The SLO is deemed met if at least 70% of the students scored a six or higher.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Grading Rubric</a></p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)  <b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met            Based on the rubric, the results were the following:</p> <p>By individual measure (Organization, Content Knowledge, Support/Examples):            ORGANIZATION: 13 (of 27) students scored the highest THREE ; 7 scored TWO; 7 scored the lowest ONE.            CONTENT KNOWLEDGE: 13 (of 27) students scored the highest THREE ; 11 students scored TWO; 3 students scored ONE.            SUPPORT/EXAMPLES: 11 (of 27) students scored the highest THREE; 11 students scored TWO; 5 students scored ONE.</p> <p>By total score:            9: Nine students scored a combined 9/9 (33.3% of the class);            8: Three students scored a combined 8/9 (11.1% of the class);            7: Four students scored a combined 7/9 (14.8% of the class);            6: Four students scored a combined 6/9 (22.2% of the class);            5: Two students scored a combined 5/9 (7.4% of the class);            4: Two students scored a combined 4/9 (7.4% of the class);            3: Three students scored a combined 3/9 (11.1% of the class);</p> <p>Success for the SLO for the course was if at least 70% of the students scored a 6 or higher. For this class, 20 students scored 6 or higher (74%), while 7 students scored less than 6 (26%).</p> <p>As such, the SLO can be deemed successful.</p> <p>Overall, the essay (and so the SLO) prompted something of</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>a bio-modal distribution: either the students knew the material and did well on the essay or did not know the material and did poorly on the essay; there were not too many students who did only middling. That said, the plurality of students (33%) did very well on the essay, and by far the majority of the students wrote good essays (74%) and so met the SLO goals.</p> <p>Breaking the results by each of the three measures, the students did fairly well on ORGANIZATION: as 13 students (48%) were graded 3/3, 7 students (26%) were graded 2/3, and 7 students (26%) were graded the lowest 1/3. Results for SUPPORT/EVIDENCE were slightly better: as 11 students (40.7%) were graded 3/3, 11 students (40.7%) were graded 2/3, and only 5 students (18.5%) were graded the lowest 1/3. Results for CONTENT KNOWLEDGE were the best for the three measures: 13 students (48%) were graded 3/3, 11 students (40.7%) were graded 2/3, and only 3 students (11%) were graded the lowest 1/3.</p> <p>That students did best in the CONTENT KNOWLEDGE measure is encouraging. That they did slightly worse on EXAMPLES/SUPPORT is also not surprising, as the course focuses on political science methods and methodology. The SLO in question is designed to measure specifically student understanding of Institutionalism (the study of the impact that institutions, such as the presidential versus parliamentary systems, can have on politics and political outcomes) as a major methodology in the discipline of political science. The overall focus of the course is to introduce students to various methodologies within the discipline of political science. As such, the focus of instruction in this regard is theoretical, and while examples are provided for illustration, the course is not focused specifically on different countries with presidential and parliamentary systems as a course in comparative politics (Political Science 2, for example) would be.</p> <p>The course overall had a 67.7% pass rate: of the 31 students in the course, 21 passed the class (9 students received an A</p>	

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
		<p>(29%), 8 students received a B (25.8%) and 4 students received a C (12.9%) and 10 students (32.3%) received failing grades (2 students received a D (6.4%) and 8 students received an F (25.8%)). Of the the 8 students who failed the class 4 did not take the final exam; as such, they are not reflected in the SLO scores. They received "Incomplete" grades: some might make up the final, most will probably not. For the 21 students who passed the class, SLO scores (obviously) are higher.</p> <p>There is clearly room for improvement for this SLO. I believe that of the 26% of students who failed to score at least a 6 on the essay, the majority were taking the course under the mistaken impression that it was the same material as Political Science 1 or that the course met the same General Education requirements as Political Science 1. In short, I do not believe that the majority of those 26% were political science majors. I should have made it clearer to students at the start of the course term that the course is designed for students who intend to get an AA in political science or transfer as political science majors, and as such is more difficult (and certainly more theoretical) than Political Science 1. In addition, I think the SLO itself could be restated to reflect more the methodological focus of the course: as it is currently, the SLO seems to me to be better fitted for a course on comparative politics rather than political methodology. (02/04/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Karl Striepe</p>	

## ECC: POLI 5: Ethnicity in the American Political Process

<i>Course SLOs</i>	<i>Assessment Method Description</i>	<i>Results</i>	<i>Actions</i>
<p><b>SLO #2 Race within Policymaking</b> - In a series of multiple choice questions students will critically analyze the major theories regarding race within the policymaking process.</p> <p><b>Course SLO Status:</b> Active</p> <p><b>Course SLO Assessment Cycle:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p><b>Input Date:</b> 11/08/2013</p>	<p><b>Exam/Test/Quiz</b> - Two assessments were used in the Fall 2015 semester. The first was multiple choice/matching and the second were a series of essay's given during the final exam.</p> <p><b>Standard and Target for Success:</b> Based on percentage: It is expected that 70% of students will score 70% or above on this SLO based on the essay rubric and multiple choice questions.</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Ethnicity Final.docx</a>  <a href="#">Final Exam Terms and Questions PS 5.docx</a> </p>	<p><b>Semester and Year Assessment Conducted:</b> 2015-16 (Fall 2015)</p> <p><b>Standard Met?</b> : Standard Met</p> <p>Based on the 32 respondents to the final exam 71% of the students scored 70% or better on the policy questions. (01/27/2016)</p> <p><b>Faculty Assessment Leader:</b> Eduardo Munoz</p> <p><b>Faculty Contributing to Assessment:</b> Van P. Chaney</p> <p><b>Related Documents:</b>  <a href="#">Ethnicity Final.docx</a>  <a href="#">Final Exam Terms and Questions PS 5.docx</a>  <a href="#">Essay Rubric POL SCI 005</a> </p>	<p><b>Action:</b> Strategies for teaching will center on expanded use of the policy process within the United States federal system. Additionally, a change of text with more information on race and policy development. (01/27/2016)</p> <p><b>Action Category:</b> Teaching Strategies</p>