



**Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2018-2019**

Program: \_\_\_\_\_ Honors \_\_\_\_\_

(Due: May 1, 2019)

Date report completed: \_\_\_\_\_ 5/10/2019 \_\_\_\_\_

Completed by: \_\_\_ Fawn-Amber Montoya \_\_\_\_\_

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): \_\_\_\_\_ Jonathan Rees \_\_\_\_\_

Please describe the 2018-2019 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

**Brief statement of Program mission and goals:**

**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 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	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 <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
SLO1 <b>SLO1</b> Students will be able to formulate and develop	Spring 2018		Seniors 4 Student Theses	100%	100%	Students are doing well on critical thinking	Continue to have the thesis course meet face to face

arguments with sufficient support, including reasoning, evidence, persuasive appeals, and proper attribution. (Critical thinking)							
Students will be able to apply discipline-specific as well as cross discipline-based knowledge to design, execute, and communicate a specific problem-solving strategy. (Independent research, creativity, and scholarship)	Spring 2018	Thesis- Rubric Below	Seniors 4 Student Theses	100%	Identify Interdisciplinary Approaches – 50% Formulate Independent Research Projects = 100% Describe Impact of Field on Wider Community = 75%		Restructure thesis course to have 3-5 possible methodological approaches.. surveys, interviews, textual analysis, lab research, focus groups. These should have definitions/ ideas. Provide samples of theses for students. Identify discipline specific faculty for senior theses students to work with at least the semester before the student begins. Hold a Workshop for these faculty with expectations. Require theses to all be completed in the spring semester.  Thesis needs to remain a structured course with Honors Director facilitating and faculty advising meeting with students

Comments on part I:

**II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2018-2019 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? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	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?
<i>SLO 1</i> Students will be able to formulate and develop arguments with sufficient support, including reasoning, evidence, persuasive appeals, and proper attribution. (Critical thinking)	Spring 2018	Restructure thesis course to have 3-5 possible methodological approaches: surveys, interviews, textual analysis, lab research, or focus groups.  Identify discipline specific faculty for senior theses students to work with. Workshop for these faculty with expectations for what thesis should look like regardless of discipline	In spring of 2019- made the course face to face with a set syllabi and expectatiosn for all students.	More consistency across the program. Students did not like that they were expected to meet face to face  Culture of the program still based on independent learning. Need to focus on academic choirt building.  Difficult because thesis directors have different expectations especially regarding length.
<i>SLO3</i> Students will be	Spring 2018	Thesis projects will be revised to include an interdisciplinary		Interdisciplinary component is difficult with only one thesis director need to expand this

<p>able to apply discipline-specific as well as crossdiscipline-based knowledge to design, execute, and report on a specific problem-solving strategy. (Independent research, creativity, and scholarship) Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student senior theses.</p>		<p>introduction, conclusion, and literature review. Program will revise 1 credit Honors 481 to be a Professional/ Research Skills course.</p>		<p>to two or three and students need to have clearer expectatins from a core group of faculty.</p>
---	--	---	--	--

Comments on part II:

Rubric

Student work assessed: Senior thesis Rubric	<b>Exemplary</b>	<b>Proficient</b>
<b>Formulation of argument</b> (SLO #1)	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>explicit, precisely articulated, and clear.</i>	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>explicit.</i>
<b>Quality of reasoning in support of conclusion(s)</b> (SLO #1)	Reasoning is <i>good</i> (i.e. strong or valid) and <i>well-explained.</i>	Reasoning is <i>generally good</i> (i.e. strong or valid).
<b>Use of evidence in support of conclusion(s)</b> (SLO #1. Evidence type understood to vary by academic discipline.)	Conclusions are supported with <i>appropriate, sufficient, and well-explained</i> evidence (e.g. textual,	Conclusions are supported with <i>appropriate</i> & generally <i>sufficient</i> evidence (e.g. textual, experimental or observational evidence).
<b>Use of attribution</b> (SLO #1. Formatting and standards understood to vary by academic discipline)	Standards of proper attribution are applied <i>consistently throughout.</i>	Standards of attribution are followed, but may be applied with <i>some inconsistency.</i>
<b>Independent Research / creativity / scholarship</b> (SLO #3)	Disciplinary knowledge independently applied; work involves a report of student-designed & executed problem-solving strategy.	Disciplinary knowledge clearly applied in work of student-executed problem-solving. Student autonomy may be less pronounced.