

Program: _____ University Honors Program (minor) _____

Date: ___June 1, 2017 _____

Completed by: _____ John O’Connor _

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): _Honors Steering Committee (submitted at fall meeting)_____

Please describe the 2016-2017 assessment activities for your 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 student learning in the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in previous cycles. Thank you.

PART I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning.

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?
<i>SLO 1</i> Students will be able to formulate and develop arguments with sufficient support,	SLO 1 and SLO 3 were last assessed in AY2014-15.	Senior Theses submitted since these SLOs were last assessed were evaluated	Graduating seniors who completed the Honors Program, i.e. those who wrote / defended	Each student should perform at a ‘proficient’ or higher (i.e. ‘exemplary’) level in each	Assessment revealed that students met expectations . That is, 100% of our	The students performed very well on the assessment rubric. Each also received high praise from his/her thesis mentor.	Based solely on the assessment results there is little need to alter the program, but the assessment process more generally has revealed that Honors should consider establishing a

<p>including reasoning, evidence, persuasive appeals, and proper attribution. (Critical thinking)</p> <p><i>SLO 3</i> Students will be able to apply discipline-specific as well as cross-discipline-based knowledge to design, execute, and report on a specific problem-solving strategy. (Independent research, creativity, and scholarship)</p>		<p>against a rubric (enclosed below).</p>	<p>Senior Theses in AY2015-16 and AY2016-17. A total of 9 theses / students were assessed.</p>	<p>category of this SLO. That is, 100% of UHP graduates are expected to be proficient in 'Critical Thinking' and 'Independent Research, Creativity & Scholarship' as measured on the enclosed rubric.</p>	<p>graduating seniors in AY2015-16 and AY2016-17 were 'proficient' or 'exemplary' in SLO 1 and SLO 3.</p>		<p>detailed <i>discipline-independent</i> standard of depth and rigor for the thesis. To this point, the standard has been that the thesis must represent a significant work of undergraduate research/creativity <i>as determined by the standards of the discipline</i>. To be clear, the student work is uniformly strong, but standards vary too widely across campus for the existing standard to be effective.</p> <p>To establish a <i>fair</i> discipline-independent thesis standard for a multi-disciplinary program will be difficult, but the need is now clear. With a new Director taking up the position in July, I'll leave the details to her and the Honors Committee (of which I'll be a member).</p>

Comments:

PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 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><i>SLO 1</i> Students will be able to formulate and develop arguments with sufficient support, including reasoning, evidence, persuasive appeals, and proper attribution. (Critical thinking).</p> <p><i>SLO 3</i> Students will be able to apply discipline-specific as well as cross-discipline-based knowledge to</p>	<p>AY2015-16</p>	<p>Previous assessments show that students perform very well on their theses in general and with respect to these SLOs in particular. However, we noted room to improve on consistent communication of expectations among all parties: student, major program mentor & honors program director.</p>	<p>Yes. With a larger group of seniors this year, the recommendations from two years ago (revised thesis documents, increased clarity on timelines and expectations) were carried forward into this year.</p>	<p>The results were mixed. While student theses are still uniformly strong, and there were no concerns with the assessment of the theses themselves, there is still work to be done. This year's insight regarding <i>discipline-specific vs discipline-independent</i> standards seems to be a helpful avenue to explore. The next step is to work on this issue as articulated above in I.H.</p>

design, execute, and report on a specific problem-solving strategy. (Independent research, creativity, and scholarship)				

Comments:

Following up on last year’s assessment plan revisions, and in light of previous years’ reviewer comments, this year’s revision consists of an updated assessment cycle designed to batch assessment of similar student work. This has the additional benefit of assessing SLO #3 annually, with the senior theses and group projects as samples in alternating years.

Honors Minor
 Colorado State University-Pueblo
 Critical Thinking & Independent Research / Creativity Rubric

Intended learning outcomes assessed with this instrument:

- **SLO #1: Critical Thinking.** Students will be able to formulate and develop arguments with sufficient support—including reasoning, evidence, persuasive appeals, and proper attribution.
- **SLO #3: Independent Research, Creativity, and Scholarship.** Students will be able to apply discipline-specific as well as cross-discipline-based knowledge to design, execute and report on a particular problem-solving strategy.

Student work assessed: Senior thesis

	Exemplary	Proficient	Emerging	Not Present
Formulation of argument (SLO #1)	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>explicit, precisely articulated, and clear.</i>	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>explicit.</i>	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>implied</i> and/or <i>unsophisticated.</i>	
Quality of reasoning in support of conclusion(s) (SLO #1)	Reasoning is <i>good</i> (i.e. strong or valid) and <i>well-explained.</i>	Reasoning is <i>generally good</i> (i.e. strong or valid).	Reasoning is <i>not generally good</i> (i.e. work is characterized by <i>weak</i> reasoning).	
Use of evidence in support of conclusion(s) (SLO #1. Evidence type understood to vary by academic discipline.)	Conclusions are supported with <i>appropriate, sufficient, and well-explained</i> evidence (e.g. textual, experimental or observational evidence).	Conclusions are supported with <i>appropriate & generally sufficient</i> evidence (e.g. textual, experimental or observational evidence).	Evidentiary support for conclusions is limited.	
Use of attribution (SLO #1. Formatting and standards understood to vary by academic discipline)	Standards of proper attribution are applied <i>consistently throughout.</i>	Standards of attribution are followed, but may be applied with <i>some inconsistency.</i>	Attempts at attribution are present, but are <i>too inconsistent or partial.</i>	
Independent Research / creativity / scholarship (SLO #3)	Disciplinary knowledge independently applied; work involves a report of student-designed & executed problem-solving strategy.	Disciplinary knowledge clearly applied in work of student-executed problem-solving. Student autonomy may be less pronounced.	Disciplinary knowledge not applied or student autonomy in design or execution is clearly lacking.	