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Executive Summary

The Department of Political Science supports the mission of the University in preparing students for professional success, democratic citizenship in a global environment, and a personal life of meaning and value. The mission of the department is to produce graduates who achieve the following seven learning outcome goals:

1. Identify key questions, fundamental concepts, and theoretical frameworks critical to an understanding of the political world;
2. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to American politics;
3. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to comparative politics;
4. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to the area of international relations;
5. Solve complex problems by demonstrating a mastery of substantive knowledge in the discipline’s main subfields;
6. Follow scientific and humanistic methods to design and carry out politically-oriented research projects by utilizing sufficiently advanced social research methods;
7. Communicate effectively political knowledge to general audiences as well as colleagues in the field.

The major’s core curriculum introduces students to each of the main subfields of political science at both the introductory and advanced levels, grounding them in the basic conceptual and theoretical frameworks of the discipline. Majors also receive training and acquire functional competency in elementary descriptive and inferential statistics. The program requires students to unite theory and practice through a politically-oriented internship. Finally, the major curriculum culminates in a senior thesis project and presentation, designed to integrate students’ specific learning in a subfield (or across subfields) with advanced political science research practices.

In addition to regular assessment in the classroom, we assess student learning at three specific points in students’ academic careers: First, through pre and post tests in introductory courses, second through measuring the breadth of majors’ knowledge in the junior year, and third through a senior research project.

The department developed an assessment plan this year and, in the spring term, began deploying its assessment tools. Based on but one section’s results, we currently rate student learning in the department with the “green light” designation. Future assessment should illuminate trends in the quality of student learning in the department.
Learning Goals

The Department of Political Science supports Millikin University’s three prepares of professional success, democratic citizenship in a global environment, and a personal life of meaning and value. The mission of the department is to produce graduates who can:

1. Identify key questions, fundamental concepts, and theoretical frameworks critical to an understanding of the political world;
2. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to American politics;
3. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to comparative politics;
4. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to the area of international relations;
5. Solve complex problems by demonstrating a mastery of substantive knowledge in the discipline’s main subfields;
6. Follow scientific and humanistic methods to design and carry out politically-oriented research projects by utilizing sufficiently advanced social research methods;
7. Communicate effectively political knowledge to general audiences as well as colleagues in the field.

The successful graduate of the Department of Political Science is one who has a broad understanding of the institutions and processes of government – at both the domestic and international levels – and the manners by which citizens participate in the policy process. The successful graduate of our department also has a broad understanding of the methods by which we examine political processes and an ability to design, carry out, and communicate the findings of original research.

Snapshot

The faculty of the Department of Political Science consists of three full-time faculty members – each of whom possesses professional experience relevant to the discipline. The faculty covers the discipline’s major subfields: international relations, comparative politics, and American politics. While most classes are taught by the department’s tenured and tenure-track faculty, one adjunct faculty member, with extensive – and relevant – career experience also contributes to the department’s course offerings. Additionally, a faculty member from Philosophy makes regular contributions to the department’s offerings in political philosophy and law. All of the department’s faculty members contribute courses through the university’s US and Global Studies requirements (IN 250 and IN 350).

In the past year, the department adopted a new core curriculum. Political science majors complete 23 credits of a common core (including a required internship experience and senior thesis defended before the department’s faculty) plus elective hours, for a total of 41 credit hours. The department also adopted an initial assessment plan for the major.
This report reflects the beginnings of the department’s assessment efforts. Those efforts will be expanded over time as components of the major’s new curriculum are offered. Additionally, the department sought and was successful in establishing an affiliation between Millikin University and The Washington Center for Internships and Academic Seminars. This new relationship significantly broadens the number of potential internship experiences for the department’s majors.

