

---

**Assessment Plan, Data, and Analysis**

---

**Mission Statements & Goals**

**UNIVERSITY MISSION STATEMENT:** We educate and empower students to understand and transform our world.

**HONORS PROGRAM MISSION STATEMENT:** We provide an enhanced educational experience for the most academically talented, highly motivated students of East Central University. This experience is provided primarily through an enriched curriculum of honors courses and opportunities for undergraduate research. The mission includes the continuing development and assessment of honors courses which are characterized by small enrollment, high-quality faculty, and innovative design. Further, the Honors Program seeks to develop honors students individually and as a community of scholars through providing a mentored environment, promoting university and community service, and recognizing academic achievements.

**HONORS PROGRAM GOAL(S):** Honors students demonstrate high-level writing and critical thinking skills; conduct scholarly research or produce creative work in areas of their major areas of interest; and participate in approved extra-curricular experiences and evaluate its enrichment of their ECU education.

**ASSESSMENT ACROSS HONORS PROGRAM STATEMENT:**

We assess student learning throughout our program. Early program: We track attendance of first- and second-year students at the engagement point-scoring opportunities we encourage them to attend (university-sponsored academic, cultural, and fine arts events), and the students let us know which events they consider most meaningful. At the end of the spring semester of their second-year, the midpoint of the program, students have their Project and Thesis proposals evaluated by the Honors Board. Before they graduate, juniors and seniors must complete an engagement requirement (an internship, study abroad experience, or OSLEP seminar), and either two projects or one two-semester thesis. When students complete Honors projects or theses, they have their work evaluated by their faculty mentors (projects) and thesis committees, and they make Showcase presentations that are evaluated by the Honors Board. Sophomores, juniors, and seniors evaluate their Engagement experiences and the Honors Board evaluates their Showcase presentations. All Honors students are coded as such in the Jenzabar system. The Office of Institutional effectiveness may be contacted if a list of Honors juniors and seniors not in Honors classes needs to be accessed to determine if those students are making progress towards completion of an approved Honors Project or Thesis proposal during any given semester (students may be inactive for one or more semesters and remain on track to graduation with Honors).

**Currently there are no external instruments available for the Honors program.**

**STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 1:**

Honors students demonstrate high-level writing and critical thinking skills.

**Criterion 1.1:** Writing Skills. Before students complete upper-division Honors Projects and Theses, they must submit proposals to the Honors Board describing original research and creative projects they want to undertake. Honors Project and Thesis proposals should be clear, logical, easy to follow, and polished, and they should demonstrate attention to detail.

**Instrument/Measurement #1:** Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #1 (attached):

“Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow.” Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate. The rubric is attached as Appendix A.

**Population:** Students enrolled in EQ4 (HNRS 2313), which is typically taken in the spring semester of the sophomore year.

**Standard:** 66% or more of proposals score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #1.

**Table:**

Project or Thesis Proposals					
Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	12	37	9	1	0
%2020-2021	20%	63%	15%	2%	0%
#2019-2020	10	23	14	1	0
%2019-2020	21%	28%	29%	2%	0%
# 2018-2019	15	12	7	0	0
%2018-2019	44%	33%	21%	0%	0%
# 2017-2018	16	23	4	1	0
%2017-2018	36%	52%	9%	2%	0%
2016-2017	ND*	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix A.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 83% of proposals scored “4” or higher (the standard is 66%). This is an improvement of 24 percentage points from last year’s score.

**Instrument 2:** Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #2 (attached): “Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail.”

**Population:** Students enrolled in EQ4 (HNRS 2313), which is typically taken in the spring semester of the sophomore year.

**Standard:** 66% or more of proposals score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #2.

Project or Thesis Proposals					
Proposal is polished and demonstrates attention to detail					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	11	29	12	6	1
%2020-2021	19%	49%	20%	10%	2%
#2019-2020	7	16	19	6	0
%2019-2020	15%	33%	40%	13%	0%
# 2018-2019	9	12	12	1	0
%2018-2019	26%	35%	35%	3%	0%
# 2017-2018	17	17	10	0	0
%2017-2018	39%	39%	23%	0%	0%
2016-2017	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year

The rubric is attached as Appendix A.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 68% of proposals scored “4” or higher (the standard is 66%). This is an improvement of 20 percentage points from last year’s score.

