



**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PLANNING AND REVIEW  
ANNUAL PROGRAM REPORT**

College	CLASS
Department	Political Science (POSC)
Program Unit	
Reporting for Academic Year	2015-2016
Department Chair	Kim Geron
Date Submitted	9/14/2016

**1. SELF-STUDY (about 1 page)**

**A. Five-year Review Planning Goals**

- 1. More cohesion in course offerings in order to better package our major options.**
- 2. Determine department projects that will be most useful to our students' education such as applied politics.**
- 3. We will explore partnerships with other CSUEB departments to develop synergies and enhance our limited resources. Also build relationships with local community college Political Science departments and their students**
- 4. Rebrand ourselves as a department offering a major that provides education and skills that make our students competitive in today's job market. Two things to accomplish this goal: a. create an Internship Director to focus on placing students in internships (50% of all majors) b. create a database of jobs with contact names to help facilitate acquisition of internships and potential future employment for our majors.**

**B. Five-year Review Planning Goals Progress as of end of Spring 2016**

Progress on Goal Attainment:

1. We have revised our course curriculum in preparation for semester conversion and simplified the requirements to complete the POSC major. Both the traditional option and the two other options will have same the same number of units (39) to complete the major. This we plan to promote as part of semester conversion.
2. Due to limited human resources we have not made progress on #2. We will reassess in 2016-17 what we can develop in the area of department projects.
3. We jointly supported a Mock Trial with CJ Dept. in 2016. WE plan to build relationships with Chabot and Alameda CCs in 16-17 to enhance relationships and increase POSC majors which have declined recently.
4. Due to limited human resources we have not made progress on this goal in 15-16, we plan to make headway in increasing the number of internships and building a database of locations and contacts. We also hope to assess and initiate building ties community partnerships in

conjunction with our 16-17 Affinity Hire in Race and Ethnic Politics/Civic Engagement.

### **C. Program Changes and Needs**

Over the past year there have not been changes in our program. We were asked to complete a Dept. assessment/plan to address a decline in majors beginning in Fall 2015 which we developed and will use to rebuild the major's image and increase the numbers of majors. Other ideas such as to work with Extended Education to develop a joint POSC/Paralegal degree and certification were not supported by Ext. Educ. We continue to use both in-class, hybrid and online formats to provide options for our majors and other CSUEB students to take POSC courses and learn about politics, law, public policy. We worked on revised our POSC major in preparation for Semester Conversion including training on inputting into the Curriculum system and creating proposals for GE courses of which the Dept. has a significant number in both areas of C4 and D4.

Resource Needs: During 15-16 one faculty was on a one year professional leave, one faculty member completed his FERP in Spring 2016, and another faculty colleague is starting FERP in F16. The Dept. Chair did not teach classes due to other campus service and union responsibilities. Thus we only had 3 FT tenure track faculty teaching in 15-16 and to provide advising and service to our majors.

We have hired two new faculty in 15-16 (American Political Institutions) and 16-17 (Race and Ethnic Politics/Civic Engagement). So our current TT faculty are 5 + 1 FERP. We only have 1 TT faculty to oversee/teach the entire fields of International Relations and Comparative Politics and our Pre-Law faculty member is beginning FERP in Fall 2016 so both need to be addressed in the coming year/s.

## **2. SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT (about 1 page)**

### **A. Program Student Learning Outcomes**

#### Summary of Assessment: Program Student Learning Outcomes

Students graduating with A B.A. in Political Science from CSU East Bay will be able to:

##### **SLO 1**

POSC majors will develop and articulate an understanding of the theory and practice of political systems and gain practical experience in politics, public policy, and civic engagement in a democracy.

SLO1a: understanding the theory and practice of political systems

SLO1b: involvement in practical experience/civic engagement

##### **SLO 2**

POSC majors will demonstrate through oral and written competency, an understanding of the theories, concepts, empirical content, and research agendas of the fields of political science with advanced understanding in the selected option and the use of critical thinking.

SLO2a: understanding theories and concepts in political science and applying them to new material or situations

SLO2b: understanding quantitative and qualitative empirical content

SLO 2c: understanding research agendas

##### **SLO 3**

POSC majors will demonstrate an understanding of political institutions, processes, and culture in the U.S. and around the world including the economic, ideological, ethnic and cultural groups and movements that engage the political process.

