Academic Program Assessment Plan
Minor: Homeland Security Studies

Department of History and Political Science
College of Humanities and Social Sciences
Colorado State University-Pueblo

Plan appended by Steven Liebel, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Director of Center for the Study of Homeland Security (CSHS), May 2014.

Plan originally developed by David Malet, Assistant Professor of Political Science, Director of Center for the Study of Homeland Security (CSHS), March 2012.

Primary Contact for Assessment: Steven Liebel

Mission

The Homeland Security Studies Program offers an in-depth opportunity for the scholarly study of the political and public policy issues involved in the field of homeland security and defense. It is also intended to provide professional development opportunities for graduates in a growing sector of the economy (minor) and to serve mid-career professionals interested in expanding substantive knowledge and career advancement (certificate).

The Program (encompassing the Minor degree and the non-transcripted Certificate curriculum contained within the Minor) fulfills the missions of both the university and the department as described in the University Catalog:

"The University shall offer a broad array of baccalaureate programs with a strong professional focus and a firm grounding in the liberal arts and sciences."

"The programs in history, political science, philosophy, and geography are intended to provide domains of study both for students who desire knowledge for personal enrichment and for students who desire to apply knowledge toward career objectives.... Departmental programs … prepare students for occupations in government, business, education …"

The Minor in Homeland Security Studies provides full time students a program in line with each mission. The program supplements existing baccalaureate programs with a professionally directed program informed through social scientific theories, practices, and higher order thinking. In doing so, it prepares students for a broad array of careers.

GoalsandStudentLearningOutcomes

In 2010, the national Homeland Security and Defense Education Consortium Association (HSDECA) proposed national accreditation standards and learning outcomes for homeland security undergraduate and graduate degree programs. While no guidelines were proposed for certificates or minors, the program has adopted the learning outcomes for undergraduate programs as the basis for the Minor curriculum so as to be in compliance with all accreditation recommendations.

The following section is detailed in four areas. First, Undergraduate Degree General Outcomes, as defined by the HSDECA, are used as a foundation for student understanding and application. These identify broad points of program coverage, and inform the programs states goals. Second, Core Area Outcomes identify specifics areas of concentration that are necessary for HSDECA program compliance. Each core area must cover certain aspects of knowledge within homeland security. I.E., a course concentration in intelligence necessitates more specific knowledge of that area than others. Third, program goals are detailed that are in line with General and Core Area outcomes. Fourth and finally, Student Learning Outcomes are identified and are used the means to assess student learning and application. Student Learning Outcomes distill information from both the General Outcomes and Core Outcomes into identifiable means of program assessment.

Undergraduate Degree General Outcomes (HSDECA a-i)

According to HSDECA, satisfying general outcomes indicate that programs meet a minimum set of professional and intellectual standards in degree curriculum. Though some of the following outcomes may be satisfied by program coursework, some may be satisfied by the institution's general education requirements, course test out or high school AP equivalency. Thus, at a general level, homeland security, homeland defense, or similarly named baccalaureate degree programs must demonstrate that their graduates have:

a) An ability to apply homeland security or defense concepts in a non-academic setting through an internship, cooperative, or supervised experience to include real-world experiences, strategies, and objectives.

b) An understanding of professional ethics and how they apply in the field of homeland security or defense.

c) An ability to apply knowledge of mathematics and science.

d) An ability to work collaboratively.

e) A recognition of transnational and global application of homeland security or defense issues, strategies and operations.

f) An ability to design, conduct and evaluate exercises applicable to the disciplines of homeland security or defense.

g) An ability to identify, describe and critically evaluate applicable   homeland security or defense technologies.

h) Knowledge of contemporary or emergent threats, challenges or issues including natural, man made and technological hazards.

i) Demonstrate the ability to synthesize, analyze or evaluate homeland security or homeland defense issues or challenges (i.e., either a capstone practicum or undergraduate thesis).