The department had 42 majors this past year and graduated 13. They generally go on to a variety of vocations and experiences. A significant percentage has an interest in law, and department faculty members sit on the university’s Pre-Law Committee. Other students have continued their education in graduate programs, including those in political science, public administration, and international relations. Still others have gone on to become practitioners of the political arts in a variety of public service positions. Thus, the department’s curriculum provides the foundation for a variety of politically-relevant careers.

The Learning Story

“Uniting Theory and Practice” continues to guide the development and execution of the department’s major curriculum. With this principle in mind, the department recently revised its curriculum to enhance the preparation upon which majors can build their advanced coursework; through the curriculum’s revision the department’s faculty also reiterated the importance of discipline-appropriate research skills. The revision of the curriculum also stressed the importance of professional preparation through the inclusion of a senior thesis research project. The curriculum moves students toward gaining the necessary skills to be successful in their professional lives: solid written and oral communication skills as well as critical and analytical thinking skills. The major’s curriculum moves them toward successful completion of the degree and meeting the department’s learning goals. (See curriculum map in Appendix I).

In the first year of the major curriculum, students set about the task of acquiring basic knowledge in the various subfields of the discipline. The first course majors take, Introduction to Politics (PO 100), provides students with a foundation in the discipline’s basic concepts and theoretical frameworks. These basic concepts and theoretical frameworks inform majors’ other introductory work in PO 105 (The American Political System) and PO 221 (Introduction to International Relations) and form the basis upon which majors’ more advanced work is built.

In their second year, students acquire basic research skills through either the department’s Methods of Political Research (PO 280) course or a sequence of courses from the Department of Mathematics. This requirement gives students the opportunity to examine – and learn about – the various humanistic and scientific methods political scientists employ to analyze political activity. Additionally, majors take a course in macroeconomics. These courses provide majors with the essential foundational experiences we expect our majors to employ in their upper-level courses and senior-year thesis.

In the second and third years, political science majors broaden their knowledge through electives. Students’ particular interests guide their choice of electives, and through these intensive elective studies, each major develops a line of inquiry leading to a senior thesis project. Additionally, during this time, majors complete an internship
experience (PO 371) and professional development course (PO 410), adding practical political and vocational knowledge to the resources with which they can complete their major requirements.

The political science curriculum requires majors to integrate basic and enhanced knowledge of political phenomena, research skills, and the practical experiences gained over the course of the previous three years into a senior thesis project (PO 450). Majors work with faculty members to develop research proposals which they then execute in written form and defend before the department’s faculty at the conclusion of their senior year.

Just as the curriculum assists the department in achieving its goals for student learning outcomes and helps students to actualize their plans of study, so too does the advising process. Advising in the department facilitates and integrates reasoned choices that promote the student’s growth as a person and as a major. In order to realize this mission, we try to help students:

1. Develop plans of study for successfully achieving their degree and career goals,
2. Select courses each semester to progress toward fulfilling their plans of study,
3. Use the resources and services on campus to assist in fulfilling their plans of study, and
4. Graduate in a timely manner.

At least once a semester, students meet in person with their academic advisors to discuss progress toward fulfilling the plan of study.

Assessment Methods

The department’s faculty believes that, while we assess student learning in each of our classes and in many different ways throughout our majors’ matriculation through the curriculum, there are key times when we should assess our majors’ progress: during the assimilation of the basic knowledge from the discipline’s subfields and as they complete a senior thesis project.

In a discipline such as ours, it is critical that majors have a solid foundation on which to build their later studies. We have designed the major’s introductory sequence with that principle in mind and are committed to assessing student learning in these courses in order to insure that students attain proficiency in the discipline’s central concepts, characteristics, and theories. Successful completion of – and learning in – the introductory courses contributes directly to students’ ability to fulfill Learning Goals 1 – 5.

