

Honors Program Assessment Report, 2015-18

Program Information

Program/Department: *Honors Program*
Department Chair: Catherine Buell
Department Assessment Committee Contact: Catherine Buell

*Please be as detailed as possible in your responses. We will use this information to fulfill our NEASC 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	every semester	previous semester

March 2018

	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.		
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 80-plus percent of the students who completed the Honors Thesis.	Scores of 8 or higher meet the standard for the program.	Past Honors Program Coordinators and the current Coordinator are working to communicate more effectively with HP students and advisors about standards and procedures for the Honors Thesis.
2.	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”
3.	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”
4.	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”
5.	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”
6.	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”

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 2017 and 2018 and will continue to do so in the future.

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

March 2018

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

N/A

☐

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, but new Honors Living Learning Community for 2018-19 will enhance social events. Also, the target goal will need to be adjusted due to the much larger number of freshmen HP students in 18-19.

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	The program has dropped to about 45 students and 14 minors. There is a group of 38 incoming students. Retention can reinvigorate the community.	The Honors LLC will play a role with 9 incoming students (we hope to expand this program). We will host more community-building events.	Current score is assumed to be between 70%-80%. Goal is to retain 75% of the much larger incoming class	No, it is actually difficult to determine the normal loss rate as I do not know the number that were accepted in previous years.

			into Fall 2019.	

*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 (data point from Trend Data)	Rationale for selection	Planned or Implemented Intervention	Current score/ Target Score	This measure was selected because of last Program 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. I will be working on schedule adjustments in order to help more students succeed.	Current graduate rates are between 50-75%. I would like to continue to see this improve.	no

March 2018

*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: Honors Program

- i. Date of most recent Review: November 2012
- 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.
more opportunities for Honors social	“ ”	“ ”	“ ”	funds from HP budget and assistance from Honors Work Study	Progress could be assessed via a student	Honors LLC was planned and implemented

March 2018

events/bonding for students					survey.	for 2018-19; more social events were 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	increase in number of 2018-19 HP 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: 2019-20; 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.

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 clearly stated and is appropriate.	Most criteria for student success of each PLO is clearly stated and is appropriate.	Criteria for student success discussed or touched upon but not clearly stated or is not appropriate.	Criteria for student success not provided.	
<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	Assessment Plan provided, the process is not clear and/or the expectations are not	No Assessment Plan provided.	

		expectations.	reasonable.		
<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 point. No plan implemented.	No SSC data analyzed and/or reported on.	
<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</i>	At least one component of	At least one component	Trend data	No Trend data	

<i>Upcoming Review Period</i>	the Trend data selected to assess, rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	of the Trend selected to assessed, some of the rationale provided, targets set and intervention seems to be appropriate based on information provided.	discussed and some or part of the assessment, targets or interventions are emerging but not fully appropriate.	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:					

March 2018

--

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.