Core Area (CA) Outcomes (HSDECA 1-23)

Core area outcomes demonstrate professional breadth of preparation as it applies to the field of homeland security or defense. Programs satisfying core area outcomes should include the following curricular (i.e., core academic) areas. Suggested definitions for each academic area follow. Although programs can assume some latitude in how their specific curriculum integrates or operationalizes each of the core areas below, programs must accomplish each of the following outcomes. Whereas undergraduate programs must accomplish each of the following outcomes at a lower level of learning, graduate programs must accomplish these outcomes, but demonstrate a higher level of learning than undergraduate programs. Hence, homeland security, homeland defense or similarly named programs must demonstrate that their students have knowledge in the following areas:

CA1. Intelligence - *A systematic process of collection, analysis, and dissemination of information in support of national, state, and/or local policy or strategy.*

1) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of intelligence and counter- intelligence concepts, to include the collection, analysis, and dissemination of intelligence data both within the US and internationally.

2) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of the organization and mission of the federal Intelligence Community, state and local intelligence agencies   within the US, private/corporate sector intelligence efforts, and selected   components globally.

3) An ability to demonstrate and synthesize fundamental intelligence concepts while understanding their variables, limitations, and shortcomings.

CA2. Law & Policy – *Legal and policy formulations that provide the basic direction of homeland security means and objectives and establish a context for homeland security within the broader purview of national security.*

4) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of legal and constitutional   principles and their application in the area of Homeland or National Security law and policy.

5) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of case law, precedential, and court decisions relating to and having an effect upon homeland security policy and law.

CA3. Emergency Management - *Emergency management includes the process of preparation for and the carrying out of all emergency functions necessary to protect, prepare for, respond to, and recover from emergencies and disasters caused by all hazards, whether natural, technological, or human caused. Emergency management is a comprehensive and continuous improvement oriented process designed to save lives, avoid injury or illness, and minimize damage to the environment and economic losses to property.*

6) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of emergency management and response concepts, operations, phases, and procedures across the range of homeland security challenges.

7) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of entry-level emergency management training and exercise types and strategies, and risk management principles.

CA4. Risk Analysis - *A systematic method of identifying the assets (e.g., critical infrastructure and key resources) of a system, the threats (i.e., strategic, political, economic, technological, or cultural) to those assets, and the vulnerability of the system to those threats in such a way as to be able to quantify threats and their consequences to a system for the purpose of developing appropriate countermeasures.*

8) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of risk analysis principles,   processes, and techniques, in both the public and private sectors. This includes knowledge of an all hazards approach to risk analysis and infrastructure protection.

9) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of threat, vulnerability, consequence, and critical infrastructure analysis.

10) An ability to demonstrate basic industrial security strategies, challenges and principles.

CA5. Critical Infrastructure & Key Resources – *Systems, resources and assets, whether physical or virtual, so vital to the United States that the incapacity or destruction of such systems, resources or assets would have a debilitating impact on national security, economic security, public health or safety, or any combination of these.*

11) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of the evolution and basic principles of critical infrastructure, in both the private and public sectors vital to their community, state or the nation.

12) An ability to identify and describe each of the recognized sectors of critical infrastructure and key resources, and identify appropriate counter measures using a risk-based methodology.

13) An ability to compare and contrast private sector and governmental responsibilities in the area of critical infrastructure/key resource identification and protection.

14) Identify and describe each mode of transportation and their responsible administrative authorities, threats to their security, and major legislative responses to transportation security threats including potential countermeasures to these security threats.

CA6. Strategic Planning - *the process of defining an organization's strategy (a long term plan of action designed to achieve a particular goal or objective) or direction and making decisions on allocating its resources to pursue this strategy, including its capital, its technology and its human resources.*

15) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of applicable national strategies and plans, including their history, inter-relationships, similarities and differences.

16) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of the strategic planning interface between national, state, and local governments.

17) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of basic principles underlying strategic planning, and identify these principles as they apply to the National Strategy for homeland security.

CA7. Terrorism - *The threat of violence, individual acts of violence, or a campaign of violence designed primarily to instill fear. Terrorism is violence for effect: not only and sometimes not at all for the effect on the actual victims of the terrorists' cause. Fear is the intended effect, not the by-product of terrorism.*

18) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of the history and basic concepts of global terrorism to include groups, ideologies, and underlying causes.

19) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of specific types of terrorism (e.g., state-supported, transnational, domestic, international) including their similarities and differences.

20) An ability to demonstrate knowledge of the conceptual aspects of counter-terrorism, counter-terrorist activities, and outcomes and be able to identify and describe examples of these concepts.

CA8. Strategic Communication – *An effects-based approach of synchronized themes and messages designed to enable the implementation of the national elements of power; to include but limited to diplomatic, intelligence, military, economic, financial, information and law enforcement, toward the accomplishment of national and homeland security objectives.*

> 21) An understanding of interagency communications needs, methods and processes.

> 22) An ability to compose and deliver professional reports, presentations and briefings in order to develop and refine analytical abilities and to demonstrate effective oral and written communication skills.

> 23) An understanding of the national instruments of power and their role in communication and homeland security structures and agencies.

Homeland Security Studies Program Goals

Keeping HSDECA outcome goals and core academic areas in mind, the goals of the Center for the Study of Homeland Security are thus as follows:

1. To provide individual courses as well as an academic certificate and minor in the field of Homeland Security Studies
2. To maintain congruence between course content and Core Area Outcomes as defined by the HSDECA.
3. To develop in certificate students writing and communication skills that are directly exportable to a real-world circumstance and professional career environment.
4. To develop in minor students skills in higher order thinking such as critical thinking and knowledge, and to properly socialize students into a professional mindset
5. To develop in all students an understanding of the methods and ideas behind homeland security, defense, and application.

Expected Student Learning Outcomes

In order to assess the effectiveness of instruction and student learning as it pertains to meeting these General and Core criteria, the following Student Learning Outcomes are defined and assessed on an annual basis by the Director of the Center for the Study of Homeland Security:

1. Knowledge: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of: intelligence and counter-intelligence concepts; legal and constitutional principles pertaining to homeland and national security policy; strategic planning interfaces between national, state, and local governments; conceptual aspects of terrorism and counter-terrorism; and understand basic inter-agency communication needs, methods, and processes.

2. Writing: Students will be able to construct and present coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments or discussions pertaining to topics on homeland security.

3. CriticalThinking: Students will be able to: recognize issues that are pertinent to homeland security; question issue validity; develop logically sound arguments pertaining to said issues; and evaluate sources of evidence pertaining to the issue (including contrary and supporting evidence).

4. Communication: Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings.

Because the Certificate is subsumed within the Minor, the goals of the certificate program contribute to the overall educational experience and goals of the minor. The Certificate SLO's are thus assessed independently and in conjunction with the SOL's of the Minor. The two programs are thus assessed simultaneously, but with different SOL's in mind. The primary distinction springs from the need of certification students to learn immediately applicable skills, while minors master skills of higher order thinking. The Certificate program and Minor will be assessed on the following annual cycle:

2013-14:	Certificate SOL:	Writing/Communication,
	Minor SOL:	Critical Thinking
2014-15:	Certificate SOL:	Writing/Communication,
	Minor SOL:	Knowledge
2015-16:	Certificate SOL:	Writing/Communication
	Minor SOL:	Critical Thinking
2016-17:	Certificate SOL:	Writing/Communication
	Minor SOL:	Knowledge

The manner in which these Student Learning Outcomes are assessed is addressed in the following section.

AssessmentMethodsandResults

Program faculty are primarily adjunct instructors with professional training in relevant fields. The CSHS Director meets annually with faculty to compare intended learning outcomes with student performances in each of the three Certificate program courses

(all offered annually). Course and program curricula are reviewed to evaluate alignment of individual course goals, content, and instructional methods with the overall program goals and outcomes.

Assessment will be conducted via a combination or written assignments, presentations/briefings, and in-class group presentations. This combination allows for the assessment of two SLO's (Writing and Communication) at the same time, something which is necessary given the pace of the certificate program. Students will be expected to present key findings on best practices in published literature and cases histories, apply theoretical concepts to current events and case studies, and to demonstrate pre-professional skills in developing effective written work and live presentations.

