



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2017-2018

Program: Honors

(Due: June 1, 2018)

Date report completed: 5/21/18

Completed by: Fawn-Amber Montoya

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): Jonathan Grunert, Honors Faculty Fellow

Please describe the 2017-2018 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, 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, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

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 <u>last</u> assessed? (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 that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.	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, including	Ay 2015/2016	Thesis	Four Honors' Thesis students	100% should be proficient	75% were proficient	Thesis is grounded in an disciplinary approach and varies widely by discipline and advisor	Restructure thesis course to have 3-5 possible methodological approaches: surveys, interviews, textual analysis, lab research, or focus groups. Identify discipline specific faculty for senior theses students to work with. Workshop for these

reasoning, evidence, persuasive appeals, and proper attribution. (Critical thinking)							faculty with expectations for what thesis should look like regardless of discipline.
SLO3 Students will be able to apply discipline-specific as well as crossdiscipline-based knowledge to design, execute, and report on a specific problem-solving strategy. (Independent research, creativity, and scholarship) Direct measure: Rubric used to evaluate student senior theses.	AY 2016/2017	Thesis	Four Honors' Thesis students	100% should be proficient	100% should be proficient	Thesis is grounded in a disciplinary approach and varies widely by discipline and advisor	Thesis projects will be revised to include an interdisciplinary introduction, conclusion, and literature review. Program will revise 1 credit Honors 481 to be a Professional/ Research Skills course.

Comments on part I: Thesis is now taught as an independent study. Thesis needs to be a structured course sequence with Director facilitating and faculty advisors meeting with students.

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2017-2018 cycle. These are those 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 to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
<i>SLO 1</i> Students will be able to formulate and develop arguments with sufficient support, including reasoning, evidence, persuasive	AY 2016-2017	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 detailed <i>discipline-independent</i> standard of depth and rigor for the thesis. To this point, the standard has been that	Actions were not acted upon. The new director decided to follow the previous model.	At this point the new director agrees with the assessment of the 2016-2017 AY assessment. No changes were made this year. The thesis requirement will be revised for 2018/2019 There will be a new standard that introductions, conclusions, literature review will be interdisciplinary, monthly meetings with faculty advisor, research standards, and a structure course led by the Honors director.

<p>appeals, and proper attribution. (Critical thinking)</p> <p>SLO 3 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>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 on part II:

Student work assessed: Senior thesis Rubric	Exemplary	Proficient
Formulation of argument (SLO #1)	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>explicit, precisely articulated, and clear.</i>	Argument & conclusion(s) are <i>explicit.</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).
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,	Conclusions are supported with <i>appropriate</i> & generally <i>sufficient</i> evidence (e.g. textual, experimental or observational evidence).
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>
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.