

**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 2017.

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 coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments 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:

**Homeland Security Studies Minor/Certificate Program Assessment Plan Summary**

**Date Updated: November 2015**

Student Learning Outcome	Measure description (direct or indirect?)	Expected level of student proficiency (definition and percentage)	Timeline or cycle
<p>SLO1 Critical Thinking</p>	<p>Direct measure: 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).</p>	<p>80% of students will score on the assessment rubric at the proficient level.</p>	<p>2 year cycle for Minor (2015-16, 2017-18)</p>
	<p>Indirect measure: Students are required to practice applied thinking through participation in simulations, intelligence cycle analysis, and out of class exercises.</p>		<p>Annually</p>
<p>SLO2 Knowledge</p>	<p>Direct measure: 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.</p>	<p>80% of students will score on the assessment rubric at the proficient level.</p>	<p>2 year cycle for Minor (2016-17, 2018-19)</p>
	<p>Indirect measure: Students are required to display an understanding of historical and politically relevant concepts and arguments through: briefings, written assignments, and group exercises.</p>		<p>Annually</p>



SLO3 Writing	Direct measure: Students will be able to construct coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments pertaining to topics on homeland security.	80% of students will score on the assessment rubric at the proficient level.	2 year cycle for certificate program (2015-16, 2017-18)
	Indirect measure: Students are required to write research papers that encompass background knowledge, independent research, and logical reasoning/order.		Annually
SLO4 Communication	Direct measure: Students will be able to construct, compose, and deliver professional reports, research, and briefings.	80% of students will score on the assessment rubric at the proficient level.	2 year cycle for Minor (2016-17, 2018-19)
	Indirect measure: Students are required to present their research formally to their class as an individual or as a team, and are required to participate in regular class discussion.		Annually

The manner in which these Student Learning Outcomes are assessed is addressed both within the previous table and in more detail 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: written assignments, presentations/briefings, and in-class group presentations. 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 submitted research papers and presentations. 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 as necessary 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 in a timely fashion.

### **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

<b>Homeland Security Program SLOs</b>	<b>270</b>	<b>271</b>	<b>272</b>	<b>373</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>375</b>
<u>Knowledge</u> : 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
<u>Writing</u> : Students will be able to construct and coherent, objective, and well reasoned arguments pertaining to topics on homeland security.	I	E	E	E	E	E
<u>Critical Thinking</u> : 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
<u>Communication</u> : 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.

- November 2015

1. Assessment plan updated to reflect universal formatting.
2. Updated language for writing SLO to reflect 2014-15 assessment suggestions.

- May 2016

1. "Portfolio" terminology removed from section on "Assessment Methods and Results." The portfolio is removed as a monitoring procedure for certificate students.
2. Terminology "At least once per year" in reference to Director communicating with faculty changes to SLOs removed and replaced with "as necessary" within "Dissemination of Program Goals and Outcomes."
3. Terminology "Descriptions of program activities are provided prior to the awarding of Certificates at the annual Political Science Forum" in reference to Director communicating with program faculty, is removed and replaced with "In a timely fashion" within "Dissemination of Program Goals and Outcomes."

4. Updated language for writing SLO to reflect 2014-15 assessment suggestions placed within writing rubric.

- May 2017

1. SLO3 and SLO4 were revised to reflect new bi-annual schedule/cycle.

Writing and Communication will no longer both be assessed every year. They will instead be assessed on a rotating schedule every other year.

1. Language within "Assessment Methods and Results " has be changed to reflect.

Program: Homeland Security Studies (minor)

Date: May 18, 2017

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, 2017. You’ll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.csupueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2016-2017 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2017-2018 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2016-2017 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2015-2016. 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 program are planned based on this assessment?