These assignments will be read and observed by the Director of the Center for the Study of Homeland Security. Utilizing an established rubric, the Director will record independent scores based off of both the submitted research papers and the presentations which constitute each students portfolio. The Director then submits a report of the assessment findings, as well as any related action plans, to the chair of the Department of History and Political Science and the Political Science Program coordinator, the Dean of CHASS, as well as the Assistant Provost for Assessment and Student Learning. The CSHS director holds primary responsibility for ongoing program assessment activities as well as for revision of the plan itself.

To ascertain the level of student proficiency, students must be minimally proficient in all core areas to receive the degree or certification that connote pre-professional competence. The expectation is that 80% of students achieve the level of "proficient, with few scoring either "exemplary", "emerging" or "not present."

To obtain the Minor students must successfully complete all six courses with the Political Science departmental standard of a grade of C or better. Students will not pass key courses for certification without demonstrating proficiency.

DisseminationofProgramGoalsandOutcomes

The CSHS director will meet with course instructors at least once per year to determine whether changes should be made to individual course syllabi based on student learning outcome results. The director will discuss assessment data at scheduled semester Political Science Program meetings for analysis and recommendations.

To inform the public and the university community at large, written accounts of current program goals, expected student outcomes, and assessment activities are published in the Colorado State University-Pueblo Catalog. The CSHS Director will provide program faculty with written copies of the goals, outcomes, and curriculum map. Descriptions of

program activities are provided prior to the awarding of Certificates at the annual Political Science Forum.

Curriculum(9credithournon-transcriptedCertificate,18credithourMinor)

Students will receive, upon the completion of POLSC 270, 271, 272, a non-transcripted Certificate in Homeland Security Studies that is awarded by the Political Science Program, which also independently maintains student records for this award. The three courses for the Certificate correspond to state-approved curriculum adopted by UCCS for its homeland security certificate program.

In order to receive a Minor in Homeland Security Studies, students must complete POLSC 270, 271, 272, 373, 374, and 375.

Required courses that incorporate core student learning outcomes (SLOs):

1. *Introduction to Homeland Security*, (POLSC 270) 3 credits
An overview of homeland security and key threats and responses. Major topics addressed include the structure of the Department of Homeland Security and its relation to member, state, and local agencies; strategic and military approaches to countering threats; legal elements; and the role of government-private sector partnerships.

2. *Terrorism*, (POLSC 271) 3 credits
An examination of extremist groups and private violence in the context of domestic monitoring, prevention, and response. Areas of emphasis will include recruitment and law enforcement vs. military approaches to counter-terrorism.

3. *Critical Incident Management*, (POLSC 272) 3 credits
The policies and practices of local first responders, inter-agency relationships, specific threats including infrastructure failure, natural disasters, political violence, and unconventional weapons.

4. Intelligence and National Security (POLSC 373) 3 credits
How does the Intelligence community operate and what is its role in homeland security? This course examines inter-agency relations as well as practical and political elements of domestic intelligence-gathering.

5. Homeland Security and the Law (POLSC 374) 3 credits
This course explores the legal and constitutional aspects of homeland security and homeland defense. Topics include appropriate role of civil liberties, and sources of authority and constraint for practitioners.

6. Threat and Strategic Planning (POLSC 375) 3 credits
Topics include the development of threat assessment and planning, public-private sector resource partnering, and crisis communications.

See attached curriculum map for relation of curriculum to outcomes

Curriculum Map

- Course Designations:
  - 270 – Introduction to Homeland Security Studies
  - 271 – Terrorism
  - 272 – Critical Incident Management
  - 373 – Intelligence and National Security
  - 374 – Homeland Security and the Law
  - 375 – Threat and Strategic Planning

