Analysis Questions and Analysis Answers

For Academic Programs

Informed by your assessment activities related to student learning, what changes have you made in your degree program in the last three to five years? Describe the changes (e.g., curriculum revision, new courses, faculty development), the general results that prompted the changes (e.g., student performance on an assessment measure), and any impact on student learning that you might attribute to these changes.

Primary assessment of PhD Political Science occurs during comprehensive exams and research methods courses. PhD students are expected to describe the literature and synthesize the literature in comprehensive exams. These assessment measures were put into place due to inadequate description and synthesis of the literature in comprehensive exams. Subsequent assessment suggests that some students continue to struggle in these areas. The determination was made, based on assessment measures, that we were requiring the PhD students to test in too many subfields. We reduced the number of subfield comprehensive exams from three to two, which is more common in Political Science programs across the country. We will monitor these assessment measures to see if student performance improves. Generating research questions, hypotheses, mastery of statistical concepts, and ability to conduct original research are other areas of assessment of PhD students. The ability to generate research questions and hypotheses is assessed in PSC 521 (Research Design). Assessment data will be gathered and reported in the next assessment reporting cycle. Mastery of statistical concepts is measured in PSC 621 (Quantitative Analysis 2). Assessment data suggest that most students fall into the ‘exemplary’ and ‘adequate’ category. We assess ability to conduct original research based on committee assessment of dissertations. In the past two years since we instituted this assessment measures, all dissertations have been deemed exemplary or adequate.

Mission / Purpose

The Department of Political Science at the University of Alabama seeks to meet the highest standards of research, teaching, and service. In research, it examines important questions of political institutions, behavior, and thought. It strives for publication in outlets of the highest quality and visibility to achieve maximum exposure for its ideas and to have the greatest impact on peers in the academy and on policy makers. In teaching, the Department provides undergraduate students with timely information about the political world and instruction that enhances their skills as citizens and future leaders. At the graduate level, the Department is the only full-service program in political science in the state of Alabama, preparing students for successful careers in teaching, research, and government service. At all levels, the Department strives to enhance appreciation for the science of politics and to inspire the quest for truth and excellence in the study and practice of politics. The Department commits itself to serve the profession by contributing to its growth and improvement; to serve the institution through participation in its governing structures; and to serve the community by sharing ideas and helping to provide perspective on political issues for decision makers and citizens.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Research Literature

Students should demonstrate the ability to understand, evaluate, and synthesize the literature in their major and minor fields within Political Science.

Connected Documents
- Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
- Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures

M 1: Ability to describe the relevant literature

We will assess this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students correctly describe the relevant literature in the Political Science Ph.D. Comprehensive Exams. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:

No target established.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Revise Comprehensive Exam Process

We plan to reduce the number of political science sub-fields in which the PhD students are required to take comprehensive exams from three to two. This change stems from disappointing results in the quality of the students' answers to comprehensive exam questions and from our perception that fewer political science departments are requiring their graduate students to take comprehensive exams in three fields. We hope that by allowing our graduate students to focus their preparation for these exams on a smaller amount of material that they will produce better answers on their comprehensive exams.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):

Measure: Ability to describe the relevant literature | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of
Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will begin the process of implementing this change during the 2012-2013 academic year. However, the change may require approval from the Graduate School, and so may not be fully implemented this academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014

Responsible Person/Group: Richard Fording, Department Chair

M 2: Ability to synthesize the relevant literature
We will assess this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students successfully synthesize the relevant literature into a coherent essay for the Political Science Ph.D. Comprehensive Exams. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No target established.

SLO 2: Mastery of Methodological skills
The Department expects graduate students to develop methodological skills that will serve them in academic careers.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures

M 3: Probability and basic statistical concepts
We will assess this outcome through a course-embedded assessment in PSC 522 (Quantitative Analysis I) covering probability and basic statistical concepts. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No Target Established

M 4: Ability to Execute Statistical Analyses
We will assess this outcome through a course-embedded assessment of the students’ abilities to choose and execute an appropriate statistical analysis in a research project. This assessment will be done in PSC 621 (Quantitative Analysis II). Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

SLO 3: Ability to Conduct Independent Research
Students should demonstrate the ability to conduct independent, original research that meets the highest standards of quality within the profession.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures

M 5: Ability to generate hypotheses
We will assess this outcome in PSC 521 (Research Design) by evaluating the students’ abilities to generate hypotheses that are supported by previous research in the subject area. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No Target Established

M 6: Committee assessment of dissertation
We will assess this outcome through committee assessment of the dissertation project. To pass, a student must demonstrate familiarity with relevant theory, the ability to use appropriate methodological tools, the ability to create a defensible research design, and the development of an original contribution to the literature in his or her field. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target:
No Target Established

Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

OthOtcn 4: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 7: Strengths from Program Review
A list of the strengths of the department from the most recent program review (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: Opportunities from Program Review
A list of the opportunities for improvement from the most recent program review (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
M 9: List of recommendations
A list of recommendations (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 10: List of actions in response to the recommendation
A list of actions in response to the recommendation (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 11: Summary of impacts
A summary of the impacts of the actions (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 12: Student Evaluation of the program
We will assess this outcome using a survey of current graduate students aimed at eliciting their evaluations of the quality of the program. The percent of students choosing each response to the question will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target established.