SLO 3a: understand the relationship between ethnic, racial, religious and socio-economic diversity and national political cultures.

SLO 3b: understand the relationship between political culture and political institutions and processes.

SLO 3c: understand the institutions and processes of government

SLO 3d: understand the debate over the concept of sustainability as it applies to different public policy areas, including the economy and the environment.

##### **SLO 4**

POSC majors will articulate career goals, demonstrate knowledge of how to achieve those goals, and produce evidence of working to achieve the goals.

##### **SLO 5**

POSC majors will demonstrate the ability to apply knowledge through collaborative learning and teamwork.

### **B. Program Student Learning Outcome(s) Assessed**

During the 2014-2015 academic year assessment occurred in the three sections of the capstone seminar POSC 4910, the course in which students are expected to demonstrate mastery of the program student learning outcomes through targeted course SLOs. Prior year results are used every year because current year results and exit survey results are

not available until Fall of the next AY.

Aggregate 3 sections

POSC Assessment Grid      Course:4910      Section: 3      Quarter: W /S15

POOR      FAIR      GOOD      EXCELLENT

(PSLO2a) Course SLO1: Ability, with minimum prompting, to develop a strong thesis statement.

Indicator: research paper rubric:

Unable	With much help	With some help	Independently
2	20	21	5

(PSLO2b) Course SLO2: Ability, with minimum guidance and suggestion of materials to develop a strong bibliography using appropriate academic, governmental, and other sources.

Indicator: paper preparation and bibliography

Rubric:	Weak prep with help	Inconsistent strong	Generally independent	Strong independent
	13	16	20	8

(PSLO1a,2a) Course SLO3: Ability, independently, to write a well structured research paper with a sustained argument in error-free college-level English.

Indicator: research paper

Rubric:	weak structure/ argument	some structure/ argument	mostly sustained	Strong all areas
	4	16	18	10

(PSLO2a) Course SLO4: Ability to understand and critique the concepts and theories of political science

Indicator: seminar discussion and roundtables

Rubric:	none	partial	mostly	understand and critique
	5	19	16	8

(PSLO2a) Course SLO5: Ability orally to communicate course material and academic research in persuasive professional English.

Indicator: formal presentation

Rubric:	limited or poor	some	mostly	strong
	4	12	21	11

(PSLO2b) Course SLO6: Ability to read, understand, and critique non-quantitative academic POSC articles.

Indicator: seminar presentation

Rubric:	weak	partial	grasps basics	strong and critique
	6	25	7	10

(PSLO5) Course SLO 7: Ability to apply knowledge through collaborative learning and teamwork.

Indicator: seminar groups/roundtables/peer assessment

Rubric:	weak	some	good insight/ assistance	excellent insight/ assistance
	6	17	14	10

### C. Summary of Assessment Process

Because most political science majors are transfer students, POSC Program SLOs are introduced in POSC 3030, the upper-division gateway survey of the major. Students are advised to take 3030 when they first matriculate. The PSLOs are developed in all upper-division POSC courses, which are expected to practice all the SLOs that are appropriate to the individual subject matter. All upper-division course syllabi are expected to contain course SLOs aligned with the program SLOs. In particular, all upper-division courses are expected to introduce and practice research, analytic, writing, and oral skills in the POSC sub-fields, identify students struggling academically, seek appropriate assistance for them, and notify the department. SLO measurement occurs in POSC 3030 and in POSC 4910. Students are expected to achieve mastery of the SLOs in the seminar, which involves an extensive research plan, a 20-page research paper, a formal oral presentation, and participation in a seminar reading and analysis exercise. All POSC majors are assessed. However the results are aggregated. Assessment results are shared with the department.

