

Colorado State University - Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016**Due:** June 1, 2016**Program:** Homeland Security Studies (minor)**Date:** May 10, 2016**Completed by:** Steven Liebel, PhD (Program Director)**Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's 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, 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, 2016. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.csupueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2015-2016 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2016-2017 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2015-2016 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2014-2015. 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? 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?

<p>Critical Thinking:</p> <p><i>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></p>	Spring 2014	<p>Assessing in-class simulations of intelligence cycle analysis and briefings. This simulation is done within an advanced course. The simulations include student led intelligence briefings, a proposed course of action based on the analysis of data pertaining to the issue, and a Q&A session on the briefing.</p> <p>See critical thinking rubric attached at end of document.</p>	22 students from the Spring term 300 level Intelligence course were sampled. 22 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 22 students in the assessment pool, 18 should achieve at or above proficiency.	18 of 22 students met the expectation of proficiency for critical thinking,	<p>Critical Thinking: Strengths – Students displayed an ability to present evidence in support of their assigned issue area. Students evaluated alternative perspectives and worked in teams to analyze their situation and develop prescriptions for action.</p> <p>Weaknesses – Students generally performed well. Those students who did not were either not in attendance for their portion of the presentation, or did not participate to a great degree.</p>	<p>The primary challenge to this exercise and assessment was overall student participation. The overwhelming majority of students participated, and those who did, did very well. However, a number of students were not present and therefore did not contribute to the exercise. Because the class performed at the expected outcome level, adjustments are primarily focused on adjusting metrics for simulation participation.</p>
--	-------------	---	---	--	---	--	--

Comments:

Critical Thinking

To meet the expectation of 80% proficiency, 18 of 22 students must attain said level. Upon assessing all students according to the same critical thinking rubric, 18 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 absence from class or lack of preparation in class. While the majority of students performed highly in all other aspects of the simulation, in particular those who were present those who did not meet requirements were largely driven by participation/attendance driven issues.

There are remedies for this situation. The primary area of focus must be on getting students to engage in the presentation aspects of the simulated intelligence cycle. Given that 20% of the students grade is determined through participation in the briefing, and 10% through participation, it is clear that this is a necessary exercise to be taken seriously. There should thus be additional emphasis on student participation driven by the instructor, and possibly an increase in the overall grade related to this process.

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?
<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.</i></p>	<p>Critical thinking was last assessed in 2013-14. In 2014-15, Knowledge was assessed.</p>	<p>The immediately prior assessment was on knowledge (2014-15), called for closer monitoring of knowledge related to interaction between local laws and federal authority. That is not relevant to the intelligence cycle analysis exercise monitored here. The most recent assessment on critical thinking (2013-14) called for Individual students to be monitored more closely so as to facilitate deeper knowledge of material on an individual basis.</p>	<p>The recommendation on critical thinking from 2013-14 was not acted upon. The 2013-14 assessment, the last covering critical thinking, indicated that the majority of students performed well on the assessment. The only area of weakness was a brief post intelligence analysis cycle presentation question and answer session. Revamping a semesters worth of instruction based on five minutes where multiple students compete to speak, is excessive. Students performed well across the board on other areas of exploration, and that should be retained. The 2014-15 assessment on knowledge was not relevant to this assessment year.</p>	<p>Because the changes from 2013-14 were not implemented given their relevance to an issue specific to another course section, there are no results to report. In 2016-17, there will likely be results to report on the order of the second cycle of the knowledge SLO. Knowledge will be further enhanced through more intricate discussion of the relationship between state and federal laws.</p>

Comments:

The minor program did not incorporate assessment recommendations from the knowledge cycle (2014-15) because the assessment outcome was on topical material specifically related to a class exercise from a different course. Thus, that material was not germane to the class exercise under assessment for 2015-16. Further, the last time that critical thinking was assessed (2013-14), the outcome suggested that student participation could be enhanced within the intelligence cycle briefing. Upon consideration of this, it was ultimately decided not to pursue a large change. The fact that the majority of students met or exceeded SLO expectation indicates that they “get it”. Further, taking time away from something that is clearly getting through to the overwhelming majority of students and using that time to address what is at most a minor issue, could lead to more significant challenges down the road. In particular, this could create a problem where there isn’t one (related to anything outside of the post cycle question and answer session), over an issue that was relatively minor (the short five-ten minute team led question and answer session following the presentation).

In 2016-17, there will likely be changes implemented following the recommendations of the 2014-15 knowledge assessment, which will come up again for assessment.

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