📏 Honors College Assessment

👥 Public for this Department and lower

Number:	IDR Honors College Assessment 2017 - 2018
Title:	Honors College Assessment
Start:	9/1/2017
End:	8/31/2018
Progress:	Completed
Providing Department:	Irvin D. Reid Honors College

Responsible Roles:	No Roles Selected

Assessment Method:			ill		Section Day: (start in col H.)		
Attendance # in large section:			fill		Section Time:		
Attendance in small section:			fill		Group volunteer hrs:		
					Issue:		
					Organizations:		
Heading	**Rubric**	**L Outcomes**	**4**	**3**	**2**	**1**	
Problem Defined	Problem Solving	Define Problem	Identifies and articulates problems/issues in a way that facilitates critical analysis and fully takes into account relevant contextual factors, i.e., its historical, ethical, social, cultural and disciplinary dimensions.	Identifies and articulates problems/issues and takes into account most of the relevant contextual factors, i.e., its historical, ethical, social, cultural and disciplinary dimensions.	Begins to demonstrate the ability to identify and articulate a problem/issue statement with evidence of some relevant contextual factors, but problem/issue statement is superficial.	Demonstrates a limited ability to identify and articulate problems/issues or consider related contextual factors.	
Issues Analyzed	Critical Thinking	Analyze Issues Critically and Comprehensively	Gathers and critically analyzes all information necessary to thoroughly identify and/or develop actual and potential solutions to the problem.	Gathers and critically analyzes most information necessary to identify and/or develop actual and potential solutions to the problem.	Gathers and analyzes some information necessary to identify and/or develop potential solutions. Issue/problem is stated but description leaves some terms undefined, ambiguities unexplored, and boundaries undetermined, and/or backgrounds unknown.	Does not adequately clarify or describe information necessary to identify issues to be considered.	
Evaluate Proposed Solutions	Problem Solving	Evaluate Proposed Solutions/Hypotheses to Problems	Evaluate potential and actual solutions with detailed consideration given to relevant contextual factors, feasibility, and effects/impacts, and recommend or offer conclusions based on same.	Evaluate potential and actual solutions with sufficient consideration given to relevant contextual factors, feasibility, and effects/impacts, and recommend or offer conclusions based on same.	Evaluate potential and actual solutions with adequate consideration given to relevant contextual factors, feasibility, and effects/impacts, and recommend or offer conclusions based on same.	Demonstrates a limited ability to evaluate potential and actual solutions.	

Compose effective Written Arguments	Communication	Compose written arguments that are organized, substantiated, and clear	Organizes a clear, coherent narrative with well-defined fully developed sections throughout entire argument; Substantiates argument with strong supporting examples and excellent choices for source material; Has an effective, professional writing style with few or no errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.	Organizes a narrative with relative clarity and coherence, and demonstrates rudimentary development of argument throughout most of the sections; Substantiates argument with tangential supporting examples and good choices for source material; Has a proficient, consistent writing style with isolated errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.	Constructs a somewhat disjointed organizational structure where ill-defined, insufficiently developed sections fail to create an overarching and persuasive argument; Uses anecdotal and/or infrequent evidence and suspect source material to support a position; Has an inefficient writing style with frequent errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.	Constructs a poor narrative where indistinct and unidentifiable sections contain multiple factual errors, contradictory positions and thus an illogical argument; Uses no or irrelevant and/or discredited examples and source material to offer an attempted argumentative position; Has an ineffective, negligent writing style with many repeated errors in grammar, usage, or mechanics.

Assessment Method for Learning Outcomes 1,2,3,4

1. Data Source: Honors **s**tudents' Final First Year Project and Honors Theses. Introductory and Developing Skills of the outcome are expected in the First Year (HON1000, HON PS1010), while Mastery of the outcome is expected for the Theses (HON4998).

Scores from first row of the Honors College Assessment rubric will be used to assess Learning Outcome 1, second row of the Honors College Assessment rubric will be used to assess Learning Outcome 2, the third row of the Honors College Assessment rubric will be used to assess Learning Outcome 3 and the fourth row of the Honors College Assessment rubric will be used to assess Learning Outcome 4.