<p>Knowledge:</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Spring 2015</p>	<p>This assessment is done within an advanced course covering intelligence analysis and national security. The exercise assessed is a simulation of student-group led intelligence briefings, a proposed course of action based on the analysis of data, and a Q&amp;A session on the briefing led by the faculty instructor.</p> <p>See knowledge rubric attached at end of document.</p>	<p>15 students from the Spring term 300 level Intelligence course were sampled. 17 students constitutes every student in the course, but two were unable to participate in the simulation.</p>	<p>As per the programs assessment plan, 80% of students should perform at or above "proficient" for each SLO. With 15 students in the assessment pool, 12 should achieve at or above proficiency.</p>	<p>12 of 15 students met the expectation of proficiency for knowledge,</p>	<p>Knowledge: Strengths – Students showed clear knowledge of the manner by which the intelligence cycle operates, the justifications for its procedures, and effectively executed their required group based simulation.</p> <p>Weaknesses – In general students performed well. However, it bears noting that this is a group exercise and, while difficult to discern without student feedback, appears that only a few individual students did the majority of the work for the whole of the students.</p>	<p>The primary challenge to this exercise and assessment was overall student participation. This is a repeat of previous comments of this exercise from separate SLO assessment. The overwhelming majority of students participated, and those who did, did very well. Because the class performed at an acceptable level by assessment standards, forward momentum must focus on improving overall participation from individuals either in the simulation presentation itself, or in the process of the simulation. This could be done through the development of increased faculty oversight of student throughout the term, or student feedback forms.</p>
--	--------------------	--	--	---	--	---	--

Comments:

Knowledge

To meet the expectation of 80% proficiency, 12 of 15 students must attain said level. 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 three students not meeting proficiency came as a result lack of participation in class, which could be indicative of a lack of their effort and accumulation of knowledge throughout the semester. Those who were present those who did not meet requirements were largely driven by participation/attendance driven issues.

As noted, participation in this exercise has been a challenge in the past. The primary area of focus must be on getting students to engage in the presentation aspects of the simulated intelligence cycle. 20% of the students grade is tied to briefing participation and 10% through semesterly 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 with an increase in oversight so as to eliminate the tendency of students to free-ride.

**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.**

<p>A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</p>	<p>B. When was this SLO last assessed? Please indicate the semester and year.</p>	<p>C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?</p>	<p>D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?</p>	<p>E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<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>Spring 2015</p>	<p>The prior assessment on knowledge (2014-15), called for closer monitoring of knowledge related to interaction between local laws and federal authority. This assessment was performed on a different capstone style simulation that revealed a weakness in knowledge. That weakness is not evident here.</p> <p>Note: there were no recommendations to adjust the homeland security minor from the 2015-16 assessment outside of the assessment plan.</p>	<p>The recommendation on knowledge from 2014-15 was not acted upon. The 2014-15 assessment, the last covering knowledge, indicated that the majority of students performed well on the assessment. The only area of weakness of was an absence in knowledge of legal principles guiding state and federal responses to threats. That is not the same content area as covered in the intelligence simulation. As a result, the instructor (separate from that assessed in 2014-15) was allowed to impart knowledge as they see fit.</p> <p>Note: there were no recommendations to adjust the homeland security minor from the 2015-16 assessment outside of the assessment plan.</p>	<p>Because the changes from 2014-15 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 be a push to implement closer monitoring of students engaged in group projects so as to ensure that all students participate adequately to enhance both their content knowledge and that of those around them.</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 2016-17. This notwithstanding, the last time the Critical Thinking SLO was assessed (2015-16), the outcome suggested that student participation could be enhanced within the intelligence cycle briefing. Upon consideration of this, it appears that this is an issue that could be addressed moving forward regardless of the specific SLO being assessed.

**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:

- Intelligence Analysis Simulation

<b>Knowledge</b>	<b>Exemplary:</b>	<b>Proficient:</b>	<b>Emerging:</b>	<b>Not Present:</b>
<b>A. Comprehension</b>	<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>B. Breadth of Knowledge</b>	<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	
<b>C. Application</b>	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	