

Annual Departmental Plan Report

Program Information

Program/Department:

Department Chair:

Department Assessment Committee Contact:

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NECHE requirements and this report will help with your next Program Review or aid with your external accreditation. This file is to be kept in the department and an electronic file is due to the Director of Assessment by **May 31** each academic year.*

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs) (Educational Objectives)

I. List all PLOs and the timeline for assessment.

PLO #	PLO – Stated in assessable terms.	Timing of assessment (annual, semester, bi-annual, etc.)	When was the last assessment of the PLO completed?
1.	Quality of Research: Honors Theses shall demonstrate in-depth research in the subject matter of the thesis.	every semester	previous semester
2.	Quality of Sources: The Theses shall incorporate and make significant use of rich sources. The thesis may refer to some general sources, but it shall make very significant use of high-quality sources written for the field or subject of the thesis.	every semester	previous semester
3.	Quality of Written Communication: Honors thesis shall display mastery of writing and shall avoid significant errors in writing and grammar. The thesis used an appropriate vocabulary and displayed good diction. The thesis shall make use of a clear and logical plan of organization. The thesis used accurate and complete citations.	every semester	previous semester

4.	Quality of Oral Communication: In presenting the thesis, the student shall display fluidity and confidence as a speaker. Students maintained effective eye contact with the audience. The student will clearly explain the main argument of the thesis, and will demonstrate a mastery of the relevant evidence and citing examples. If the student used note cards or power points slides the student did not simply read these aloud word-for-word.	every semester	previous semester
5.	Initiative: The students displayed initiative in developing and working on their theses. They helped to develop a vision for the project and followed through on fulfilling that vision.	every semester	previous semester
6.	Creativity: Students left their own imprint on the thesis. They went beyond simply reciting facts to develop or advance their own conclusions or their own materials.	every semester	previous semester

II. PLO Assessment (Please report on the PLOs assessed and/or reviewed this year, programs should be assessing at least one each year.)

Using the table below, list and briefly describe the **direct method(s)** used to collect information assessing whether students are learning the core sets of knowledge (K), skills (S) and attitudes (A) identified as essential.

PLO #	Assessment description (exam, observation, national standardized exam, oral presentation with rubric, etc.)	When assessment was administered in student program (internship, 4 th year, 1 st year, etc.)	To which students were assessments administered (all, only a sample, etc.)	What is the target set for the PLO? (criteria for success)	Reflection on the results: How was the “loop closed”?
1.	advisors’ ratings and comments on Honors Thesis projects	senior year/capstone level	Assessments were solicited for all students who completed the Honors Thesis. Assessments were returned for 75-plus percent of the students who completed the Honors Thesis.	Scores of 8 or higher meet the standard for the program.	HP Coordinator is looking to communicate more effectively with HP students and advisors about standards and procedures for the Honors Thesis and the roles of thesis advisors and second readers.

III. Summary of Findings: Briefly summarize the results of the PLO assessments reported in Section II above combined with other relevant evidence gathered and show how these are being reviewed/discussed. How are you “closing the loop”?

Other than GPA, what data/evidence is used to determine that graduates have achieved the stated outcomes for the degree? (e.g., capstone course, portfolio review, licensure examination)	Who interprets the evidence? What is the process? (e.g. annually by the curriculum committee)	What changes have been made as a result of using the data/evidence? (close the loop)
Advisors' evaluation/rating of Honors Thesis projects (as described above).	The Honors Program Coordinator interprets the evidence each semester.	The "Honors Thesis Guidelines" document has been revised, and a new, brief "Honors Thesis Checklist" has been created for students. In addition, the HP Coordinator hosted an informational student panel discussion on the Honors Thesis experience in since 2017 and will continue to do so every year.

Assessment Plan for Program/Department

I. Insert the program or department Assessment Plan

The Honors Program assesses students' completed Honors Thesis projects (the capstone experience for the program) each semester. Faculty Honors Thesis Advisors submit their ratings of thesis projects, enabling the Honors Coordinator to identify areas for improvement in student work. Thesis Advisors assess all six PLOs. Based on the assessment data, the HP Coordinator enhances advising and overall communication to HP students about the Honors Thesis.

II. Explain any changes in the assessment plan including new or revised PLOs, new assessments that the program/department plans to implement and new targets or goals set for student success.

March 2019

No changes have been made to the Honors Program PLOs in recent years.

III. If you do not have a plan, would you like help in developing one?

☐

University Data

I. SSC Data

Indicate **at least one** Student Success Performance Measure that the department/program has identified for planned change or improvement.