The senior thesis project provides an opportunity for us to assess how effectively our students have mastered comprehensive knowledge of the discipline (Learning Goals 1 – 5). Students in PO 450 work closely with faculty members to develop a proposal – a process in which students report on their progress, try out various formulations of a central thesis or idea for exploration, find and locate sources to be used, etc. The faculty assesses each proposal on the basis of the rubric for the Thesis Proposal (see Appendix III). Students complete a substantial written essay – generally between 25-30 pages. This essay forms the basis for majors’ PO 450 grade, and we assess the quality of the written work by employment of the rubric for the Written Thesis (see Appendix III) in conjunction with our own intuitive judgments regarding the quality of the writing, the
difficulty of the subject matter, etc. (Learning Goals 5 and 6). Each student then makes a
formal presentation of their senior thesis to political science majors and faculty members,
and we assess the quality of the oral presentation by employing the rubric for the Oral
Presentation (see Appendix III) (Learning Goal 7)

Assessment Data

In the department of political science, assessment of goals 1 – 4 involves the
administration of pre and post tests in introductory classes (See Appendix II for samples)
to gauge student learning over the course of the semester. The department proceeded
with initial efforts at collecting assessment data in the spring term of 2008. That process
involved 11 students in one section of the introductory American politics course; the
department expects to expand its data collection efforts significantly in the next academic
year. The instructor of the introductory American politics class administered pre and post
tests to students from which the data presented below are derived.

Answering 85 to 100 percent of the instrument’s questions correctly qualifies a
student for a rating of “excellent”; 64 to 84 percent correct a rating of “adequate;” and
below 63 percent correct a rating of “nominal.” The department employed the following
assessment criteria to evaluate student progress in achieving learning goals:

“Green light” (an acceptable level or clearly heading in the right direction and not
requiring any immediate change in course of action): 80% or more of the students
ranked “adequate” or “excellent”; “Yellow light” (not an acceptable level; either improving, but not as
desired or declining slightly. Strategies and approaches should be reviewed and
appropriate adjustments taken to reach an acceptable level or desired rate of
improvement): 60% to 80% of the students ranked “adequate” or “excellent”; and
“Red light” (our current status or direction of change is unacceptable. Immediate,
high priority actions should be taken to address this area): fewer than 60% of the
students ranked “adequate” or “excellent”.

Table 1

Learning Goal 2: Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central
to American politics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Politics</th>
<th>Pre-Test</th>
<th>Post-Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean Correct Answers</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>10.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominal (0 – 63 % Correct)</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate (64 – 84% Correct)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent (85 – 100% Correct)</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rating for Goal 2: Green Light
Analysis of Assessment Results

As can be seen in the table, a significant portion of students improved their performance on the instrument measuring student learning in the spring 2008 American politics course. Every student scored higher on the post test, and improvement ranged from 1 to 8 correct answers. Indeed, a few students demonstrated striking improvement by doubling – and in one case, tripling – the number of correct answers.

While this is an encouraging start for assessment of student learning in the department of political science, the current data cannot provide a basis on which to discern a trend in the quality of student learning. One section’s results do not a trend make. As the department continues the process of collecting data over the next year or two, a trend will likely emerge. Additionally, the small number of students sampled makes discerning a trend difficult. Over, time, data from multiple sections of the department’s introductory courses should provide a much better picture of the quality of student learning in political science courses.

Given that the department has only recently adopted an assessment plan and begun collecting data, we cannot make any year-to-year comparisons at this time. We will report those trends as assessment data accumulates over time.

Improvement Plans

The department of political science remains committed to providing a quality learning experience for its majors and those students who take its courses in the MPSL, but we cannot yet draw conclusions from assessment data. The department will closely monitor its teaching practices, collect assessment data, and – as the collection of more extensive data indicates – address areas in need of improvement.
Appendix I: Curriculum Map for Political Science

University Goals
1. Professional success
2. Democratic citizenship in a global environment
3. A personal life of meaning and value

Department Goals
1. Identify key questions, fundamental concepts, and theoretical frameworks critical to an understanding of the political world;
2. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to American politics;
3. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to comparative politics;
4. Identify the fundamental concepts, characteristics, and theories central to the area of international relations;
5. Solve complex problems by demonstrating a mastery of substantive knowledge in the discipline’s main subfields;
6. Follow scientific and humanistic methods to design and carry out politically-oriented research projects by utilizing sufficiently advanced social research methods;
7. Communicate effectively political knowledge to general audiences as well as colleagues in the field.