Homeland Security Program SLOs	270	271	272	373	374	375
Knowledge: Students will be able to demonstrate knowledge of: intelligence and counter-intelligence concepts; legal and constitutional principles pertaining to homeland and national security policy; strategic planning interfaces between national, state, and local governments; conceptual aspects of terrorism and counter-terrorism; and understand basic inter-agency communication needs, methods, and processes.	I	I	I	E	E	E
Writing: Students will be able to construct and present coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments or discussions pertaining to topics on homeland security.	I	E	E	E	E	E
CriticalThinking: Students will be able to: recognize issues that are pertinent to homeland security; question issue validity; develop logically sound arguments pertaining to said issues; and evaluate sources of evidence pertaining to the issue (including contrary and supporting evidence).	I	I	I	E	E	E
Communication: Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings.	I	E	I	E	E	E

ItemizedChangestoAssessmentPlan

- May 2013:
  1. Assessments section amended to reflect more closely the means of annual assessment (i.e., written paper and verbal presentation).
  2. Courses listed in curriculum specified as "270, 271, 272" to remove ambiguity from student expectations for completion.
  3. Curriculum description expanded to include courses necessary for completion of minor.
  4. Curriculum map description refined.
  5. "Goals and Student Learning Outcomes" final paragraph clarified to represent restructured section on General/Core Outcomes and Student Learning Outcomes.
  6. "Undergraduate Degree General Outcomes (HSDECA a-i)" edited to reflect HSDECA acronym.
  7. "Core Area (CA) Outcomes (HSDECA 1-23)" edited for formatting
  8. "Student Learning Outcomes" section added. This addition was made to reflect changes to the 2013-2014 CSU-Pueblo Catalog on program Student Learning Outcomes.
  9. "Curriculum" section relocated to end of document.
  10. Curriculum Map learning outcome for POLSC 271, Terrorism, "Compose and deliver professional reports, presentations and briefings" changed from "E" to "I" to better reflect the courses 200 level expectations.
  11. Assessment method adjusted. The phrase: "In addition to faculty assessments, in-class written evaluations are collected from all students on the final day of class" has been removed. This action was taken because the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes by the program director and outside faculty is reflective of instructor ability. With the addition of student feedback via anonymous online evaluations, and annual consultations between the Director and faculty, these written evaluations are viewed as redundant.
  12. Assessment method adjusted. The phrase: "In addition to faculty assessments, in-class written evaluations are collected from all students on the final day of class" has been removed. This action was taken because the assessment of Student Learning Outcomes by the program director and outside faculty is reflective of instructor ability. With the addition of student feedback via anonymous online evaluations, and annual consultations

between the Director and faculty, these written evaluations are viewed as redundant.

13. Assessment method adjusted. The phrase: "The CSHS director will meet with course instructors at least once per semester" has been appended to "at least once per year." This is because it is not possible to meet every semester given that assessment only occurs once per year. The program director will meet with all faculty once per year following assessment to update instructors on outcomes and future goals and revisions.

- May 2014
  1. Annual cycle for SLO adjusted to reflect short term nature of certificate program and long term nature of minor, as well as goals of the certificate program being separate from the minor. This change was recommended in 2012-13 and allows for the assessment of multiple SLO's at the same time.
  2. Mission statement updates to more accurately reflect the relationship between the program and the missions of both the university and department.
  3. Assessment Methods and Results section updates to reflect a newly included metric of "expected achievement level" and to incorporate means of assessment that are more expansive than simply written work. This includes the addition of a student portfolio monitoring procedure, newly implemented for certificate students, that allows the director to identify student strengths and weakness early in the program, so as to provide clarity for how the students needs can best be addressed moving forward.
  4. A new section was added to the plan: Dissemination of Program Goals and Outcomes. This helps to better delineate the manner in which the program director will incorporate the findings of the annual assessment into the curriculum with both the faculty, and public.
  5. Numerous passages have been eliminated that give reference to the minor bring in it's first year.
  6. Curriculum map revised to reflect recommendations made in 2012-13 that it should include SLOs that are assessed directly as opposed to alternative technical SLOs. This adjustment also reflects the revised program SLO's made in 2013-14.
  7. Program goals have been revised so as to maintain consistency with the HSDECA, but to also focus on the purpose of the assessment.

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2013-14   Due: June 2, 2014
Program:HomelandSecurityStudies(Minor)   Date: 5/15/2014
Completed by: StevenLiebel,PhD(ProgramDirector)
Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): _____

Please complete this form for eachundergraduate,minor,certificate,andgraduateprogram (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 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx. Thank you.