Freshman retention, bottleneck courses, graduation rates, at risk student retention etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
Freshman retention	HP Coordinator worked with HP Work Study to develop and host more student-friendly social events and to create an overall greater sense of belonging in the Honors Program.	Satisfied. The new Honors Living Learning Community for 2018-19 will enhance social events. We had a much larger group in 2018-2019. From Fall to Spring we lost one student from Honors and the university in the freshman class out of 36. We have retained all (at least all signed up for classes) for Fall 2019.

b. What will your focus be for the upcoming year?*

Student Success Measure (data point from SSC)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Freshman retention	Continued retention can reinvigorate the community.	The Honors LLC will play a role with several incoming	Past scores were assumed to be	No, it is actually difficult to

		students. We will host more community-building events. These students are 7 second year returning students and a (currently unknown) number of new students joining them.	between 70%-80%. The goal to retain 75% of the class was surpassed. We will continue with the goal of 80% retentions.	determine the normal loss rate as I do not know the number that were accepted in previous years. This has been changed as the HP Coordinator now records this information for future coordinators.

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

II. Trend Data

Indicate **at least one** Department Performance Measure that the program/department identified for change or improvement. Number of graduates, number of majors, credit production, substitutions etc.

a. What was the focus this year?

Department Performance Measure (data point from Trend Data)	Implemented Intervention	Update on Implemented Intervention (i.e. change in target, satisfied with outcome, not satisfied, will continue or not)
Graduates in Honors Program	More frequent communication and intrusive advising using SSC platform and email.	Satisfied with number of HP graduates but will continue interventions.

b. What will be the focus next year?*

Department Performance Measure	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program
--------------------------------	-------------------------	-------------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

(data point from Trend Data)				Review or Accreditation (yes/no)
Graduates in Honors Program	Having students finish the program is the ideal.	Intrusive advising and more formal and informal contact with students. HP Coordinator will be working on schedule adjustments in order to help more students succeed.	Past graduate rates were between 50-75%. We would like to continue to see this improve and believe it has, but improper data has been kept by past HP Coordinators and limited by Banner programming.	no

*Note: Programs may wish to monitor or review the same data point over multiple years.

Program Review Action Plan or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report

Annual Reflection/Follow-up on Action Plan from last Program Review or external accreditation (only complete the table that is appropriate for your program)

I. Programs that fall under Program Review:

- i. Date of most recent Review: November 2012 (scheduled for Fall 2019)
- ii. Insert the Action Plan table from your last Program Review and give any progress towards completing the tasks or achieving targets set forth in the plan.

[See attached 2012-13 Program Review-related document.]

Specific area where improvement is needed	Evidence to support the recommended change	Person(s) responsible for implementing the change	Timeline for implementation	Resources needed	Assessment Plan	Progress Made this Year
More communication to the campus about the program, particularly at summer advising	testimonies of students and faculty during Program Review site visit to FSU	Honors Program Coordinator	next Program Review cycle	support from upper administration and Student Affairs	Progress could be assessed via a student survey.	HP Coordinator was present at summer orientation academic meet-and-greet session in Summer 2017 and 18 and Summer 2019.
more opportunities for Honors social	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	funds from HP budget and assistance from Honors Work Study	Progress could be assessed via a student	Honors LLC has additional programming; more social events were

events/bonding for students					survey.	offered.
more support for Honors team- teaching, faculty development, and coordination among Honors faculty	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	support and funding from upper administration	Progress could be assessed via a survey of Honors Faculty.	HP Coordinator increased communication to faculty about Honors course field trip funding. Otherwise, pro. development and team- teaching opportunities have been limited.
raising overall number of Honors Program students	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	support and funding from upper administration	assessable by enrollment data	There were 36 students in Fall 2018 and also over 30 for Fall 2019. In addition, HP Coordinator brought in 14 Minors in AY 2018-2019 (doubling the minors). Also secured five additional spots

						for late entry in Fall for underrepresented students.

iii. If you do not have an action plan, would you like help in developing one based on your last program review and needs of the program?

☐ Yes

II. Programs with external Accreditation:

- i. Accreditor: Commonwealth Honors Program
- ii. Date of last review: November 2012
- iii. Date of next review and type of review: Fall 2019; Program renewal/re-certification
- iv. List key performance indicators:
 1. mission
 2. organization and administration
 3. admission criteria
 4. transfer criteria
 5. program curriculum
 6. graduation criteria
 7. program resources
 8. curriculum review process

List key issues for continuing accreditation identified in accreditation action letter or report.	Key performance indicators as required by agency or selected by program (licensure, board or bar pass rates; employment rates, etc.)(If required.)	Update on fulfilling the action letter/report or on meeting the key performance indicators.
[See areas for improvement in Section I. above.]	N/A	Significant progress has been made to address issues #1, #2, and #4 above. Issue #3 (professional development

		of Honors Program faculty) has not been sufficiently addressed.