OthOtcM 5: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 13: Number of Students in PhD Program
We will assess this outcome using the number of students in the graduate program for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

M 14: Comparison of the number of degree awarded to ACHE
We will assess this outcome by comparing the number of degrees awarded in the last three years with the ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Target:
We intend to maintain numbers of degrees awarded that meet or exceed the ACHE standard for PhD programs, which is 2.25 graduates per year.

OthOtcM 6: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 15: Success of Graduate Students in Employment
We will assess this outcome using data on the extent to which graduates of the program are able to find employment related to the discipline.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target:
No target established.

M 16: Student Evaluation of the value of the program
We will assess this outcome using a survey of current graduate students aimed at eliciting their evaluations of the value of the program in terms of helping them reach their career goals. The percent of students choosing each possible response to the question will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target established.

OthOtcM 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribution
The Department expects its faculty to contribute to the discipline through the publication of significant and visible research.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Publication Rates
The Department Chair monitors each faculty member's publications through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of refereed publications and average number per faculty for the past 3 years. Our general expectation is that total refereed publications, forthcoming and in print (including books, articles, and book chapters), will meet or exceed 1.5 contributions per faculty member per year. This is an increase from last year's expectation of 1.0 contribution per faculty member.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Our general expectation is that total refereed publications, forthcoming and in print (including books, articles, and book chapters), will meet or exceed 1.5 contributions per faculty member per year. This is an increase from last year's expectation of 1.0 contribution per faculty member.

M 18: Faculty Presentation Rates
The Department Chair monitors faculty research presentations at national and regional academic conferences through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of presentations and average number per faculty. The expectation is that total research presentations will meet or exceed one presentation per year per faculty.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
The Department Chair monitors faculty research presentations at national and regional academic conferences through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of presentations and average number per faculty.

### OthOtm 8: Department Outcome: Faculty Service
The Department expects its faculty, where appropriate, to serve the discipline of political science and the Alabama community.

**Related Measures**

**M 19: Faculty Service to the Community**
The Department Chair monitors each faculty member's service to the Alabama community, including interviews to members of the press and presentations to community groups, through the annual faculty activity reports. The number and types of service to the community will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

**M 20: Faculty Service to the discipline**
The Department Chair monitors service to the discipline, including reviewing journal articles and service to disciplinary organizations, through the annual faculty activity report. The number and types of service to the discipline will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

### OthOtm 9: Department Outcome: Provide adequate course availability
The department will provide adequate course availability to allow students to finish the Political Science and International Studies majors within 5 years.

**Related Measures**

**M 21: Time-to-Degree Data**
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not provide supporting documentation.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

**M 22: Student's perception of the availability of required courses**
This outcome was not intended to be assessed with regard to this degree program. No data was collected.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target established.

### OthOtm 10: Department Outcome: Competitiveness in Graduate Acceptance and Placement
The department expects its undergraduate majors and graduate students to be competitive with other students throughout the United States in terms of admission to graduate study or obtaining employment related to political science.

**Related Measures**

**M 23: Employment rate**
We will assess this outcome by using an exit survey to gather information on the proportion of MPA, MA, and PhD program graduates who have secured employment or job interviews in public administration, political science, or a related field.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**
No target established.

**M 24: Survey on the quality of the major**
This outcome was not intended to be assessed with regard to this degree program. No data was collected.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target established.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Revise Comprehensive Exam Process**
We plan to reduce the number of political science sub-fields in which the PhD students are required to take comprehensive exams from three to two. This changes stems from disappointing results in the quality of the students' answers to comprehensive exam questions and from our perception that fewer political science departments are requiring their graduate students to take comprehensive exams in three fields. We hope that by allowing our graduate students to focus their preparation for these exams on a smaller amount of material that they will produce better answers on their comprehensive exams.
Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Ability to describe the relevant literature | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will begin the process of implementing this change during the 2012-2013 academic year. However, the change may require approval from the Graduate School, and so may not be fully implemented this academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Fording, Department Chair
Mission / Purpose

