

**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 2015.

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-transcribed 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.

Goals and Student Learning Outcomes

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. Critical Thinking: 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.

Assessment Methods and Results

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 of 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.

Dissemination of Program Goals and Outcomes

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 (9 credit hour non-transcripted Certificate, 18 credit hour Minor)

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
Critical Thinking: 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

Itemized Changes to Assessment Plan

- 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.

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. 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 2014-2015 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2015-2016 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2014-2015 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2013-2014. 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 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>Knowledge.</p> <p>From the SLO statement:</p> <p><i>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></p>	<p>The 2012-13 Academic year was the first year for the Homeland Security minor. In that year, the Communication SLO was assessed. In 2013-14 Critical Thinking was assessed. This is thus the first year Knowledge has been assessed as an SLO.</p>	<p>The program director observed and participated in student directed in-class table-top simulation of threat response and management. This simulation is done within an advanced course. In doing so, the director observed student led responses to emergencies, witnessed multiple proposed courses of action based on the analysis of data pertaining to the issue, and participated in a Q&A session following the simulation. The director then evaluated each student participating in the simulation.</p> <p>See Knowledge rubric attached at end of</p>	<p>16 students from the Spring term 300 level Threat and Strategic Planning course were sampled. 16 students constitutes every student in the course.</p>	<p>As per the programs assessment plan, 80% of students should perform at or above "proficient" for each SLO. With 16 students in the assessment pool, 13 should achieve at or above proficiency. Notably, because 16 students are in the class, every student score impacts the courses achievement level significantly. The difference between 13 students reaching "proficient" and 12 is equal to 81% of the students versus 75%.</p>	<p>12 of 16 students met the expectation of proficiency for knowledge.</p>	<p>Knowledge:</p> <p>Strengths – Students consistently displayed an understanding of the resources granted them in the face of pending emergencies. Students competently discussed alternatives amongst themselves before choosing a course of action.</p> <p>Weaknesses – It is clear that students are often unable to delineate boundaries of authority in terms of action-response.</p>	<p>The primary challenge to the students came not from having a deep enough background of the choices available to them once an emergency manifests, but from having a sufficient knowledge of the boundaries of action each option faces. In particular, this is a legal discussion, whose jurisdiction ends where, etc. We attribute this to the fact that the students were given a relatively short time to prepare themselves for the live-action emergency simulation. While they had undergone a significant number of challenges throughout the semester, all of which are designed to prepare students for emergency</p>

		document.		respectively. Given this large range brought about by variance in individual student scores, and the proximity of 75% to 80%, it is deemed acceptable that 12 or 13 students reach proficiency, which is considered achievement of expected outcomes.			<p>response, the first live action simulation is purely a learning vehicle.</p> <p>In total, the performance of the students in the simulation evidences the strength of the program in training students to research options, choose among them rationally, and execute a course of action decisively. Because the class performed at the expected outcome level, adjustments are primarily focused on the area of difficulty, assessing boundaries of jurisdiction. To remedy this, the program will consider moving to emphasize additional points of discussion that are relevant to legal boundaries in the traditional sections of the semester.</p>
--	--	-----------	--	---	--	--	--

Comments:

Knowledge:

To meet the expectation of 80% proficiency (defined in accordance with the above note of single student impact), 12 of 16 students must attain said level (75%), 13 if one wants to be stringent and attain 81% proficiency. Upon assessing all students according to the same knowledge rubric, 12 achieved proficiency. This is at the necessary level. The primary factor that contributed to four students not meeting proficiency came as a result of their inability to articulate and defend their recommendations for particular responses to an emergency in regards to jurisdictional boundaries. While they performed strongly in all other aspects of the simulation, these students were thus categorized as being "emerging" in the area of knowledge.

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 organization, collaboration, and action-response, the primary area of focus must be on providing students the tools to be more engaged with real-world limitations of power through jurisdiction. 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 a continuing one, and is difficulty connecting concepts with theories. In the advanced threat and strategic planning class this difficulty developing arguments and taking a position for action is not present. This would indicate that students are successfully developing knowledge as they advance through the program. That established, we must tailor our focus on providing these students with more granular knowledge that should be exercised in a real-world scenario.