Curriculum Map of Core PO Courses’ Applications to Department Learning Goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Goals</th>
<th>Core PO Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Identify Key Concepts, Frameworks, and Theories in the Political World</td>
<td>PO 100 PO 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Identify Key Concepts, Frameworks, and Theories in the American system</td>
<td>PO 221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Identify Key Concepts, Frameworks, and Theories in Comparative Politics</td>
<td>PO 280 PO 371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Identify Key Concepts, Frameworks, and Theories in International Relations</td>
<td>PO 410 PO 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Solve Problems by Integrating Substantive Knowledge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Follow Scientific/Humanistic Methods to Carry Out Research</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Communicate Political Knowledge Effectively</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix II: Pre- and Post-Tests for Introductory Political Science Courses

PO 100: Introduction to Politics

1. What is politics?
   a. The art of argumentation and debate
   b. The process by which groups of people make decisions
   c. Competition between government actors
   d. Duplicitous interactions that result in a corrupt society

2. What is power?
   a. The ability to use force
   b. The possession of significant capabilities, e.g., military and economic resources
   c. The ability to achieve one’s goals, to influence others to get the outcome one wants
   d. Status, or position in society

3. A state is:
   a. A legal entity that possesses territory, sovereignty and a government
   b. A culturally cohesive community that shares political aspirations
   c. The most important actor in international relations
   d. The highest form of political organization

4. Sovereignty is:
   a. A king or queen
   b. The ability to act independently from external actors or internal rivals
   c. International law, as laid out by the UN security council
   d. Only guaranteed when a state has a written constitution

5. Capitalism advocates:
   a. The limited provision of social goods via the state
   b. Encourages individual responsibility
   c. A laissez-faire approach to market management
   d. All of the above

6. Political liberalism is the foundation of western democracy.  T  F

7. Political attitudes (left, center, right) are particular and context specific.  T  F

8. Communism emphasizes equality of condition vs. equality of opportunity.  T  F

9. Authoritarianism concentrates power in the hands of the few.  T  F

10. Unitary forms of government can often be more efficient than those characterized by checks and balances.  T  F
1. If a bill passes Congress with MORE than 10 days remaining in the session, the president may
   A. sign either the House or the Senate version of the bill.
   B. exercise the pocket veto.
   C. ignore the bill, and it will still become law.
   D. do either A or C.

2. Which of the following determines whether a law is constitutional?
   A. The President
   B. The Congress
   C. The Supreme Court
   D. The Media

3. The Three-Fifths Compromise provided that
   A. states would have three-fifths of the power of the national government.
   B. each slave counted as three-fifths of a person for purposes of representation and taxation.
   C. three-fifths of all slaves had to be freed by the time the U.S. Constitution was ratified.
   D. three-fifths of the states needed to approve of the Constitution before it went into effect.

4. Which of the following BEST describes the relationship between states and the national government?
   A. Federal
   B. Confederal
   C. Limited
   D. Unitary

5. When members of Congress decide how to cast a vote, which of the following do they use as a cue for how to vote?
   A. Party leaders.
   B. Committee recommendations.
   C. Constituent preferences.
   D. All of the above are voting cues for members of Congress.

6. A political action committee is
   A. an organization formed to raise and to spend money in political campaigns.
   B. an interest group seeking to serve the public interest without material reward.
   C. a government organization created to lobby for agency budgets and programs.
   D. an interest group’s direct action group willing to picket in order to dramatize an issue.
7. Shifts by large numbers of voters in their support from one party to another that endure over time are better known as
   A. dealignments.
   B. reapportionments.
   C. realignments.
   D. redistrictings.