The Department of Political Science at the University of Alabama seeks to meet the highest standards of research, teaching, and service. In research, it examines important questions of political institutions, behavior, and thought. It strives for publication in outlets of the highest quality and visibility to achieve maximum exposure for its ideas and to have the greatest impact on peers in the academy and on policy makers. In teaching, the Department provides undergraduate students with timely information about the political world and instruction that enhances their skills as citizens and future leaders. At the graduate level, the Department is the only full-service program in political science in the state of Alabama, preparing students for successful careers in teaching, research, and government service. At all levels, the Department strives to enhance appreciation for the science of politics and to inspire the quest for truth and excellence in the study and practice of politics. The Department commits itself to serve the profession by contributing to its growth and improvement; to serve the institution through participation in its governing structures; and to serve the community by sharing ideas and helping to provide perspective on political issues for decision makers and citizens.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Research Literature
Students should demonstrate the ability to understand, evaluate, and synthesize the literature in their major and minor fields within Political Science.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures

M 1: Ability to describe the relevant literature
We will assess this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students correctly describe the relevant literature in the Political Science Ph.D. Comprehensive Exams. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: We assessed this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students correctly described the relevant literature in each of their subject exams in the PhD-level Comprehensive Exams. Results: 4 exemplary, 2 adequate, and 1 inadequate. Interpretations and Conclusions: We did not establish a target for this measure, but are pleased that 4 students were exemplary. Two students performed at an adequate level, and one was inadequate. No changes planned.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Revise Comprehensive Exam Process
We plan to reduce the number of political science sub-fields in which the PhD students are required to take comprehensive exams from three to two. This changes stems from disappointing results in the quality of the students' answers to comprehensive exam questions and from our perception that fewer political science departments are requiring their graduate students to take comprehensive exams in three fields. We hope that by allowing our graduate students to focus their preparation for these exams on a smaller amount of material that they will produce better answers on their comprehensive exams.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Ability to describe the relevant literature | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will begin the process of implementing this change during the 2012-2013 academic year. However, the change may require approval from the Graduate School, and so may not be fully implemented this academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014

Responsible Person/Group: Richard Fording, Department Chair

M 2: Ability to synthesize the relevant literature
We will assess this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students successfully synthesize the relevant literature into a coherent essay for the Political Science Ph.D. Comprehensive Exams. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: We assessed this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students correctly synthesized...
the relevant literature in each of their subject exams in the PhD-level Comprehensive Exams. Results: 4 exemplary, 2 adequate, and 1 inadequate. Interpretations and Conclusions: We did not establish a target for this measure, but are pleased that 4 students were exemplary. Two students performed at an adequate level, and one was inadequate. No changes planned.

SLO 2: Mastery of Methodological skills
The Department expects graduate students to develop methodological skills that will serve them in academic careers.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures
M 3: Probability and basic statistical concepts
We will assess this outcome through a course-embedded assessment in PSC 522 (Quantitative Analysis I) covering probability and basic statistical concepts. Results from this assessment will be reported. Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: No Target Established

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: Instructor in PSC 522 used course-embedded assessments to evaluate students’ abilities in basic probability and statistics. Results from the five PhD students in the course: 0 exemplary, 5 adequate, 0 inadequate. Interpretations and Conclusions: Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are positive. All five of the students performed at an adequate level. No changes are planned.

M 4: Ability to Execute Statistical Analyses
We will assess this outcome through a course-embedded assessment of the students’ abilities to choose and execute an appropriate statistical analysis in a research project. This assessment will be done in PSC 621 (Quantitative Analysis II). Results from this assessment will be reported. Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target: No Target Established

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: Instructor in PSC 621 assessed this outcome through evaluation of students' success at describing, executing and evaluating a sophisticated statistical analysis of political science data. 5 PhD students were assessed for this measure. 2 performed exemplary, 2 adequate, and 1 inadequate. Interpretations and Conclusions: We did not establish a target for this assessment. The majority of students are adequate or exemplary. No changes are planned.

SLO 3: Ability to Conduct Independent Research
Students should demonstrate the ability to conduct independent, original research that meets the highest standards of quality within the profession.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures
M 5: Ability to generate hypotheses
We will assess this outcome in PSC 521 (Research Design) by evaluating the students’ abilities to generate hypotheses that are supported by previous research in the subject area. Results from this assessment will be reported. Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target: No Target Established

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: Instructor in PSC 521 used course-embedded assessments to evaluate students’ ability to derive research questions from existing research in the subject area. Results from the 5 PhD students in the course: 1 exemplary, 4 adequate, 0 inadequate Interpretations and Conclusions: Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are very satisfactory. All five of the students mastered this skill at an adequate or exemplary level. No changes are planned.