Expectations of individual faculty in support of assessment are renewed regularly. The Instructors in POSC 3030 and POSC 4910 work closely together. Both courses have been adapted extensively over the past few years to focus on the SLOs. Several years ago, the seminar formalized the literature review portion of the paper, which had been introduced in POSC 3030. In 2016, the POSC 3030 instructor introduced a formal research paper so that students could practice the various components that go into the seminar project. The seminar instructors use a highly detailed process approach to the research project whereby weekly preliminary assignments provide incremental development of the final paper and multiple indicators of the SLOs. The rubric for POSC 4910 reflects this developmental approach and indicates how close students come to mastery of the program SLOs including the degree of instructor assistance required.

## D. Summary of Assessment Results

The results of the direct indicators of student achievement are included in the charts above. They indicate that the department needs to redouble its efforts to help students reach the desired achievement levels. In addition to the direct indicators, the Department uses two indirect indicators, the graduate exit survey and the senior seminar focus group, to determine student satisfaction with the program and student perception of individual achievement of the PSLOs. The exit survey results summarized here are from the Winter 2015 section of the seminar, the only one available. In general, students tend to rate their skill levels somewhat higher than do their instructors.

A majority of Political Science majors were satisfied with the program. 12/17 agreed or strongly agreed that the major “fulfilled my expectations.” In addition, 9/27 said that the program had the right balance “between free choice and requirements.” 11/17 said that they were “satisfied with the curriculum.”

A majority of Political Science majors believed that they had improved their reading and interpretative skills. 38/49 thought they were now, “skilled at reading and interpreting different types of writing.”

12/17 majors said that they had a “clear understanding of Political Science as a discipline, including the main theoretical and methodological debates.” 4/17 disagreed.

11/27 were confident that they understood the “core issues, theoretical frameworks and analytic methods” of the various disciplinary sub-fields. 4/17 disagreed.

A majority of students (9/17) did not think that there was sufficient emphasis on “research, writing, speaking and analytical skills” in POSC courses. 7/27 thought that there was enough such emphasis.

A majority of Political Science majors believed that they had strengthened their analytic skills. 12/17 (4/17 disagreed) thought that they were now “skilled at distinguishing between well-substantiated argument and unsupported assertions.”

A majority of Political Science majors have confidence in their research skills. 12/17 (3/17 disagreed) asserted that they were now “skilled at finding political and legal information using books, journals and available electronic databases.”

10/27 said that they were “skilled at using social science methods of analysis” 3/27 disagreed.

Political Science majors were nearly as confident about their academic writing skills. 11/17 (3/17 disagreed) held that they could now “write knowledgeably, correctly, clearly and logically on political subjects.” The senior seminar was cited most often as the course that helped develop writing skills.

Political Science majors affirmed (14/27) that political science instructors “explained plagiarism, taught me how to avoid it, checked for it and enforced plagiarism rules.” 2/27 disagreed.

Students felt confident (12/27) about their ability to “participate effectively in classroom dialogue on controversial political subjects, challenging the facts and ideas presented by others and defending my own ideas.” 2/27 disagreed.

Political Science majors were confident in their oral communication skills. 12/17 asserted that they were now “skilled at oral presentation.” 2/17 disagreed.

11/17 said that they had prepared at least 5 papers involving academic research prior to the seminar.

The vast majority of Political Science majors considered POSC to be a challenging major. 15/17 said “the Political Science curriculum challenged me to be the best student I could be.”

PSLO 1 identifies the goal of giving students the opportunity to gain political experience while completing the major. 5/16 students felt “there was adequate opportunity for internships, fieldwork, and service learning.” 5/14 “found my internship, fieldwork, service learning experience to be valuable.” These are troubling results that are in sharp decline from the 2014 results. They suggest the need to reevaluate the internship program

In response to student concerns in years past, the department revised its academic advising program. In 2015, 8/15 said that they were “satisfied with the assistance from my major advisor.” 5/15 disagreed.

In response to student request for better career advising, Political Science added PSLO 4. The exit survey revealed that only 6/15 were “satisfied with the assistance I received from the political science faculty in the area of career counseling or preparation for graduate school.” More work needs to be done in this area.

The Political Science Department has always encouraged students to become engaged participants in politics. Political engagement was included in the revised PSLO 1. The exit survey shows that completion of the political science major increases the chances that a student will become politically active. Only 4/10 students were active in politics prior to entering the major. 9/10 said that they planned to be active after graduating. 5/10 said that their shift was due to the program.