One potential remedy for this circumstance, and one that we believe is both simple to address and will be useful in the long-term, is to incorporate topics related to both vertical and horizontal authority structures into the normal semester teaching.

Of note, it bears repeating that this emergency simulation is a real-world scenario. As a consequence, students were intentionally given a short time period to prepare their simulation and action-response. We believe that under these circumstances they performed quite well. Had they had more 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?
<p>Knowledge.</p> <p>From the SLO statement:</p> <p><i>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></p>	<p>The 2012-13 Academic year was the first year for the Homeland Security minor. In that year, the Communication SLO was assessed. In 2013-14 Critical Thinking was assessed. This is thus the first year Knowledge has been assessed as an SLO.</p>	<p>The 2012-13 Academic year was the first year for the Homeland Security minor. In that year, the Communication SLO was assessed. In 2013-14 Critical Thinking was assessed. This is thus the first year knowledge has been assessed as an SLO and there were no previous recommendations directed squarely at knowledge.</p> <p>The only recommendations that are generally applicable from the Critical Thinking SLO feedback were to document if students in the class were in fact minors or simply taking the class as an elective, so as to identify if the class is capturing the programs growth, or if it is spurious.</p>	<p>We believe the recommendations of 2013-14 can inform the knowledge SLO for 2013-14.</p> <p>To incorporate the 2013-14 feedback, students were identified as a minor or not. 15 of 16 students in this class are homeland security minors, so we are confident that the results displayed herein in terms of growth from certificate level to minor are in some way attributable to the program itself.</p>	<p>The results of this suggested change were to validate the assessment mechanism itself, not necessarily to alter the behavior of students. As a result, visible changes are not present, but there has been supportive evidence collected to indicate that the assessment is in fact collecting information that is useful as an assessment mechanism.</p> <p>It bears noting, because knowledge 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 well during their simulations without a time constraint, and the program now has a baseline for determining student development in knowledge.</p>

Comments:

The minor program incorporated assessment recommendations from the critical thinking assessment (2013-14) to identify if the assessment is capturing the growth of intra-program students, or students in the class as an elective, and therefore, not capturing the growth of program students. In doing so, we believe we have provided evidence to support the argument that our assessment has, this year, accurately captured intra-program development.

Overall, students performed at the level of proficiency. Issues of concern are no doubt related to the short time allowed to plan for the simulation assignment. However, it is worth noting, even under duress the students performed well in terms of basic planning and response.

It is the recommendation of this assessment to integrate standard course materials on the subject of jurisdiction and authority between emergency responders on the local, state, and federal level. In doing so, students depth of knowledge should be increased, and should translate into an increased ability to functionally participate in a professional environment.

**Homeland Security Studies Minor
Colorado State University--Pueblo
Knowledge Rubric**

Intended student learning outcome assessed with this rubric:

- 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.*

Student work assessed:

- Live-action emergency response simulation

Knowledge	Exemplary:	Proficient:	Emerging:	Not Present:
A. Comprehension	<i>Full and comprehensive understanding of concepts and arguments</i>	Understanding of concepts and arguments are <i>present</i> but <i>lack full clarity</i> and development	<i>Minimal</i> understanding of concepts and arguments	
B. Breadth of Knowledge	<i>Analyzes and evaluates relevant points of view from multiple sources</i>	<i>Attempts analysis</i> and evaluation of relevant alternative points of view	<i>Superficially presents</i> alternative points of view only, and/or considers alternatives that are not fully relevant	
C. Application	Provides a <i>clear and well directed</i> choice based on evidence with an <i>understanding</i> of ramifications of choices	Provides a decision <i>occasionally</i> based on evidence, with <i>limited understanding</i> of ramifications of choices	Decisions <i>do not</i> evidence clarity or deep understanding of ramifications from choices	