M 6: Committee assessment of dissertation
We will assess this outcome through committee assessment of the dissertation project. To pass, a student must demonstrate familiarity with relevant theory, the ability to use appropriate methodological tools, the ability to create a defensible research design, and the development of an original contribution to the literature in his or her field. Results from this assessment will be reported. Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

Target: No Target Established

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: We assessed this outcome through committee assessment of the dissertation project. To pass, a student must demonstrate familiarity with relevant theory, the ability to use appropriate methodological tools, the ability to create a defensible research design, and the development of an original contribution to the literature in his or her field. All six of the dissertation projects evaluated this year were adequate or exemplary. Interpretations and Conclusions: Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are very satisfactory. All six of the projects were adequate or exemplary. No changes are planned.
OthOtcm 4: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

Related Measures

M 7: Strengths from Program Review
A list of the strengths of the department from the most recent program review (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 8: Opportunities from Program Review
A list of the opportunities for improvement from the most recent program review (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 9: List of recommendations
A list of recommendations (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 10: List of actions in response to the recommendation
A list of actions in response to the recommendation (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 11: Summary of impacts
A summary of the impacts of the actions (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

M 12: Student Evaluation of the program
We will assess this outcome using a survey of current graduate students aimed at eliciting their evaluations of the quality of the program. The percent of students choosing each response to the question will be reported.
Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made
Target: No target established.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not provide supporting documentation.

OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

Related Measures

M 13: Number of Students in PhD Program
We will assess this outcome using the number of students in the graduate program for the last three fall semesters.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target: No target established.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: We assess this outcome using data on students enrolled from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. In Fall semester 2012 there were 39 students enrolled in the PhD Program in Political Science. In Fall semester 2011 there were also 39 students enrolled in the PhD Program in Political Science, compared with 40 in Fall 2010. Interpretations and Conclusions: Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, these numbers indicate a sustainable population of students in the program. No changes are planned.

M 14: Comparison of the number of degree awarded to ACHE
We will assess this outcome by comparing the number of degrees awarded in the last three years with the ACHE viability standards.
Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers
Target: We intend to maintain numbers of degrees awarded that meet or exceed the ACHE standard for PhD programs, which is 2.25 graduates per year.
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results Summary: We assess this outcome using data on degrees conferred from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The total number of Political Science majors graduating with Ph.D. degrees conferred in the 2011-12 academic year was 1, in the 2010-11 academic year was 4, and 3 during the 2009-10 academic year. Interpretations and Conclusions: The average number of degrees awarded over the past three years is 2.6 per year. This exceeds the ACHE viability standard.

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 15: Success of Graduate Students in Employment
We will assess this outcome using data on the extent to which graduates of the program are able to find employment related to the discipline.
Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas
Target: 
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
These data will be collected and reported in the 2013-14 academic year assessment report.

M 16: Student Evaluation of the value of the program
We will assess this outcome using a survey of current graduate students aimed at eliciting their evaluations of the value of the program in terms of helping them reach their career goals. The percent of students choosing each possible response to the question will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not provide supporting documentation.

OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribution
The Department expects its faculty to contribute to the discipline through the publication of significant and visible research.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Publication Rates
The Department Chair monitors each faculty member’s publications through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of refereed publications and average number per faculty for the past 3 years. Our general expectation is that total refereed publications, forthcoming and in print (including books, articles, and book chapters), will meet or exceed 1.5 contributions per faculty member per year. This is an increase from last year’s expectation of 1.0 contribution per faculty member.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Our general expectation is that total refereed publications, forthcoming and in print (including books, articles, and book chapters), will meet or exceed 1.5 contributions per faculty member per year. This is an increase from last year’s expectation of 1.0 contribution per faculty member.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results Summary: We assessed faculty publication rates by counting the number of publications (forthcoming and in print) listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. The 19 faculty had a total of 41 forthcoming and in print publications. Interpretations and Conclusions: The number of publications for the department exceeds the target for this assessment. No changes are planned.

M 18: Faculty Presentation Rates
The Department Chair monitors faculty research presentations at national and regional academic conferences through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of presentations and average number per faculty. The expectation is that total research presentations will meet or exceed one presentation per year per faculty.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
The Department Chair monitors faculty research presentations at national and regional academic conferences through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of presentations and average number per faculty.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Results Summary: We assessed faculty presentation rates by counting the number of research presentations listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. The faculty made 45 such research presentations. This is an average of 2.4 presentations per faculty member. Interpretations and Conclusions: The 2.4 presentations per faculty member exceeds the target for this assessment. No changes are planned.