Political Science students agree that the senior seminar “works well as a capstone experience in the major.” 10/16 agreed; 3/16 disagreed. In addition, 9/16 agreed that prior course work “prepared me to research write, and present the seminar project.” 3/16 disagreed. 10/16 students thought that the “format and structure of the seminar was conducive to the preparation of a quality research paper.” 4/16 disagreed.

In addition to the senior exit survey, the department also uses an end-of-the-year focus group in the senior seminar to allow students to articulate and discuss any issues relative to the political science program. Since these discussions address the capstone course where the PSLOs are “mastered” and advising, which is a separate PSLO, the focus groups serve as indirect indicators of PSLO achievement. The following comments summarize the focus group meetings in the three Winter and Spring Quarter seminars in 2016.

The students said that the senior seminar was a challenging but very valuable capstone experience that should not be dropped. They were proud of their achievements in the class. However, they felt that, except for POSC 3030, the other courses in the major had not prepared them for the work expected in the seminar. 3030, they thought, should work on all the components of the seminar paper. They want more courses to help them develop the skills they need for the seminar project. They were especially critical of the short response papers or discussion boards prevalent in many classes. They also complained that most instructors were not making comments on the writing assignments and, therefore, not helping them develop their research and writing skills. Many students felt that, as a result, the seminar was asking too much of them. Some would like to see the seminar split into two courses (similar to the History Department). Others thought that the seminar topic reading assignments could be reduced or dropped. Some thought that the switch to semesters would solve the problem.

A separate review of course syllabi indicates that while a majority of courses have PSLO related learning outcomes listed on the syllabus, many course syllabi do not include course objectives that align with the PSLOs. In addition, a review of course assignments also reveals that many courses are not practicing the PSLOs according to the agreed upon plan summarized above in the Summary of Assessment Process.

In the focus groups, the students also brought up program and career advising (PSLO 4). All three groups insisted that the advising system was not working. "Horrible" was the word that one group unanimously agreed on. Advisors, with a couple of exceptions, were rarely available, had very limited office hours, and were unwilling to spend more than a few minutes with students. Pre-law advisors were signaled out as being unhelpful. Students want the department to help guide them as they prepare for law school, grad school, and for other careers. They also want better advising on internship opportunities.



### 3. STATISTICAL DATA (about 1 page)

#### APR Summary Data

Fall 2011 - 2015

<b>Political Science</b>					
	<b>Fall Quarter</b>				
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>A. Students Headcount</b>					
1. Undergraduate	247	266	249	205	202
2. Postbaccalaureate	4	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	251	266	249	205	202
<b>College Years</b>					
<b>B. Degrees Awarded</b>					
	<b>10-11</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>	<b>14-15</b>
1. Undergraduate	55	71	67	69	61
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total	55	71	67	69	61
<b>Fall Quarter</b>					
	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>C. Faculty</b>					
<b>Tenured/Track Headcount</b>					
1. Full-Time	6	6	4	4	4
2. Part-Time	0	0	1	1	0
3a. Total Tenure Track	6	6	5	5	4
3b. % Tenure Track	60.0%	75.0%	50.0%	41.7%	33.3%
<b>Lecturer Headcount</b>					
4. Full-Time	0	0	0	0	0
5. Part-Time	4	2	5	7	8
6a. Total Non-Tenure Track	4	2	5	7	8
6b. % Non-Tenure Track	40.0%	25.0%	50.0%	58.3%	66.7%
7. Grand Total All Faculty	10	8	10	12	12
<b>Instructional FTE Faculty (FTEF)</b>					
8. Tenured/Track FTEF	4.0	5.1	3.3	2.3	4.0
9. Lecturer FTEF	1.8	1.1	2.1	2.8	2.9
10. Total Instructional FTEF	5.8	6.1	5.5	5.1	7.0
<b>Lecturer Teaching</b>					
11a. FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	102.1	132.0	84.8	60.0	52.3
11b. % of FTES Taught by Tenure/Track	63.1%	77.1%	52.2%	41.8%	37.6%
12a. FTES Taught by Lecturer	59.7	39.2	77.6	83.5	86.7
12b. % of FTES Taught by Lecturer	36.9%	22.9%	47.8%	58.2%	62.4%
13. Total FTES taught	161.9	171.2	162.4	143.5	138.9
14. Total SCU taught	2428.0	2568.0	2436.0	2152.0	2084.0
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>					
1. Tenured/Track	25.5	26.1	25.5	26.5	13.0
2. Lecturer	33.2	36.8	36.3	29.8	29.6
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	27.9	27.9	29.7	28.3	20.0
4. Lower Division	39.5	37.4	42.0	37.6	30.3

