

Honor 102 Research Paper Rubric – Spring 2014

Factor	5 (Outstanding)	4 (Very Good)	3 (Adequate)	2 (Needs Attention)	1 (Not Acceptable)
Preparation, Organization, Sources Cited	Paper includes topic focus summary. Is complete, thorough & narrowed to key question or issue. Obvious attention to research elements results in coherent, well-organized discussion of topic. Title page and other requirements are complete according to assignment. The number and quality of citations exceeds minimum required. Proper use of end notes and in text citations.	Generally strong organization and thoroughness, but some omissions or unprofessional appearance weakens overall presentation of topic. Some organizational errors or missing citations. Citations correctly formatted and attributed, but may not be complete in every respect.	Organized, but paper is missing some a key organizational thread, or citations, or utilizes limited sources. The paper appears incomplete or rushed to completion. Lack of student thoughtfulness limits overall value. Incomplete development of some sections weakens the conclusions drawn. Adequate citations, but errors in formatting and end notes.	Topic shows some development, but paper itself is disorganized and poorly crafted. Limited or missing citations, conclusion, or transitions that is not of the quality expected of an honors student. Formatting and in text citation errors confuse reader.	Obvious lack of preparation; Incomplete and poorly crafted. Topic not developed, organization is weak or convoluted. No conclusion or unclear in presentation. Minimal or no citations, poor formatting of end notes and in text usage—or significant inconsistencies. Work not appropriate for honors student work.
Communication & Writing Mechanics	Excellent, clear, polished, and edited writing throughout. College level discourse and discussion revealed through good use of English grammar, spelling, writing mechanics and punctuation. Writing guidelines followed and consistent throughout.	Generally strong writing. Evidence of thoughtful development and clear presentation of arguments and ideas. Some writing mechanics issues, but not significant enough to detract from reader's comprehension. Occasional errors in spelling or punctuation.	Clear but not polished writing. Average discussion and commentary, but lacks editing, attention to writing mechanics or writing flow. Some inconsistencies make value limited. A number of spelling and punctuation errors.	Inconsistent writing resulting in lack of clarity and meaning. Spotty discussion obvious and a lack of review to edit or proof the work. Numerous mechanical errors. Not college level work.	Poor writing throughout resulting in poor communication with reader. Numerous writing or mechanical errors, obvious lack of flow and maturity of writing skill. Not college level work and not honors quality at any level.
Content	Paper reflects the assignment requirements and the topic theme in the Syllabus, including a focus on critical thinking & research. Content research is outstanding and the paper shows growth and development of ideas throughout the semester. Content reflects the research cited as well as student's thinking and reasoning skills. Topical and relevant.	Paper reflects assigned elements, Including a focus on critical thinking & research, but content does not go beyond the scope of the assignment. Use of citations and end notes support the arguments presented, but conclusion may not follow as closely. Strongly developed relevance topic to content.	Paper content is basically on point, but lacks specificity, examples or a focus that shows careful thought or reasoning. The scope of the assignment is limited. Very few examples or threads to pull together varied ideas or sources. Relationship between theme and content is clear.	Paper lacks any focus above and beyond the basic assignment. Ideas are simple and underdeveloped or overly generalized. Limited use of sources and/or overdependence on a single source. Relationship between topic and content unclear.	Content does not reflect assignment, lacks research, is limited in scope or clarity. No focus on relationships among sources, topic assignment or the content is evident. Content inappropriate or misinformed at one or more levels. Content does not add to our knowledge of the topic.
Citations Research Conclusion	Student used sources appropriate to topic idea. May have used classmate suggestions or comments. Interpreted readings critically and utilized sources to develop a strong set of arguments. Conclusion present and clearly stated. Student was created in using a mix of sources.	Good research, citations used to enhance development of ideas and were interpreted appropriate to their use in the paper. Evidence of thoughtful consideration of sources through arguments presented and conclusion. Student used feedback to enhance overall paper development.	Some creative thought and development but limited to occasional comments rather than to the paper as a whole. Sources add minimal new information to paper or are interpreted in narrow ways. Overall research evidence is vague or limited. Conclusion poorly stated or unclear in some way.	Citations missing, poorly used, unclear or duplicative. Limited sources may result in shallow research evidence overall. Conclusion missing or unclear—or may not follow from arguments presented. Opinions replace arguments or research.	No evidence of real research. Paper heavily based on opinions, unsupported statements or overly simplified thinking. Citations missing or misused. Conclusion missing or improperly aligned with previous arguments. Conclusion based on personal opinions or beliefs rather than critical thought.