2 & 3. Data gathering and timeline: Honors First Year faculty will collect these projects as a part of normal class requirement at the end of First Year coursework. Departmental Theses advisors will report the scores to the Honors College Advisor.

4. Data Scoring: Student work will be scored by Honors First Year faculty and Honors Theses advisors using the Honors Assessment rubric.

5. Scales: The rubric is based on an ordinal scale of 1 – 4, and defines each of the scores from 1 – 4 (Please refer to Honors College Assessment rubric).

6. **Criterion for Acceptable performance:** A score of 2.0 or above on this Learning Outcome is acceptable.

7. **Review of Results:** Honors faculty will conduct an annual review of student performance on this assessment by May 15th each year.

Prog_Assessment_Rubric_V1_17_18_outForInstructors

Results : Learning Outcome 1: Define Problem

Average score on students' Define Problem from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.67 on the 4 point scale.
This average exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

Average score on students' Senior Theses Define Problem from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.89 on the 4 point scale.
This average substantially exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

Learning Outcome 2: Analyze Issues Critically and Comprehensively

Average score on students' Analyze Issues Critically and Comprehensively from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.60 on the 4 point scale. This average exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

Average score on students' Senior Theses Define Problem from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.84 on the 4 point scale.
This average substantially exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

Results showed a substantial increase from the previous academic year but controlling for the lecturers performing the

assessment in both years shows an extremely similar result in both years.

Learning Outcome 3: Evaluate Proposed Solutions/Hypotheses to Problems

Average score on students' Evaluate Proposed Solutions/Hypotheses to Problems from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.54 on the 4 point scale. This average exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

Average score on students' Senior Theses Define Problem from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.84 on the 4 point scale. This average substantially exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

Again, results showed a substantial increase from the previous academic year but controlling for the lecturers performing the assessment in both years shows an extremely similar result in both years.

Learning Outcome 4: Compose Effective Written Arguments

Average score on Compose Effective Written Arguments from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.39 on the 4 point scale. This average exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome but stands out as the lowest of the four indicators.

Average score on students' Senior Theses Define Problem from Fall 2017 – Winter 2018 is 3.82 on the 4 point scale. This average substantially exceeds the target of 2.0 for this learning outcome.

On this indicator also, results showed a substantial increase from the previous academic year but controlling for the lecturers performing the assessment in both years shows virtually no change.

Results from Surveys Delivered through Baseline: Program Action Plan:	Name	Source
	No items to display.	

Learning Outcome 1: Define Problem

The results from the assessment for Define Problem during AY 17– 18 were good up substantially from the year before, but because of the significant turnover in personnel (3 of 8 senior lecturers in AY 16—17 were not part of the staff in AY 17-18) the changes may be due to the different standards of new coders. Restricting the assessment sample only to those senior lecturers who had also coded results in the year shows almost no change from the previous year.

With the retirement of Dean Jerry Herron and the transfer of first semester lecturing duties to Kevin Deegan-Krause, we will need to make certain changes to the overall curriculum to reflect the new lecturer's disciplinary strengths and limitations and to respond to student comments obtained through extensive efforts undertaken in 2017-2018 to obtain student feedback (focus groups, OTL mid-semester evaluation, new semester-end evaluation forms)

1. Moving some discussions of problem-identification from the second semester of the Honors Sequence (PS1010) to the beginning of the first semester course (HON1000) and including repeated attention to the question throughout the first semester.
2. Introduction of new tools of problem definition, including emphasis on downstream v. upstream thinking (tested extremely successfully in Winter 2018)
3. Introduction of more examples of problem identification including presentations by groups from past years (tested so successfully in 2018 that students requested more such presentations for future years) and personal examples from the instructors (requested by students in feedback from 2018).

Modification of the first-semester course to include more contact with Detroit residents in a way that will assist with problem identification efforts in the second semester of the course sequence.