8. A single-member, plurality district electoral system
   A. benefits parties that finish second in individual races.
   B. encourages the emergence of a two-party system.
   C. gives each party legislative seats in proportion to the number of votes it receives.
   D. means that legislators are elected by the public at large.

9. The situation of one political party controlling the White House while the other controls the Congress is better known as
   A. divided government.
   B. an ineffective government.
   C. weak-party government.
   D. a coalition government.

10. The processes laid out in the U.S. Constitution tend to favor
    A. the Congress.
    B. the status quo.
    C. those who want change.
    D. the president.

11. Voter turnout is HIGHEST among which of the following?
    A. People with strong party identifications.
    B. People with weak party identifications.
    C. People with no party identification – independents.
    D. None of the above.  Strength of partisanship is not related to turnout.

12. Which of the following is an example of *de facto* segregation?
    A. Laws designed to limit minority participation in the political process.
    B. More restrictive immigration laws.
    C. White flight to the suburbs to avoid the integration of city schools.
    D. Government policies that place burdens on minority-owned businesses.

13. The MAIN provision of the Connecticut (or Great) Compromise at the Constitutional Convention
    A. created a bicameral legislature which resolved the issue of representation.
    B. established the Electoral College which resolved the dispute over who should elect the president.
    C. guaranteed that Connecticut would always negotiate government conflicts.
    D. established a federal system which resolved the power dispute between states and the national government..

14. Interest groups find it EASIEST to achieve their policy goals when they
A. cut all ties to the government.
B. fight for broad policy change.
C. address controversial issues.
D. support the *status quo*.

15. Under the provisions of the Pendleton Act of 1883, passed after the assassination of President Garfield, government employees would be
   A. made more accountable to the public by the political patronage system.
   B. hired and promoted mainly on the basis of merit.
   C. more responsive to the politicians who appointed them.
   D. used to maintain political machines.

16. “Sometimes politics and government seem so complicated that a person like me can’t really understand what’s going on.”
   A. Agree
   B. Disagree
   C. Neither agree nor disagree
   D. Don’t know, depends, not sure, can’t say, refuse to say

**PO 221: Introduction to International Relations**

1. International relations is the study of:
   a. Diplomatic, military and political relations between states
   b. The global economy
   c. Peoples, groups and organizations that act internationally
   d. All of the above

2. What is power?
   a. The ability to use force
   b. The possession of significant capabilities, e.g., military and economic resources
   c. The ability to achieve one’s goals, to influence others, and to get the outcome one wants
   d. Status, or position in society

3. A state is:
   a. A legal entity that possesses territory, sovereignty and a government
   b. A culturally cohesive community that shares political aspirations
   c. The most important actor in international relations
   d. The highest form of political organization

4. Sovereignty is:
   a. A king or queen
   b. The ability to act independently from external actors or internal rivals
   c. International law, as laid out by the UN security council
   d. Only guaranteed when a state has a written constitution

5. The security dilemma states that:
   a. No state will ever achieve absolute security
b. All states need security, but rarely invest enough in it
c. When states attempt to increase their security, they make others feel less secure
d. Without a strong state like the U.S., there will be insecurity in the international system

6. Realism is a “state centric” theory.    T     F
7. Economic liberalism has largely defined the existing international economic environment.    T     F
8. Dependency theory argues that the core, or wealthy industrialized states, imposes a dependent relationship upon the less developed world, creating a structural imbalance.    T     F
9. Benedict Anderson famously referred to nations as “imagined communities”.    T     F
10. There is no objective way to determine the “justness” of war; it depends upon the perspective of the individual participants.    T     F
Appendix III: Evaluation Rubrics for Senior Thesis