5. Upper Division	24.6	26.9	27.6	25.5	16.9
6. Graduate	.	.	.	.	.
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	20.0	21.0	22.0	22.0	22.0
2. Average Section Size	33.4	35.1	31.7	29.5	26.0
3. Average Section Size for LD	47.0	42.0	42.0	42.0	31.3
4. Average Section Size for UD	29.5	34.3	29.8	25.9	24.1
5. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	1	1	0	1	1
7. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	12	16	14	11	9
8. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
9. LD Section taught by Lecturer	3	1	3	3	4
10. UD Section taught by Lecturer	4	3	5	7	7

Source and definitions available at:

<http://www.csueastbay.edu/ira/apr/summary/definitions.pdf>

<b>Fall Quarter</b>					
<b>Headcount Enrollment</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>	<b>2013</b>	<b>2014</b>	<b>2015</b>
<b>Potilical Science</b>					
1. Undergraduate	183	204	193	156	145
2. Postbaccalaureate	3	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	186	204	193	156	145
<b>International Studies</b>					
1. Undergraduate	64	62	56	49	57
2. Postbaccalaureate	1	0	0	0	0
3. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
4. Total Number of Majors	65	62	56	49	57
<b>College Years</b>					
<b>Degrees Awarded</b>	<b>10-11</b>	<b>11-12</b>	<b>12-13</b>	<b>13-14</b>	<b>14-15</b>
<b>Potilical Science</b>					
1. Undergraduate	37	50	51	51	50
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total Number of Majors	37	50	51	51	50
<b>International Studies</b>					
1. Undergraduate	18	21	16	18	11
2. Graduate	0	0	0	0	0
3. Total Number of Majors	18	21	16	18	11

<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>	<b>Potilical Science</b>				
1. Tenured/Track	25.5	26.5	25.6	26.7	13.0
2. Lecturer	33.2	36.8	36.3	29.8	29.6
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	27.9	28.3	29.9	28.4	20.0

4. Lower Division	39.5	37.4	42.0	37.6	30.3
5. Upper Division	24.6	27.3	27.8	25.6	17.0
6. Graduate	.	.	.	.	.
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	20.0	19.0	20.0	20.0	21.0
2. SCU taught	2428.0	2556.0	2428.0	2144.0	2080.0
3. Average Section Size	33.4	35.1	31.7	29.5	26.0
4. Average Section Size for LD	47.0	42.0	42.0	42.0	31.3
5. Average Section Size for UD	29.5	34.3	29.8	25.9	24.1
6. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	1	1	0	1	1
8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	12	14	12	9	8
9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
10. LD Section taught by Lecturer	3	1	3	3	4
11. UD Section taught by Lecturer	4	3	5	7	7
12. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
<b>D. Student Faculty Ratios</b>	<b>International Studies</b>				
1. Tenured/Track	.	7.2	12.1	15.7	8.1
2. Lecturer	.	.	.	.	.
3. SFR By Level (All Faculty)	.	7.2	12.1	15.7	8.1
4. Lower Division	.	.	.	.	.
5. Upper Division	.	7.2	12.1	15.7	8.1
6. Graduate	.	.	.	.	.
<b>E. Section Size</b>					
1. Number of Sections Offered	0.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0
2. SCU taught	0.0	12.0	8.0	8.0	4.0
3. Average Section Size	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
4. Average Section Size for LD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
5. Average Section Size for UD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
6. Average Section Size for GD	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
7. LD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
8. UD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	2	2	2	1
9. GD Section taught by Tenured/Track	0	0	0	0	0
10. LD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
11. UD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0
12. GD Section taught by Lecturer	0	0	0	0	0