**Criterion 1.2:** Critical Thinking. Before students complete upper-division Honors Projects and Theses, they must submit proposals to the Honors Board describing original research and creative projects they want to undertake. These proposals should demonstrate an awareness of the complexity of the issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic. They should also describe a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable.

**Instrument 1:** Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #3 (attached): “Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic.” Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.

**Population:** Students enrolled in EQ4 (HNRS 2313), which is typically taken in the spring semester of the sophomore year.

**Standard:** 66% or more of proposals score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #3.

**Table:**

Project or Thesis Proposals “Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic.”					
	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	10	23	18	7	1
%2020-2021	17%	39%	31%	12%	2%
# 2019-2020	5	15	19	9	0
%2019-2020	10%	31%	40%	19%	0%
# 2018-2019	10	12	11	1	0
%2018-2019	29%	35%	32%	3%	0%
# 2017-2018	14	20	8	2	0
%2017-2018	32%	45%	18%	5%	100%
2016-2017	ND*	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix A.

**Analysis:** Standard not met. 56% of proposals scored “4” or higher (the standard is 66%). While this is an improvement of 15 percentage points from last year’s score, it is the only standard not met in this assessment.

**Instrument 2:** Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #4 (attached): “describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable.” Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.

**Population:** Students enrolled in EQ4 (HNRS 2313), which is typically taken in the spring semester of the sophomore year.

**Standard:** 66% or more of proposals score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #4.

**Table:**

Project or Thesis Proposals “describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	25	24	9	1	0
%2020-2021	42%	41%	15%	2%	0%
#2019-2020	9	27	12	0	0
%2019-2020	19%	56%	25%	0%	0%
# 2018-2019	16	8	9	1	0
%2018-2019	47%	24%	27%	3%	0%
# 2017-2018	12	23	8	1	0
%2017-2018	27%	52%	18%	2%	0%

2016-2017	*ND	ND	ND	ND	ND
-----------	-----	----	----	----	----

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix A.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 83% of proposals scored “4” or higher (the standard is 66%). This is the highest percentage of proposals scoring “4” or higher that we have had since we began this assessment.

### **STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOME 2:**

Honors students conduct scholarly research or produce creative work in areas of their major areas of interest.

**Criterion 2.1:** Communication Skills (Writing and Presentation). Upper-division students complete Honors Projects and Theses. Their presentation of this work should be clear, logical, easy to follow, polished and demonstrates attention to detail.

**Instrument 1:** Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #1: “Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow.” Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate.

**Population:** Students completing Honors Thesis or Project (typically during junior or senior year).\*

\*Note: All Honors students are coded as such in the Jenzabar system. The Office of Institutional effectiveness may be contacted if a list of Honors juniors and seniors not in Honors classes needs to be accessed to determine if those students are making progress towards completion of an approved Honors Project or Thesis proposal during any given semester (students may be inactive for one or more semesters and remain on track to graduation with Honors).

**Standard:** 66% or more of Theses and Projects score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #1.

**Table:**

Projects or Theses “Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow.”					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	22	8	1	0	0
%2020-2021	71%	26%	3%	0%	0%
# 2019-2020	13	9	3	0	0
%2019-2020	52%	36%	12%	0%	0%
# 2018-2019	22	12	5	0	0
%2018-2019	56%	31%	13%	0%	0%
# 2017-2018	9	7	1	0	0

%2017-2018	53%	41%	6%	0%	0%
2016-2017	ND*	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix B.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 97% of theses and projects scored “4” or higher (the standard is 66%). This is the highest number of “5” scores (22) and highest percentage of “5” scores (71%) we have had since we started this assessment.

**Instrument 2:** Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #2: “Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail”. Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate.

**Population:** Students completing Honors Thesis or Project (typically during junior or senior year).

**Standard:** 66% or more of Theses and Projects score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on five-point scale for item #2.

**Table:**

Projects or Theses “Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail”.					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	18	10	3	0	0
%2020-2021	58%	32%	10%	0%	0%
# 2019-2020	10	9	4	2	0
%2019-2020	40%	36%	16%	8%	0%
# 2018-2019	14	17	8	0	0
%2018-2019	36%	44%	21%	0	0
# 2017-2018	4	11	2	0	0
%2017-2018	24%	65%	12%	0%	0%
2016-2017	*ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix B.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 90% of theses and projects scored “4” or higher (the standard is 66%). This is the highest number of “5” scores (18) we have received since we began this assessment.