**Thesis Proposal:** Assessed by Department Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Sources (Goals 1 – 4)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[6 points] Reflects a high level of integration of multiple sources of information and knowledge acquired in political science courses.</td>
<td>[4 points] Demonstrates only occasional integration of information from multiple sources and political science coursework.</td>
<td>[2 points] Demonstrates little or no integration of information from multiple sources.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method (Goal 5)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[5 points] Presents a clear research design, including discussion of hypotheses to be tested, pertinent data, as well as methods skills acquired in the program and relevant to the project’s execution.</td>
<td>[3 points] Research design and hypotheses present, but proposal falls short in tying in pertinent data and relevant methods.</td>
<td>[1 point] No clear design or hypotheses, few – if any – connections to relevant data and methods. Proposal suggests methods incorrect for research question.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity (Goal 7)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[3 points] Very few grammatical errors, if any. Sentences clearly express ideas, and paragraphs are coherent wholes. Overall structure is logical and coherent and contributes to overall strength of proposal.</td>
<td>[1 points] Common errors in usage and sentence structure. Sentences and paragraphs may run too long or too short. Variation in coherence of paragraphs and clarity of logic.</td>
<td>[0 points] Many spelling and grammar errors, use of incomplete sentences, inadequate proof reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Written Thesis:** Assessed by Department Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Literature Review (Goal 1)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[6 points] Presents a well-organized review of pertinent political science literature. Demonstrates clearly how previous findings relate to the project at hand. Builds toward a clear hypothesis.</td>
<td>[4 points] Review of pertinent political science literature present; however, connections to current project tenuous or – in a few cases – absent.</td>
<td>[2 points] Superficial to no connection of project to pertinent political science literature.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis (Goal 5)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[5 points] Makes clear connections between findings in the data and established knowledge in the field. Demonstrates superior mastery of the material. Suggests – and explores – areas for possible future research.</td>
<td>[3 points] Connections between findings and established knowledge present, but analysis fails to make some of them clearly. Demonstrates ample mastery of the material. Only suggests – without much elaboration – future avenues of research.</td>
<td>[1 point] Few to no connections between established knowledge in the field and the project’s findings. Questionable mastery of the material.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clarity (Goal 7)</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[3 points] Very few grammatical errors, if any. Sentences clearly express ideas, and paragraphs are coherent wholes. Overall structure is logical and coherent and contributes to overall strength of proposal.</td>
<td>[1 points] Common errors in usage and sentence structure. Sentences and paragraphs may run too long or too short. Variation in coherence of paragraphs and clarity of logic.</td>
<td>[0 points] Many spelling and grammar errors, use of incomplete sentences, inadequate proof reading.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Oral Presentation:** Assessed by Department Faculty.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Adequate</th>
<th>Nominal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td>[5 points]</td>
<td>[3 points]</td>
<td>[1 point]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation communicates the work’s central idea in a clear organizational pattern.</td>
<td>Exhibits some connections between major points and the work’s central idea but may be disorganized at points.</td>
<td>Confused, jumbled, disorganized presentation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td>[5 points]</td>
<td>[3 points]</td>
<td>[1 point]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clear, confident presentation. Student fields audience questions in manner that illustrates command of the topic.</td>
<td>A good presentation but lacking somewhat in clarity or confidence.</td>
<td>An awkward, weak presentation but a presentation made nevertheless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td>[4 points]</td>
<td>[2 points]</td>
<td>[1 point]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student uses notes effectively, meets time constraints, exhibits directness and competence, and avoids mannerisms that might otherwise detract from presentation.</td>
<td>Student makes occasional eye contact, relies occasionally on notes, and speaks intelligibly.</td>
<td>Student overly tied to notes, does not make eye contact with audience, speaks unintelligibly.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Millikin University
## Department of Political Science
### Student Learning Evaluation