Please describe the 2013-2014 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2014-2015 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2013-2014 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2012-2013. Thank you.

I. 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(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of t 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 program are planned based on this assessment?
Critical Thinking. From the SLO statement: *Students will be able to: recognize issues that are pertinent to homeland security; question issue validity; develop logically sound arguments pertaining to said issues; and evaluate sources of evidence pertaining to the issue (including contrary and supporting evidence).*	The 2012-13 Academic year was the first year for the Homeland Security minor. In that year, the Communication SLO was assessed. This is thus the first year Critical Thinking has been assessed as an SLO.	The program director observed and participated in student directed in-class simulations of intelligence cycle analysis and briefings. This simulation is done within an advanced course. In doing so, the director observed student led intelligence briefings, received a proposed course of action based on the analysis of data pertaining to the issue, and led a Q&A session on the briefing. The director then evaluated each student participating in the briefing. See critical thinking	14 students from the Spring term 300 level Intelligence course were sampled. 14 students constitutes every student in the course.	As per the programs assessment plan, 80% of students should perform at or above "proficient" for each SLO. With 14 students in the assessment pool, 12 should achieve at or above proficiency. Notably, because 14 students are in the class, every student score impacts the courses achievement level significantly. The difference between 12 students reaching "proficient" and 11	11 of 14 students met the expectation of proficiency for critical thinking,	Critical Thinking: Strengths – Students consistently displayed an ability to present accurate evidence in support of their assigned issue and chosen argument. Students competently evaluated alternative perspectives in coming to decisions. Weaknesses – During question and answer sessions it is clear that when presented with original material or contrary perspectives/arguments several students were unable to clearly defend their arguments.	The primary challenge to the students came not from providing evidence or doing quality research, but from having a thorough enough knowledge to participate in a spontaneous question and answer session. In part, we attribute this to the fact that this simulation briefing **was** sprung on the students with the intent to assess how they perform within the intelligence cycle on short notice. Thus, when accounting for the fact that we intentionally presented a new obstacle of shortened time to prepare, they did quite well. In total, the

		rubric attached at end of document.		is equal to 85% of the students versus 78%, respectively. Given this large disparity brought about by individual student scores, and the proximity of 78% to 80%, is deemed acceptable that 11 or 12 students reaching proficiency is considered achievement of expected outcomes.			performance of the students throughout the briefings evidences the strength of the program in training students to collect data and develop/present arguments professionally. Because the class performed at the expected outcome level, adjustments are primarily focused on the area of difficulty, question and answer. To remedy this, the program will move to emphasize depth of knowledge in individual students. This can be accomplished by more closely following the level of work input by individual students throughout the simulations multi-week duration.

Comments:

Critical Thinking:

To meet the expectation of 80% proficiency, 11 of 14 students must attain said level (78%), 12 if one wants to be stringent and attain 85% proficiency. Upon assessing all students according to the same communication rubric, 11 achieved proficiency. This is at the necessary level. The primary factor that contributed to three students not meeting proficiency came as a result of their inability to defend their position on the fly in a rapid question and answer session following their intelligence briefing. These students were thus categorized as being "emerging" in the area of critical thinking.

There are remedies for this situation. However, we must first be sure this is the only area of concern. Because the class performed well in terms of presentation of evidence and assessing multiple sources of evidence for alternative perspectives (both areas directly assessed on the rubric), the primary area of focus must be on providing students the tools to be more responsive to circumstances that parallel a real-world environment. As noted in the assessment for the certificate program, students are capable of doing quality research and communicating it well in a briefing. The issue in the certificate classes is, in fact, an inability to connect concepts with theories. Higher order processes. In the advanced Intelligence class this difficulty developing arguments is not present. This would indicate that students are successfully developing critical thinking skills as they advance through the program. That established, we must tailor our focus on providing these students tools to engage a critical audience more effectively by emphasizing masterly of concepts and information.

