Political Science 2013-2014 Baseline Assessment Report Review

IAC Review Group: Dr. Mable Moore, Dr. Sametria McFall-Dickerson, Dr. Keenya Mosley and Ms. Arisa Burgest

⌃ IAC Baseline Report Feedback Rubric

	4.000 Exemplary	3.000 Established	2.000 Developing	1.000 Undeveloped	N/A
Department or Program Mission weight: 0.000	• Focuses on program function and purpose • Clear, precise language • Two or three balanced sentences • Clear link to SSU mission	✓ • Identifies program function and purpose • Clear language • Less than a paragraph	• Some insight into function and purpose • May be somewhat vague or general • May be excessively wordy or lengthy • May be too short to distinguish the unique function/purpose of the dept. or program	• No mission present • Mission present but very vague, general, unclear, unfocused or does not address function and purpose	N/A
Comment:	Rewording suggested to shorten and present clear, precise focus on program function and purpose including more specific, descriptive language. Mission provided was more of a vision due to length.				
Student Learning Outcomes or Service Delivery Outcomes weight: 0.000	• Outcomes are clear and specific • Outcomes are measurable • Outcomes fully align with mission	• Outcomes are clear • Outcomes are measurable • Outcomes relate to mission	✓ • Outcomes listed but difficult to measure • Outcomes do not relate to mission • There are too few or too many outcomes	• No outcomes listed • Outcomes listed but unclear or vague	✓ N/A
Comment:	☐ Should read "Students need to be able to.." ☐ Provided listing maybe difficult to measure				
Opportunities to Achieve Outcomes weight: 0.000	• More than two opportunities per outcome AND some opportunities cover multiple outcomes • Specific opportunities are clearly identified	✓ • More than two opportunities identified per outcome • Opportunities are general but identified	• One or two opportunities are provided for each outcome • Opportunities are only vaguely identified	• No opportunities are identified for some/all outcomes • Only one opportunity is identified per outcome	✓ N/A
Comment:					
Assessment Tools weight: 0.000	• More than two tools for each outcome • At least two tools measure more than one outcome • Tools include both direct and indirect measures	• More than two tools for each outcome	✓ • One or two tools for each outcome • Tools include only direct or only indirect measures but not both	• No tools linked to outcomes or only one tool per outcome • Tools may be present but not linked to specific outcomes	✓ N/A
Comment:	Suggest annual two to three question survey to former students of how program learning contributed to policy process in their current employed positions				
Assessment Timeline and Information Sharing weight: 0.000	• Timeline includes two or more assessment times • Information is shared with two or more groups • Information is shared within the program AND across campus units	• Timeline is present and complete (identifies gathering, analyzing, reporting data and implementing changes) • Information is shared either internally or with other units	• Timeline is present but not complete • Sharing of information is not included	✓ • No timeline • No sharing of information • Information provided is vague or confusing	✓ N/A
Comment:					
Use of Results weight: 0.000	• Systematic use of assessment results for improvement is evident • Includes evaluation of improvements	• Systematic use of assessment results for improvement is evident	• Use of assessment results for improvement is present but not systematic • May be too vague or missing key components	✓ • No evidence of using assessment results for improvement	✓ N/A
Comment:					
Link to Budget/Resources weight: 0.000	• Clear systematic link between assessment results and budget/resource allocation is evident • Includes evaluation of the impact of allotted resources	• Clear systematic link between assessment results and budget/resource allocation is evident	• Link between assessment results and budget/ resource allocation is present but not systematic • May be too vague or missing key components	✓ • No evidence of a link between assessment results and budget/resource allocation	✓ N/A
Comment:					