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Faculty Service
The Department expects its faculty, where appropriate, to serve the discipline of political science and the Alabama community.

Related Measures

M 19: Faculty Service to the Community
The Department Chair monitors each faculty member’s service to the Alabama community, including interviews to members of the press and presentations to community groups, through the annual faculty activity reports. The number and types of service to the community will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary: We assessed faculty service to the community by counting the numbers of press contacts and presentations to community groups listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. Although press contacts were not systematically reported, department faculty members appeared in various media as experts at least 20 times. The largest number of such appearances were by Department Chair Dr. Richard Fording. Interpretations and Conclusions: Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results show that the Political Science Faculty is an valued resource for the local, state, and national media, and that appearances in the media promote the University’s scholarly image. No changes are planned.

M 20: Faculty Service to the discipline
The Department Chair monitors service to the discipline, including reviewing journal articles and service to
disciplinary organizations, through the annual faculty activity report. The number and types of service to the discipline
will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Results Summary: We assessed faculty service to the discipline by counting the numbers of scholarly
reviews listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2012 to March 31, 2013. Our faculty
reviewed 98 manuscripts during the period. Interpretations and Conclusions: Although we did not establish a
target for this assessment, the results show that the Political Science Faculty is active in service to the
discipline. No changes are planned.

**OthOtcn 9: Department Outcome: Provide adequate course availability**
The department will provide adequate course availability to allow students to finish the Political Science and International
Studies majors within 5 years.

**Related Measures**

**M 21: Time-to-Degree Data**
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not
provide supporting documentation.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data are not available at this time.

**M 22: Student's perception of the availability of required courses**
This outcome was not intended to be assessed with regard to this degree program. No data was collected.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data are not available at this time.

**OthOtcn 10: Department Outcome: Competitiveness in Graduate Acceptance and Placement**
The department expects its undergraduate majors and graduate students to be competitive with other students
throughout the United States in terms of admission to graduate study or obtaining employment related to political science.

**Related Measures**

**M 23: Employment rate**
We will assess this outcome by using an exit survey to gather information on the proportion of MPA, MA, and PhD
program graduates who have secured employment or job interviews in public administration, political science, or a
related field.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
These data will be collected and reported in the 2013-14 academic year assessment report.

**M 24: Survey on the quality of the major**
This outcome was not intended to be assessed with regard to this degree program. No data was collected.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data are not available at this time.

**Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)**

**Revise Comprehensive Exam Process**
We plan to reduce the number of political science sub-fields in which the PhD students are required to take
comprehensive exams from three to two. This changes stems from disappointing results in the quality of the students’
answers to comprehensive exam questions and from our perception that fewer political science departments are
requiring their graduate students to take comprehensive exams in three fields. We hope that by allowing our graduate
students to focus their preparation for these exams on a smaller amount of material that they will produce better
answers on their comprehensive exams.

**Established in Cycle:** 2011-2012

**Implementation Status:** Planned

**Priority:** High

**Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):**
Measure: Ability to describe the relevant literature | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Research Literature

**Implementation Description:** We will begin the process of implementing this change during the 2012-2013 academic
year. However, the change may require approval from the Graduate School, and so may not be fully implemented this academic year.

**Projected Completion Date:** 05/2014  
**Responsible Person/Group:** Richard Fording, Department Chair
Mission / Purpose

The Department of Political Science at the University of Alabama seeks to meet the highest standards of research, teaching, and service. In research, it examines important questions of political institutions, behavior, and thought. It strives for publication in outlets of the highest quality and visibility to achieve maximum exposure for its ideas and to have the greatest impact on peers in the academy and on policy makers. In teaching, the Department provides undergraduate students with timely information about the political world and instruction that enhances their skills as citizens and future leaders. At the graduate level, the Department is the only full-service program in political science in the state of Alabama, preparing students for successful careers in teaching, research, and government service. At all levels, the Department strives to enhance appreciation for the science of politics and to inspire the quest for truth and excellence in the study and practice of politics. The Department commits itself to serve the profession by contributing to its growth and improvement; to serve the institution through participation in its governing structures; and to serve the community by sharing ideas and helping to provide perspective on political issues for decision makers and citizens.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Mastery of Research Literature
Students should demonstrate the ability to understand, evaluate, and synthesize the literature in their major and minor fields within Political Science.

Related Measures

M 1: Ability to describe the relevant literature
We will assess this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students correctly describe the relevant literature in the Political Science Ph.D. Comprehensive Exams. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Results Summary
We assessed this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students correctly described the relevant literature in each of their subject exams in the PhD-level Comprehensive Exams. Results: 1 exemplary, 8 adequate, and 0 inadequate.