#### Thesis Proposal
- **Student name:**
- **Date of evaluation:**
- **Evaluation by:** Department Faculty
- **Faculty name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Excellent Description</th>
<th>Adequate Description</th>
<th>Nominal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge Sources (Goals 1 – 4)</td>
<td>Reflects a high level of integration of multiple sources of information and knowledge acquired in political science courses.</td>
<td>Demonstrates only occasional integration of information from multiple sources and political science coursework.</td>
<td>Demonstrates little or no integration of information from multiple sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method (Goal 5)</td>
<td>Presents a clear research design, including discussion of hypotheses to be tested, pertinent data, as well as methods skills acquired in the program and relevant to the project’s execution.</td>
<td>Research design and hypotheses present, but proposal falls short in tying in pertinent data and relevant methods.</td>
<td>No clear design or hypotheses, few – if any – connections to relevant data and methods. Proposal suggests methods incorrect for research question.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity (Goal 7)</td>
<td>Very few grammatical errors, if any. Sentences clearly express ideas, and paragraphs are coherent wholes. Overall structure is logical and coherent and contributes to overall strength of proposal.</td>
<td>Common errors in usage and sentence structure. Sentences and paragraphs may run too long or too short. Variation in coherence of paragraphs and clarity of logic.</td>
<td>Many spelling and grammar errors, use of incomplete sentences, inadequate proof reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points (14 max.)**
# Millikin University
## Department of Political Science
### Student Learning Evaluation

## Written Thesis

**Student name:**
**Date of evaluation:**
**Evaluation by:** Department Faculty

**Faculty name:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Student Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Literature Review</strong> (Goal 1)</td>
<td>[6 points] Presents a well-organized review of pertinent political science literature. Demonstrates clearly how previous findings relate to the project at hand. Builds toward a clear hypothesis.</td>
<td>[4 points] Review of pertinent political science literature present; however, connections to current project tenuous or – in a few cases – absent. [2 points] Superficial to no connection of project to pertinent political science literature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis (Goal 5)</td>
<td>[5 points] Makes clear connections between findings in the data and established knowledge in the field. Demonstrates superior mastery of the material. Suggests – and explores – areas for possible future research.</td>
<td>[3 points] Connections between findings and established knowledge present, but analysis fails to make some of them clearly. Demonstrates ample mastery of the material. Only suggests – without much elaboration – future avenues of research. [1 point] Few to no connections between established knowledge in the field and the project’s findings. Questionable mastery of the material.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarity (Goal 7)</td>
<td>[3 points] Very few grammatical errors, if any. Sentences clearly express ideas, and paragraphs are coherent wholes. Overall structure is logical and coherent and contributes to overall strength of proposal.</td>
<td>[1 points] Common errors in usage and sentence structure. Sentences and paragraphs may run too long or too short. Varied coherence of paragraphs and clarity of logic. [0 points] Many spelling and grammar errors, use of incomplete sentences, inadequate proof reading.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Points</strong> (14 max.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oral Presentation of Thesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Criteria</th>
<th>Student Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organization</strong></td>
<td><strong>[5 points]</strong> Presentation communicates the work’s central idea in a clear organizational pattern</td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[3 points]</strong> Exhibits some connections between major points and the work’s central idea but may be disorganized at points.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[1 point]</strong> Confused, jumbled, disorganized presentation.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Delivery</strong></td>
<td><strong>[5 points]</strong> Clear, confident presentation. Student fields audience questions in manner that illustrates command of the topic.</td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[3 points]</strong> A good presentation but lacking somewhat in clarity or confidence.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[1 point]</strong> An awkward, weak presentation but a presentation made nevertheless.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical</strong></td>
<td><strong>[4 points]</strong> Student uses notes effectively, meets time constraints, exhibits directness and competence, and avoids mannerisms that might otherwise detract from presentation.</td>
<td><strong>Excellent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[2 points]</strong> Student makes occasional eye contact, relies occasionally on notes, and speaks intelligibly.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>[1 point]</strong> Student overly tied to notes, does not make eye contact with audience, speaks unintelligibly</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Points (14 Max.)**