

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2012-2013 **Due: June 1, 2013**
Program: Homeland Security Studies (Minor) **Date: 5/19/2013**
Completed by: Steven Liebel, PhD (Program Director)
Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Gayle Berardi PhD, Joel Johnson PhD

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, 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, and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2013. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx>. Thank you.

A. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle?	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	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.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	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?
<p>Communication.</p> <p>From the SLO statement:</p> <p><i>"Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings."</i></p>	<p>The 2012-13 Academic year is the first year for the Homeland Security minor, and is thus the first year of program assessment. There have been no previous SLO assessments.</p>	<p>The program director and Political Science faculty observed in-class presentations of student research on terrorist organizations. Faculty independently evaluated each presentation. Evaluations were then examined by the program director independently and in aggregate.</p> <p>See rubric attached at end of document.</p>	<p>Five students were randomly sampled from a 200 level Terrorism class of 23. Students were given the opportunity to volunteer for presentation slots, and the students who volunteered for the first day were assessed without knowing the assessment was taking place. Three males, two females.</p>	<p>Per the curriculum map students are introduced to the communication learning outcome in Terrorism. Because they are introduced at this level, all students (100%) should achieve the expected level. Expected achievement level on the basis of the communication rubric: proficient.</p>	<p>The sample of students assessed are proficient in terms of communicating and presenting research. To reiterate, however, this is judged on the basis of communication being a concept that is introduced at this level, as opposed to more advanced level requirements (e.g., refine/master). 100% proficiency would not be an expectation at a higher level.</p>	<p>Students are capable of presenting research with introductory level skill. The majority of students communicate effectively, but are not advanced when judged on an introductory scale. Some issues require further development (i.e., speaking voice, presentation style). However, for a class in which the communication outcome is introduced, students performed to a satisfactory level.</p>	<p>Students will continue to be taught research practices with the expectation that all analyses must be presented. In the future students will be thoroughly instructed on basic skills to practice prior to such activity (e.g., voice dynamics and information presentation). Students will also be given feedback such that they can improve their performance moving on.</p>

Comments:

Aggregate-level notes: On a 1-4 scale in each of 9 sub-categories, with 1 being considered unacceptable and 4 being advanced, students averaged 31.9 total points out of a possible 36 (88% of all possible points). Students range from 30 to 35 (83-97%) points. This indicates that on an aggregate level students achieved basic proficiency as defined in the communication rubric on an introductory level scale. It should be repeated, however, that this is judged with the expectation that students are to achieve introductory level proficiency with communications and presentations. That the sample of students achieved proficiency on this level is unsurprising.

Micro-level notes: two students were judged to be "minimally acceptable" in the sub-category of "Vocal Delivery." In both instances the issue was voice volume and rate of speech. Students spoke at a very low volume with a high rate of speed and minimal pauses or interruptions. These signs are indicative of students who are not accustomed to presenting to a classroom. Projecting ones voice and using dynamic tones/pauses has been noted in their feedback. Two students were judged to be either "unacceptable" or "minimally acceptable" for the sub-category of "Power Point Presentation." Spelling errors were common in these presentations, and slide colors were not appropriate. Reasons for this issue are easily

remedied. One of these students did not submit their slides to the professor prior to presentation for feedback as instructed. The second student did not make the changes recommended by the professor. The importance of proof-reading slides and using readable font/colors was stressed in feedback.

Micro-level notes continued: Strengths of the students exist in their ability to effectively organize and present complex ideas/concepts. Indeed, students were tasked with presenting a 12 page research paper in 7 minutes. This required students to suss out and present only pertinent information, and to do so in a concise manner. Generally speaking, language was concise and content appropriate.

Moving forward: Although all students performed with proficiency, there is much to be done moving forward. First, one must question the validity of the sample assessed to know if it is the best option for future assessment. Indeed, with five students sampled, if a single student fails or succeeds in achieving this outcome it will alter the results significantly. In order to assure the validity of scores represented by the sample of students presented here, the random sample of students was compared to the larger student body. This was done by correlating the scores of those who were sampled with the larger class (the students not included in this sample was scored by the program director alone). The assessment sample is closely aligned to the larger student body. This would indicate that randomly sampling approximately 20% of the class was an effective assessment technique. Moving forward, this sampling technique can continue to be performed. Second, there are questions as to whether 100% proficiency is an acceptable expectation for student achievement. However, because this concept is introduced at this level, the high outcome expectation is necessary. In more advanced classes Homeland Security Students are expected to refine and master these skills. If students are not achieving introductory level proficiency at this stage it would indicate that significant changes need to be made in terms of the relationship between the course content and the student expectations. It is also worth noting, that even though students are judged at the introductory level, no student scored a perfect score, and on a 100 point scale, the class average was an 88. This should allay fears that high expectations are being set and students are then not being assessed with the same expectations in mind (i.e., passing all students simply to meet expectations). In order to continue the development of the program, in the future more time will be spent instructing students in basic presentation practice before they present. Specifically, it more emphasis will be put on the development of effective verbal and visual delivery.

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
The 2012-13 academic year is the first in which the Homeland Security program offered a minor. This is also the first academic year that assessments are required for this program. There are no previous assessment cycles from which action can be taken.	The 2012-13 academic year is the first in which the Homeland Security program offered a minor. This is also the first academic year that assessments are required for this program. There are no previous assessments for student learning outcomes.	The 2012-13 academic year is the first in which the Homeland Security program offered a minor. This is also the first academic year that assessments are required for this program. There are no previous assessment cycles from which recommendations were made.	The 2012-13 academic year is the first in which the Homeland Security program offers a minor. This is also the first academic year that assessments are required for this program. There are no previous assessment cycles from which recommendations can be adopted and acted upon.	The 2012-13 academic year is the first in which the Homeland Security program offers a minor. This is also the first academic year that assessments are required for this program. There are no previous assessment cycles from which changes can be made. There is no point for comparison to ascertain effective practices.