Interpretations and Conclusions
All nine of the students performed at an adequate or exemplary level. However, the fact that only one essay was judged to be exemplary is disappointing. One problem may be that the breadth and variety of material tested on the exams as they are currently configured may be unrealistic for students to master. We plan to change the nature of the PhD comprehensive exams to allow students to focus on the core literature in public administration. These changes are outlined in the action plan for this degree program.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):

Revise Comprehensive Exam Process
We plan to reduce the number of political science sub-fields in which the PhD students are required to take comprehensive exams from three to two. This changes stems from disappointing results in the quality of the students’ answers to comprehensive exam questions and from our perception that fewer political science departments are requiring their graduate students to take comprehensive exams in three fields. We hope that by allowing our graduate students to focus their preparation for these exams on a smaller amount of material that they will produce better answers on their comprehensive exams.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
Measure: Ability to describe the relevant literature | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will begin the process of implementing this change during the 2012-2013 academic year. However, the change may require approval from the Graduate School, and so may not be fully implemented this academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsible Person/Group: Richard Fording, Department Chair

M 2: Ability to synthesize the relevant literature
We will assess this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students successfully synthesize the relevant literature into a coherent essay for the Political Science Ph.D. Comprehensive Exams. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Results Summary
We assessed this outcome by evaluating the extent to which students adequately synthesized the relevant literature in each of their subject exams in the PhD-level Comprehensive Exams. Results: 1 exemplary, 8 adequate, and 0 inadequate.

Interpretations and Conclusions
All nine of the students performed at an adequate or exemplary level. However, the fact that only one essay was judged to be exemplary is disappointing. One problem may be that the breadth and variety of material tested on the exams as they are currently configured may be unrealistic for students to master. We plan to change the nature of the PhD comprehensive exams to allow students to focus on the core literature in public administration. These changes are outlined in the action plan for this degree program.

SLO 2: Mastery of Methodological skills
The Department expects graduate students to develop methodological skills that will serve them in academic careers.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures

M 3: Probability and basic statistical concepts
We will assess this outcome through a course-embedded assessment in PSC 522 (Quantitative Analysis I) covering probability and basic statistical concepts. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Results Summary
Instructor in PSC 522 used course-embedded assessments to evaluate students’ abilities in basic probability and statistics. Results from the five PhD students in the course: 1 exemplary, 4 adequate, 0 inadequate.

Interpretations and Conclusions
Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are positive. All five of the students performed at an adequate or exemplary level. No changes are planned.

M 4: Ability to Execute Statistical Analyses
We will assess this outcome through a course-embedded assessment of the students’ abilities to choose and execute an appropriate statistical analysis in a research project. This assessment will be done in PSC 621 (Quantitative Analysis II). Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Results Summary
Instructor in PSC 621 assessed this outcome through evaluation of students’ success at describing, executing and evaluating a sophisticated statistical analysis of political science data. Six of the 7 students were able to succeed at a high level.

Interpretations and Conclusions
Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are very satisfactory. Six of the seven students mastered these complicated skills at a high level. No changes are planned.

SLO 3: Ability to Conduct Independent Research
Students should demonstrate the ability to conduct independent, original research that meets the highest standards of quality within the profession.

Connected Documents
Curriculum Map II-Political Science PhD
Curriculum Maps I-Political Science Ph.D.

Related Measures

M 5: Ability to generate hypotheses
We will assess this outcome in PSC 521 (Research Design) by evaluating the students’ abilities to generate hypotheses that are supported by previous research in the subject area. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
No Target Established

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle

Results Summary
Instructor in PSC 521 used course-embedded assessments to evaluate students’ ability to derive research questions from existing research in the subject area. Results from the 5 PhD students in the course: 1 exemplary, 4 adequate, 0 inadequate.

Interpretations and Conclusions
Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are very satisfactory. All five of the
students mastered this skill at an adequate or exemplary level. No changes are planned.

**M 6: Committee assessment of dissertation**
We will assess this outcome through committee assessment of the dissertation project. To pass, a student must demonstrate familiarity with relevant theory, the ability to use appropriate methodological tools, the ability to create a defensible research design, and the development of an original contribution to the literature in his or her field. Results from this assessment will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Senior thesis or culminating major project

**Target:**
No Target Established

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

**Results Summary**
We assessed this outcome through committee assessment of the dissertation project. To pass, a student must demonstrate familiarity with relevant theory, the ability to use appropriate methodological tools, the ability to create a defensible research design, and the development of an original contribution to the literature in his or her field. All four of the dissertation projects evaluated this year were adequate or exemplary.