**Instrument 3:** Rubric for Showcase Presentation: Research (attached) items #1-5:

1. Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow;
2. Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail;
3. Use of body language is effective; consider: eye

contact, posture, gestures; 4. Use of voice is effective; consider: pacing, fluency, volume, tone; 5. Conveys intellectual enthusiasm. Honors Board and Honors Faculty attending Showcase will evaluate.

**Population:** Students completing Honors Thesis or Project (typically during junior or senior year).\*

**Standard:** When aggregating all student scores, the average score for each item (1-5) should be higher than 3.75 on a five-point scale (where “3” is “satisfactory” and “4” is “commendable”).

**Table:**

Showcase Presentation: Research Communication						
Item	1	2	3	4	5	N
2020-2021 Student Average	4.49	4.29	4.15	4.21	4.54	80
2019-2020 Student Average	4.34	4.19	4.00	3.98	4.52	58
2018-2019 Student Average	4.19	4.05	4.09	4.01	4.43	91
2017-2018 Student Average	4.37	4.26	4.11	4.17	4.52	52
2016-2017	*ND	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix C.

**Analysis:** Standard met. Scores are the highest we have had in every area. Area #3: “pacing, fluency, volume and tone of delivery” need to remain a point of emphasis in Showcase preparation.

**Criterion 2.2:** Critical Thinking. Students complete Honors Projects or a Thesis, which may be creative or scholarly. Completed work demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic and describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable.

**Instrument 1** Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #3: “Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic.” Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate.

**Population:** Students completing Honors Thesis and Honors Project (typically during junior or senior year).

**Standard:** 66% or more of Theses and Projects score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #1.

**Table:**

Projects and Theses: Critical Thinking “Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic.”					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-2021	20	10	1	0	0
%2020-2021	65%	32%	3%	0%	0%
#2019-20	13	10	2	0	0
%2019-20	50%	42%	8%	0%	0%
#2018-19	18	15	6	0	0
%2018-19	46%	38%	15%	0%	0%
#2017-18	8	7	2	0	0
%2017-18	47%	41%	12%	0%	0%
2016-17	*ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix B.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 97% of scored a 4 or higher demonstrating awareness of complexities of issue under discussion. Number (20) and percentage (65%) scoring “5” or higher are the highest we’ve had since we started the assessment plan.

**Instrument 2:** Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #4: “Describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable.” Thesis Committees and Project Mentors will evaluate.

**Population:** Students completing Honors Thesis and Honors Project (typically during junior or senior year).

**Standard:** 66% or more of Theses and Projects score “4” (“commendable”) or higher on a five-point scale for item #4.

**Table:**

Projects and Theses: Critical Thinking “Describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable.”					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-21	23	7	0	1	0
%2020-21	74%	23%	0%	3%	0%
#2019-20	10	11	4	0	0
%2019-20	40%	44%	16%	0%	0%



#2018-19	24	12	3	0	0
%2018-19	62%	31%	8%	0%	0%
#2017-18	9	6	1	0	0
%2017-18	56%	38%	6%	0%	0%
2016-17	ND*	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix B.

**Analysis:** Standard met. 97% of Projects and Theses scored “4” or higher (standard is 66%). The percentage scoring “5” or higher (74%) is the highest we have had since we started this assessment plan.

**Instrument 3:** Rubric for Showcase Presentation: Research (attached) items #6-7:

6) “Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research contributed by others on topic” and 7) “Describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable.”

**Population:** Students completing Honors Thesis or Project (typically during junior or senior year).

**Standard:** When aggregating all student scores, the average score for both items (6-7) should be higher than 3.75 on a five-point scale (where “3” is “satisfactory” and “4” is “commendable”).

**Table:**

Showcase Presentation: Research (Critical Thinking)			
Item	6	7	n
2020-21 Student Average	4.54	4.52	80
2019-20 Student Average	4.36	4.50	58
2018-19 Student Average	4.07	4.26	91
2017-18 Student Average	4.38	4.49	52
2016-17 Student Average	*ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix C.

**Analysis:** Standard met. Scores in both areas are the highest we have had since we started this assessment process.

### **CONTRIBUTION TO STUDENT LEARNING: OUTCOME 3:**

Honors students participate in approved extra-curricular experiences and evaluate its enrichment of their ECU education.