Comments:

2012-13 is the first academic year that the Homeland Security studies program conducted an annual assessment of Student Learning Outcomes. As a result, the program offered an assessment without previous recommendations to follow. This years assessment will be used to make recommendations for the 2013-14 academic year.

COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

Student Name: _____ Presentation Title/Topic: _____

Criteria	1 – Unacceptable	2 – Minimally Acceptable	3 – Proficient	4 – Advanced	Score
Content	Central idea/purpose is not stated; content is erroneous or irrelevant; support for assertions is largely absent.	Central idea/purpose is stated; content is accurate but not always relevant; support is offered by inadequate for some assertions.	Central idea/purpose is clearly stated; content is accurate and relevant; credible support is provided for each assertion.	Central idea/purpose is vividly stated; content is accurate, thorough, and directly on point; strong support is provided for each assertion.	Score: _____
Organization (Intro, Body, Conclusion)	Little or no structure present. Presentation is confusing to the audience; no logical sequence of ideas; frequently off-topic.	Identifiable structure is present but inconsistently executed; may contain several statements out of place and occasionally deviate from topic.	Identifiable structure is present and consistently executed with few statements out of place.	Identifiable structure is presented in a purposeful, interesting, and effective sequence and remains focused.	Score: _____
Language	Grammar, pronunciation, and/or word choice are severely deficient.	Isolated errors in grammar, pronunciation, and/or word choice reduce clarity and credibility.	Presentation is free of serious errors in grammar, pronunciation, and/or word usage.	Presentation is free of errors in grammar and pronunciation; word choice aids clarity and vividness.	Score: _____
Adaptation to Audience and Context	Content and/or style are frequently inappropriate to the audience and/or context. Presentation falls well outside set time parameters.	Content and/or style are occasionally inappropriate to the audience and/or context. Presentation falls slightly outside set time parameters.	Content and/or style are consistently appropriate to the audience, and/or context. Presentation meets set time parameters.	Content and/or style are consistently appropriate and targeted to audience and context. Presentation makes full, effective use of time and stays within	

COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

				time parameters.	Score: _____
Vocal Delivery	Vocal delivery is too soft to hear, too fast to understand and/or long, unintended silences and speech disruptions (repetitions; filled pauses, e.g., "um") frequently distract audience.	Vocal delivery is audible. Rate, volume, or speech disruptions only occasionally distract from audience comprehension.	Vocal delivery is clear and distinct. Rate, volume, and tone facilitate audience comprehension.	Vocal delivery is varied and dynamic. Speech rate, volume, and tone enhance listener interest and understanding.	Score: _____
Nonverbal Delivery	Eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement, and/or facial expressions are inappropriate and significantly distracting.	Eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement, and facial expressions neither enhance nor hinder effectiveness significantly.	Some but not all of the following apply: eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement or facial expressions enhance the presentation.	Most or all of the following apply: eye contact, posture, attire, gestures, movement or facial expressions enhance the presentation.	Score: _____

Audio-Visual Aid	<input type="checkbox"/> Contain errors in grammar and/or spelling <input type="checkbox"/> Illegible or hard to see <input type="checkbox"/> Content, format or use is inappropriate and distracts from meaning or credibility	<input type="checkbox"/> Error free <input type="checkbox"/> Legible and displayed so that most or all of the audience can see <input type="checkbox"/> Does little or nothing to enhance the presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Error free <input type="checkbox"/> Legible and displayed so that entire audience can see <input type="checkbox"/> Used appropriate (e.g., displayed so all can see only when being discussed) <input type="checkbox"/> Some but not all of the aids make a positive contribution to the presentation (e.g., increase attention or enhance understanding)	<input type="checkbox"/> Error free <input type="checkbox"/> Legible and displayed so that entire audience can see <input type="checkbox"/> Used appropriately (e.g., displayed so all can see only when being discussed) <input type="checkbox"/> All of the aids make a positive contribution to the presentation (e.g., increase attention or enhance understanding)	Score: _____
-------------------------	---	--	---	--	--------------

COMMUNICATION RUBRIC

PowerPoint Presentation	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reflects no logical sequence <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate number of slides for information presented <input type="checkbox"/> Very distracting transitions and effects are used <input type="checkbox"/> No backgrounds were chosen to go on the slide	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation reflects some logical sequence <input type="checkbox"/> Inappropriate number of slides for information presented <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat distracting transitions and effects are used <input type="checkbox"/> Backgrounds clash with font color and styles	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation mostly reflects logical sequence <input type="checkbox"/> Includes appropriate number of slides <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions and effects rarely distract from information presented <input type="checkbox"/> Use of fonts, colors and styles is appropriate	<input type="checkbox"/> Presentation always reflects logical sequence <input type="checkbox"/> Includes appropriate number of slides with outstanding graphics <input type="checkbox"/> Transitions and effects are used appropriately without distraction from information presented <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent use of font, color and style	Score: _____
--------------------------------	---	--	--	---	--------------

Question and Answer Period	Speaker gives erroneous, inadequate, incomprehensible, or distracting answers to questions.	Speaker gives answers to questions that are partly but not fully acceptable (i.e., accurate, complete, comprehensible, cogent).	Speaker gives accurate and appropriate answers.	Speaker consistently gives accurate, cogent, dynamic, and appropriate answers that enhance credibility.	Score: _____
-----------------------------------	---	---	---	---	--------------