**Interpretations and Conclusions**
Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results are very satisfactory. All four of the projects were adequate or exemplary. No changes are planned.

**Other Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans**

**OthOtcm 4: Program Outcome: High Level of Recognized Quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality.

**Related Measures**

**M 7: Strengths from Program Review**
A list of the strengths of the department from the most recent program review (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 8: Opportunities from Program Review**
A list of the opportunities for improvement from the most recent program review (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 9: List of recommendations**
A list of recommendations (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 10: List of actions in response to the recommendation**
A list of actions in response to the recommendation (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 11: Summary of impacts**
A summary of the impacts of the actions (specific to the Doctorate in Political Science) will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**M 12: Student Evaluation of the program**
We will assess this outcome using a survey of current graduate students aimed at eliciting their evaluations of the quality of the program. The percent of students choosing each response to the question will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not provide supporting documentation.

**OthOtcm 5: Program Outcome: Sustain Optimal Level of Enrollment**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion.

**Related Measures**

**M 13: Number of Students in PhD Program**
We will assess this outcome using the number of students in the graduate program for the last three fall semesters.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Results Summary We assess this outcome using data on students enrolled from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. In fall semester 2011 there were 39 students enrolled in the Ph.D. Program in Political Science, compared with 40 in fall 2010 and 34 in fall 2009.

**Interpretations and Conclusions**
Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, these numbers indicate a sustainable population of students in the program. No changes are planned.
Comparison of the number of degree awarded to ACHE

We will assess this outcome by comparing the number of degrees awarded in the last three years with the ACHE viability standards.

Source of Evidence: Benchmarking of learning outcomes against peers

Target:
We intend to maintain numbers of degrees awarded that meet or exceed the ACHE standard for PhD programs, which is 2.25 graduates per year.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Results Summary We assess this outcome using data on degrees conferred from the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment. The total number of Political Science majors graduating with Ph.D. degrees conferred in the 2010-11 academic year was 4, compared with 3 during the 2009-10 academic year and 2 during the 2008-09 academic year.

Interpretations and Conclusions
The average number of degrees awarded over the past three years is 3 per year. This exceeds the ACHE viability standard.

OthOtcm 6: Program Outcome: Highly Valued by Program Graduates
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves.

Related Measures

M 15: Success of Graduate Students in Employment
We will assess this outcome using data on the extent to which graduates of the program are able to find employment related to the discipline.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This assessment relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood directed us not to provide findings for this academic year.

M 16: Student Evaluation of the value of the program
We will assess this outcome using a survey of current graduate students aimed at eliciting their evaluations of the value of the program in terms of helping them reach their career goals. The percent of students choosing each possible response to the question will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not provide supporting documentation.

OthOtcm 7: Department Outcome: Faculty Contribution
The Department expects its faculty to contribute to the discipline through the publication of significant and visible research.

Related Measures

M 17: Faculty Publication Rates
The Department Chair monitors each faculty member's publications through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of refereed publications and average number per faculty for the past 3 years. Our general expectation is that total refereed publications, forthcoming and in print (including books, articles, and book chapters), will meet or exceed 1.5 contributions per faculty member per year. This is an increase from last year's expectation of 1.0 contribution per faculty member.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Our general expectation is that total refereed publications, forthcoming and in print (including books, articles, and book chapters), will meet or exceed 1.5 contributions per faculty member per year. This is an increase from last year's expectation of 1.0 contribution per faculty member.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Results Summary We assessed faculty publication rates by counting the number of publications listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012. The faculty produced 18 journal articles, four books and seven book chapters during that period, for a total of 29 published contributions. This is an average of 1.61 contributions per faculty member. Interpretations and Conclusions The 1.61 contributions per faculty member exceeds the target for this assessment. No changes are planned.

M 18: Faculty Presentation Rates
The Department Chair monitors faculty research presentations at national and regional academic conferences through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of presentations and average number per faculty. The expectation is that total research presentations will meet or exceed one presentation per year per faculty.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
The Department Chair monitors faculty research presentations at national and regional academic conferences through the annual Faculty Activity Report and will report the total number of presentations and average number per faculty.
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Results Summary We assessed faculty presentation rates by counting the number of research presentations listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012. The faculty made 25 such research presentations. This is an average of 1.4 presentations per faculty member. Interpretations and Conclusions The 1.4 presentations per faculty member exceeds the target for this assessment. No changes are planned.

OthOtcm 8: Department Outcome: Faculty Service
The Department expects its faculty, where appropriate, to serve the discipline of political science and the Alabama community.