Campus Climate

Each department was asked to review the Campus Climate Survey information distributed by the Leading for Change Committee and determine what your department has been doing to contribute to the positive outcomes identified.

The survey data may be found through this link: <https://www.fitchburgstate.edu/offices-services-directory/institutional-research-and-planning/office-of-assessment/campus-climate-survey/>

Please list the feedback and recommendations that your department provided to the Leading for Change Committee, along with any additional plans that you might have to further explore this data.

N/A to Honors. It is not a department.

UARC Peer Review of the Program Annual Report

Program: _____ Date of Review: _____

Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Program Learning Outcomes (PLOs)</i>	All or almost all PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	Most of the PLOs clearly stated and measurable.	PLOs written in general, broad or abstract statements OR are not measurable.	PLOs not provided.	
<i>Expected Timing of Assessment</i>	All or almost all PLOs have a timeline stated.	Most PLOs have a timeline stated.	Very few PLOs have a stated timeline.	No timelines are given or are To Be Determined (TBD).	
<i>Assessment Tool Quality</i>	Assessment tool(s) is/are strong: very good quality and appropriate.	Assessment tool(s) are acceptable: good quality and appropriate	Assessment tool(s) are a good start but could use some strengthening or changes.	Assessment tool(s) are either not appropriate or not discussed.	
<i>PLO Assessment</i>	More than one PLO assessed and information is complete in the chart.	At least one PLO assessed and information is complete in chart.	At least one PLO assessed, information is not complete in chart.	No assessments completed during the academic year reported.	
<i>Criteria for Success</i>	The criteria for student success of each PLO is	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but	Criteria for student success not provided.	

	clearly stated and is appropriate.	clearly stated and is appropriate.	not clearly stated or is not appropriate.		
<i>Summary of Findings</i>	Measures used in from PLO assessment fully incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis supports the summary.	Very limited use of data from PLO assessment incorporated with additional evidence to formulate the summary and analysis somewhat supports summary.	Used evidence other than PLO assessment to formulate the summary or analysis of the data doesn't seem to support summary.	No summary utilizing assessment data is evident.	
Assessment Plan for Program/Department					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Department or Program Assessment Plan</i>	Assessment Plan provided. Has clearly stated process with reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided. Has somewhat clear process and/or somewhat reasonable expectations.	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not reasonable.	No Assessment Plan provided.	
<i>Activities and Adjustments to/Deviation from the Department/Program Assessment Plan</i>	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are clearly stated and decision(s) are appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are described in general terms and may be appropriate based on the reported results.	Decision to change or not change the assessment plan are vague and lack clarity.	No changes are discussed.	
University Data					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>SSC Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one SSC data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one SSC data	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	

			point. No plan implemented.		
<i>SSC Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the SSC data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the SSC selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	SSC data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Current Review Period</i>	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Clearly documented results.	Intervention undertaken by program/department for at least one Trend data point. Plan not fully implemented.	Planned intervention by program/department for at least one Trend data point. No plan implemented.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<i>Trend Data for Upcoming Review Period</i>	At least one component of the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	At least one component of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	Trend data discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	No Trend data analyzed and/or reported on.	
Action Plane or External Accreditation Action Letter/Report					
Criterion	Highly Developed (3)	Developed (2)	Emerging (1)	Initial (0)	Score
<i>Only for those under Program Review</i> <i>Annual Reflection on Program Review</i>	Full Action Plan provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Full Action Plan provided with some discussion of on-going progress plans stated.	Full Action Plan provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Action Plan is either not provided or there no progress or plans stated for	

				progress discussed.	
<i>Only for those under External Accreditation</i> <i>Annual Reflection on Report/Letter from accrediting body.</i>	Key issues and performance standards provided with definitive on-going progress clearly stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with some discussion of on-going progress stated.	Key issues and performance standards provided with vague ideas regarding on-going progress plans stated.	Key issues and/or performance standards are either not provided or there has been no progress or plans stated for progress.	
Comments:					

NOTE: This rubric is NOT an evaluation of the program/department. It is simply a tool for UARC to use as an aid in reviewing and providing constructive feedback to each program.