Learning Outcome 2: Analyze Issues Critically and Comprehensively

While the results from the assessment for Analyze Issues Critically and Comprehensively during AY 17 – 18 were good, we hope to improve student performance through the following adjustments:

1. Reworking learning objectives to reflect critical thinking as one of three key objectives for the first-year sequence
2. Expanding the online pre-test on US political institutions to include questions about the city of Detroit and the introduction of a post-test to determine progress on learning goals.
3. Including brief specific texts and lessons on critical thinking in the first-semester of the sequence as part of scaffolding on writing assignments.
4. Expanding the segment introduced in AY 17-18 on fact-checking and information literacy.

Working with the Honors Librarians to help students critically analyze their choice of sources by expanding the number of formal sessions conducted with librarians to two during the first semester.

Learning Outcome 3: Evaluate Proposed Solutions/Hypotheses to Problems

While the results from the assessment for Evaluate Proposed Solutions/Hypotheses to Problems during AY 17 – 18 were good, we hope to improve student performance through the following adjustments:

1. Work with the Honors Librarian to develop principles for students to evaluate the quality and partisanship of think-tank research.
2. Introduce in-class and video interviews to help students learn the mechanics of the policy process (as requested by students in 2018 feedback)
3. Link students to new policy resources with access to topic-specific policy guides from recently published textbooks (proposed for AY 2017-2018 but not implemented.
4. Significantly expand the emphasis on policymakers in the following ways:

   - Provide additional examples of students as effective advocates in policy questions
   - Further developing procedures (introduced in AY 2017-2018) for encouraging students to reach out to elected officials and assisting them in using their direct experiences to enrich their group paper.
   - Continue working with the university administration to integrate the Honors College with student advocacy trips to Lansing.

5. Again revising and rewording question for the final group paper to help students assess the most feasible mode of solving the problem (with reference to upstream and downstream solutions).

Dealing directly with students' difficulties in obtaining responses from policymakers and other policy experts by teaching them methods of reaching and dealing with administrative staff.

Learning Outcome 4: Compose Effective Written Arguments

While the results from the assessment for Evaluate Proposed Solutions/Hypotheses to Problems during AY 17 – 18 were well above the target, they were the lowest of the four assessment scores and have shown a slight decline over time. We will therefore take the following significant steps to improve student writing performance:

1. Expanding the paper-scaffolding introduced in AY 17-18 to include every major writing assignment of the semester: two in Fall 2018 and two in Winter 2019:
2. Improving the usefulness of peer-reading of papers in line with new methods taken from best practices in the field (which we are working on finding).
3. Introducing a stronger requirement for self-review with required first drafts and a required self-edit submitted along with the paper.
4. Testing the usefulness and time-demands of a rewriting exercise with in-class discussion of the process of revision to help students understand the need for and benefit from substantial revision (an understanding that is currently lacking)
5. Reworking assignment sheets to follow the recommendations of Mary-Ann Winklemes of UNLV for making "Unwritten Rules" visible including explicit discussion of assignment purpose, the nature of the task, and the criteria for evaluation, and providing a video introduction of each major writing assignment by the instructor.
6. In both classes testing new templates student feedback that will allow faculty members to focus on the key aspects of the writing process and to emphasize the formative rather than summative aspects of the assignment (including a "what to do next" focus).

Repeated attention to allowing early assignments and posting of grades so that students are able to calculate where they stand in the course, how much work is done (and at what level of quality) and how much remains.

📄 Assessment 2017-2018_Honors College Website _Final

Timeline for Action Plan Implementation:	Honors faculty will implement the action items listed above throughout AY 2018-2019. Data for this assessment will be gathered and analyzed again during April – May, 2018.
Reporting to Stakeholders:	We have already shared our assessment results with our Honors First Year faculty in May 2018 Course planning meeting. We plan to disseminate this information in our August 2018 staff meeting, with the Honors College Staff members. We also plan to post the results to our program website by August 2018.
Additional Information :	