Related Measures

M 19: Faculty Service to the Community
The Department Chair monitors each faculty member's service to the Alabama community, including interviews to members of the press and presentations to community groups, through the annual faculty activity reports. The number and types of service to the community will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary We assessed faculty service to the community by counting the numbers of press contacts and presentations to community groups listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012. Although press contacts were not systematically reported, department faculty members appeared in various media as experts at least 25 times. The largest number of such appearances were by Department Chair Dr. Richard Fording. In addition one of our faculty members, Dr. Norman Baldwin, supervised more than 150 students working in disaster relief after the tornado of April 27, 2011. Interpretations and Conclusions Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results show that the Political Science Faculty is an valued resource for the local, state, and national media, and that appearances in the media promote the University's scholarly image. No changes are planned.

M 20: Faculty Service to the discipline
The Department Chair monitors service to the discipline, including reviewing journal articles and service to disciplinary organizations, through the annual faculty activity report. The number and types of service to the discipline will be reported.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Results Summary We assessed faculty service to the discipline by counting the numbers of scholarly reviews listed in Faculty Activity Reports for the period from April 1, 2011 to March 31, 2012. Our faculty reviewed 102 manuscripts during the period. Interpretations and Conclusions Although we did not establish a target for this assessment, the results show that the Political Science Faculty is active in service to the discipline. No changes are planned.

OthOtcm 9: Department Outcome: Provide adequate course availability
The department will provide adequate course availability to allow students to finish the Political Science and International Studies majors within 5 years.

Related Measures

M 21: Time-to-Degree Data
This outcome relates to one of the three common program outcomes for which Dr. Smallwood told us we need not provide supporting documentation.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data are not available at this time.

M 22: Student's perception of the availability of required courses
This outcome was not intended to be assessed with regard to this degree program. No data was collected.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target:
No target established.

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
Data are not available at this time.

OthOtcm 10: Department Outcome: Competitiveness in Graduate Acceptance and Placement
The department expects its undergraduate majors and graduate students to be competitive with other students throughout the United States in terms of admission to graduate study or obtaining employment related to political science.

Related Measures

M 23: Employment rate
We will assess this outcome by using an exit survey to gather information on the proportion of MPA, MA, and PhD
program graduates who have secured employment or job interviews in public administration, political science, or a related field.

Source of Evidence: Job placement data, esp. for career/tech areas

Target: No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**

Results Summary We assessed our achievement of this outcome through a survey students graduating from the Masters of Public Administration program during the 2011-2012 academic year. Of the eight students surveyed, two had been invited to interview for jobs in public administration, three had not, and three were not seeking jobs in public administration. Of the eight students surveyed, one had been offered a job in public administration, four had not been offered jobs in public administration, and three were not seeking jobs in public administration.

Interpretations and Conclusions These data are inconclusive. We would like to see higher numbers of our MPA graduates being offered interviews and jobs. However, the survey was conducted in April. It is possible that more of the students have now been offered jobs and interviews. Also, our placement of students is heavily dependent on economic conditions, which are difficult right now.

**M 24: Survey on the quality of the major**
This outcome was not intended to be assessed with regard to this degree program. No data was collected.

Source of Evidence: Student course evaluations on learning gains made

Target: No target established.

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle**
Data are not available at this time.

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

**Revise Comprehensive Exam Process**
We plan to reduce the number of political science sub-fields in which the PhD students are required to take comprehensive exams from three to two. This changes stems from disappointing results in the quality of the students’ answers to comprehensive exam questions and from our perception that fewer political science departments are requiring their graduate students to take comprehensive exams in three fields. We hope that by allowing our graduate students to focus their preparation for these exams on a smaller amount of material that they will produce better answers on their comprehensive exams.

Established in Cycle: 2011-2012
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):  
Measure: Ability to describe the relevant literature | Outcome/Objective: Mastery of Research Literature

Implementation Description: We will begin the process of implementing this change during the 2012-2013 academic year. However, the change may require approval from the Graduate School, and so may not be fully implemented this academic year.

Projected Completion Date: 05/2014
Responsibility Person/Group: Richard Fording, Department Chair
### Curriculum Maps #1 (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Describe, evaluate and synthesize literature.</td>
<td>Develop methodological skills</td>
<td>Develop ability to conduct high-quality research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 521</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 522</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Exams</td>
<td>X (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Required Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Curriculum Map II
(What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 1</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 3</th>
<th>Student Learning Outcome 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 521</td>
<td>Describe, evaluate and synthesize literature.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Course-embedded assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 2</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 522</td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop methodological skills</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course 3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSC 621</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop ability to conduct high-quality research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comprehensive Exams</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rubric to evaluate comprehensive exams answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Required Experience</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Committee evaluation of dissertation research</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>