Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2022-2023

Program: <u>Minor—Legal Studies</u>   **Date report completed:** <u>May 26, 2023</u>

Completed by: <u>Matt Harris (Program Director)</u>

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2023-2024 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? **Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.**	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
SLO 3 Students will be able to explain the major turning points, personalities, and issues in drafting and ratifying the United States Constitution and	New SLO	<u>Direct Measure</u>: Rubric used to evaluate student papers (see attached rubric) <u>Indirect Measure</u>: Evaluated students through an in-class debate, seeing how	Eight students in the Minor were assessesed in Legal Studies 415. Observations from a panel of judges on the in-class debate contributed to the	Rating of "proficient" or above in each SLO (see rubric). With 8 students in the assessment pool, 6 should achieve at or above proficiency.	8 of 8 students met the proficiency standard for primary source analysis and legal application.	A panel of three judges evaluated an in-class debate about the Second Amendment and the students' use of primary sources to argue a particular position of legal significance. In preparation, they read a book, wrote a paper, and listened to a podcast.	There was too much planning and strategizing at the end of the semester to prepare for the debate. Between the book, paper, and podcast, students felt a bit overwhelmed, although all enthusiastically praised the assessment and encouraged the instructor to do it again. In a future assessement, an in-depth activity of this kind will be moved to the middle of the semester when

| demonstrate competence in applying those principles to modern-day applications. | | well they applied their knowledge of primary sources to a real-life constitutional issue. | indirect measure. Observations and syllabi also evaluated. | | | Strengths: Each student participated in the nearly 2 hour debate. Each strategized and showed a command of the relevant material.

Weaknesses: In the point-counterpoint portion of the debate, some students didn't effectively engage with their opponents' position. In addition, they missed some (but not all) relevant case law that would have bolstered their position. | students don't feel the pressures of finals week. |

Comments on part I:

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2022-2023 cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? **Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.**	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
New Assessment	New Assessment	New Assessment	New Assessment	New Assessment

Comments on part II:

Rules for Classroom Debate

1. Each group is to agree on <u>two to three</u> significant points of argument.

2. The "pro" group will read the first point of argument. A debate on the validity of that particular point will ensue, providing others in the group opportunities to elaborate and the "con" group opportunities to counter.

3. One person speaks at a time. No side discussions!

4. All comments MUST address the previous student comment directly. You may not simply ignore a comment and shift the argument to an unrelated point.

5. Each person will credit the source of any statistic, quotation, speech, or other research information AT THE TIME that source is mentioned during the debate.

Debate Etiquette

1. Team members must meet together in preparation for the debate, so they can work together as an effective team. (You guys already did this last class!)

2. All members of each side must participate in the debate.

3. Do not read your materials, but you can refer to the readings.

4. You may bring some brief notes, but you may not read them.

5. Maintain good eye contact with the opposing team.

6. Use proper language and be polite in referring to your opposing team.

Question you will debate: Does the Second Amendment protect an individual right to bear arms?

Pro (or yes Group)

Con (or no Group)

<u>**Debate Format**</u>

10 minute Position Presentation – Pro (Yes, the Second Amendment protects an individual right to bear arms.)

<u>10 minute Position Presentation</u> – Con (No, the Second Amendment does not protect an individual right to bear arms.)

> *5 minute Work Period*

10 minute Rebuttal - Pro

<u>10 minute Rebuttal - Con</u>

> *5 minute Work Period*

5 minute Response - Pro

<u>5 minute Response - Con</u>

> *3 minute Work Period*

2 minute Position Summary - Pro or Con

<u>2 minute Position Summary - Pro or Con</u>

> 5 minute Tallying of Ballots/Announcement of Winner

Rubric used: [DEBATE-GRADING-RUBRIC-1.pdf (uconn.edu)](DEBATE-GRADING-RUBRIC-1.pdf)