Program: University Honors Program

Date: June 2, 2014

Completed by: Patricia Bowie Orman, Ph.D. , Acting Director

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Marc Pratarelli, Derek Lopez

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 submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me 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/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

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.

*****Note: This assessment is based on student learning outcomes drafted by two UHP directors, and includes some comparative work from Fall 2013, but most of the analysis of SLO activity is based on one semester, Spring 2014. Please see COMMENTS section.**

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? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the 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.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of 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?
---	---	--	---	--	---	--	--

SLO #2: Interdisciplinary Learning: When promoted, did the student connect examples, facts, or theories from more than one field of study of perspective as part of an argumentative work, e.g., their research paper or in-class discussions and recitations?	To my knowledge, this SLO was not previously addressed as a singular outcome for review. (In 2013, the five SLOs for Honors were addressed as a unit because it was the first assessment report submitted.)	Research papers (Fall 2013 and Spring 2014) plus assigned Blackboard thought questions and in-class discussion based on in-class speakers and TED lectures. (See rubric attached.)	First year Honors students* who enrolled in both Honor 101 (Fall 2013) and Honor 102 (Spring 2014). Fall 2013: N= 43 Spring 2014: N=42 *Included students who completed the major paper for both classes, not the official enrollments for the course.	No expected achievement levels were established for this cohort, however, based on this population, I presume that 85-90% of students would meet or exceed a minimum level of performance.	Research paper comparisons permitted an opportunity to observe integration and analysis of learning, plus writing ability to communicate ideas. Based on one reader results, 85% were able to use course materials to extrapolate ideas from learning models to their own disciplinary areas. See comments below.	The acting director's conclusion—based on materials screened and discussions with other faculty—is one of positivity. In short, these students have skills, talents, and abilities that need to be further tapped through interdisciplinary approaches.	A new, full-time UHP director should have multiple opportunities to align in-Honors programs with elective courses available. One suggestion would be to create a standard syllabus item that would address one or more assessment items specifically in each minor course offered—with the exception of the Thesis course which serves its own purposes.

Comments: The aggregate approach taken in the 2012-2013 academic year was likely appropriate for a first assessment report, and as each of the outcomes is assessed, specific changes in each of the required honors courses, more integration of new ideas and learning options can align. As these students come to the program from more than a dozen majors, the importance of integrating critical thinking and interdisciplinary learning are primary. See comments below as well.

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? Please indicate the semester and year.	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 previous assessment report combined five outcomes into one outcome analysis, so no specific SLO is isolated here.	SLO #2 was addressed this year to complete the two first-seminar courses and to provide benchmark materials for future assignments.	Unknown.	Several course number and topical changes were advanced to the Curriculum Committee in September 2013. All changes were accepted, but none of these changes will be implemented until Fall 2014.	As noted in the comments above, more specific attention to a curriculum map and specific assessment activities would enhance the year to year assessment process.

Comments: Because the University Honors Program has yet to graduate a cohort, AY 2014-15 is a benchmark year as the first round of Honors thesis students develop their research for presentation to the program and the University community. Further, a new director has been appointed to begin duties on July 1, 2014. That individual will likely re-write the assessment plan to accommodate a number of course changes made during 2013-2014. Other important items to document in 2014-15:

- The role of the Honors thesis process, use of faculty mentors, construction of documents and presentations and the Honors symposium scheduled for Spring 2015 should be assessed now that a full cycle of students will have completed the minor.
- New course requirements (with an Honor prefix) and electives in major disciplines need further examination and support.
- A non-Honors recommended curriculum, offered on a rotating basis, might be useful for planning in UHP and in individual departments/programs that support honors courses.