One potential remedy for this circumstance, and one that we believe will be fruitful, is to more closely monitor the process students are individually going through to produce their intelligence briefing. This would necessitate an increased level of monitoring by the professor to assure that students are mastering their respective research assignment. Monitoring could potentially take the form of students submitting several small documents indicating both the current status of research, as well as any issues that have presented themselves.

Of note, it bears repeating that this intelligence briefing is a real-world scenario. As a consequence, students were intentionally given a shorter time period to prepare their briefing than they originally expected. We believe that under these circumstances they performed quite well. Had they had the fully allotted time, we believe they would have excelled.

II. 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?
Critical Thinking. From the SLO statement: *Students will be able to: recognize issues that are pertinent to homeland security; question issue validity; develop logically sound arguments pertaining to said issues; and evaluate sources of evidence pertaining to the issue (including contrary and supporting evidence).*	The 2012-13 Academic year was the first year for the Homeland Security minor. In that year, the Communication SLO was assessed. This is thus the first year Critical Thinking has been assessed as an SLO.	The 2012-13 Academic year was the first year for the Homeland Security minor. In that year, the Communication SLO was assessed. This is thus the first year critical thinking has been assessed as an SLO and there were no previous recommendations directed squarely at Critical Thinking. The only recommendations that are generally applicable from the Communication SLO feedback were to increase the number of students within the assessment sample and to provide more time for individual presentations.	While not directly applicable given the differences in assessment topic, we believe the recommendations of 2012-13 can inform the critical thinking SLO for 2013-14. To incorporate the 2012-13 feedback, every student within the Intelligence class participated in the exercise and assessment. Further, briefings were not limited in the amount of time they had to present. This allowed students to fully develop their arguments, and participate in a real-world question and answer session.	First, every student participates as an individual metric within the assessment as opposed to a smaller random sample. Second, every student has as much time as necessary to articulate their argument to a critical audience. It bears noting, because critical thinking was not previously assessed, and these adjustments were made without having a prior baseline from which to judge, results from changes cannot be inferred with any validity. Students performed will during their simulations without a time constraint, and the program now has a baseline for determining student development in Critical Thinking.

Comments:

The minor program incorporated assessment recommendations from the communications assessment (2012-13) to increase time for presentation and the size of the sample. We believe these steps have both minimized basic statistical bias, and provided the students a more reasonable period of time to present their argument.

Overall, students performed at the level of proficiency. Issues of concern are no doubt related to the spontaneity of the intelligence briefing assignment. However, it is worth noting, even under duress the students performed well in terms of providing the necessary evidence in support of their arguments.

It is the recommendation of this assessment to more closely observe the progress of students as they perform their research during the simulation. In doing so, students depth of understanding should be increased, and should translate into an increased ability to functionally participate in a professional briefing environment. Monitoring progress can take the form of students submitting numerous smaller papers to the professor, or perhaps student/professor conferences.

Homeland Security Studies Minor
Colorado State University--Pueblo
Critical Thinking Rubric

Intended student learning outcome assessed with this rubric:
- *Students will be able to: recognize issues that are pertinent to homeland security; question issue validity; develop logically sound arguments pertaining to said issues; and evaluate sources of evidence pertaining to the issue (including contrary and supporting evidence).*

Student work assessed:
- Case study analysis and intelligence cycle briefings

Critical Thinking	Exemplary:	Proficient:	Emerging:	Not Present:
A. Evidence	Marshalls *relevant* data in support of argument(s). *Accurately* interprets data and evidence	Marshalls data of *some relevance* in support of argument(s). *Usually accurate* interpretation of data and evidence	Data and evidence *are not fully relevant* or in short supply. *Misinterprets* data and evidence	
B. Points of View	*Thoughtfully* and *clearly* analyzes and evaluates *relevant* alternative points of view	*Provides* an analysis and evaluation of relevant alternative points of view	Evaluates alternative points of view only *superficially,* and/or considers alternatives that are not fully relevant	
C. Question and Answer Period	Provides a *thorough* justification of conclusions, *clearly* explains rationales and assumptions	*Provides* a justification of conclusions, explains rationales and assumptions	Conclusions are *not clearly justified,* and/or assumptions are not explained	