**Criterion 3.1:** Engagement Honors Experience. In order to graduate with Honors, students must do one of the following: 1) successfully complete an Oklahoma Scholar Leadership Enrichment Seminar; 2) participate in a university-sponsored study abroad experience; 3) complete a summer internship experience that is enhanced by additional reading, writing or research assignments given by an Honors advisor; 4) successfully complete a Research Experience for Undergraduates; or 5) complete a comparatively enriching Honors-travel/learning experience approved by the Honors Board. After completing one of these experiences, students make a presentation about the experience at the Honors Showcase that is held each semester.

**Instrument 1:** Rubric for Showcase Presentation: Engagement (attached), items #1-5: 1. Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow; 2. Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail; 3. Use of body language is effective; consider: eye contact, posture, gestures; 4. Use of voice is effective; consider: pacing, fluency, volume, tone; 5. Conveys intellectual enthusiasm. Honors Board and Honors Faculty attending Showcase will evaluate.

**Population:** Students completing Engagement Honors requirements (Study Abroad/OSLEP Seminar/REU/Internship, etc.), typically during the sophomore, junior, or senior year.

**Standard:** When aggregating all student scores, the average score for each item (1-5) should be higher than 3.75 on a five-point scale (where “3” is “satisfactory” and “4” is “commendable”).

**Table:**

Showcase Presentation: Engagement Communication						
Item	1	2	3	4	5	N
2020-21 Student Average	4.20	3.9	3.9	3.8	4.5	11
2019-20 Student Average	4.69	4.75	4.56	4.75	5	16
2018-19 Student Average	4.22	4.00	3.91	3.84	4.24	46
2017-18 Student Average	4.6	4.56	4.6	4.5	4.7	20
2016-17	ND*	ND	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix D.

**Analysis:** Standard met. Scores in 4 of the 5 areas were the lowest we have had since we started this assessment process. Students had fewer off-campus engagement experiences—and perhaps less engaging experiences—to report on due to Covid restrictions and small sample size may have played a factor in the lower scores. Two of the Engagement Showcase presentations were group presentations,

**Instrument 2:** Rubric for Engagement Honors Experience (attached). Honors students complete Engagement Experiences will use rubric to evaluate experience.

**Population:** Students completing Engagement Honors requirements (Study Abroad/OSLEP Seminar/REU/Internship, etc.), typically during the sophomore, junior, or senior year.

**Standard:** 66% evaluations attribute score of “4” (“commendable”) or higher on five-point scale to Honors Engagement experience.

**Table:**

Student evaluations of Engagement Experience					
Score	5	4	3	2	1
#2020-21	3	2	1	0	0
%2020-21	50%	33%	17%	0%	0%
#2019-20	3	2	0	0	0
%2019-20	60%	40%	0%	0%	0%
#2018-19	5	2	1	0	0
%2018-19	63%	25%	13%	0%	0%
#2017-18	6	1	1	0	0
%2017-18	75%	13%	13%	0%	0%
2016-17	ND**	ND	ND	ND	ND

\*\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

The rubric is attached as Appendix E.

**Analysis:** Standard met. Not all students who participated in an Engagement Experience returned their evaluations.

**Criterion 3.2: Engagement Point-Scoring Experiences.** Students enrolled in Honors EQ courses attend university-sponsored academic, cultural and fine arts events. Such events may include university lecture series, the Ramadan Research symposium, Honors Presents the Sciences night in the fall, the Scissortail Creative Writing Festival, Hallie Brown Ford Feature events, and performances by ECU’s choir, band, dance and theatre companies. Most events are worth one point; each semester seven

incentivized events are worth two points. At the end of the semester, students submit an email enumerating the events they have attended and reflecting on those that were most meaningful to them.

**Instrument:** Chart tracking attendance and experiences deemed most meaningful by students.

**Population:** All students enrolled in Honors EQ courses.

**Standard:** 75% of students enrolled in Honors EQ courses score 12 points each semester.

**Table One:**

Engagement Experiences	12 or greater	<12
Spring 2021 Point totals	*ND	*ND
Fall 2020 Point totals	*ND	*ND
Spring 2020 Point totals	*ND	*ND
Fall 2019 Point totals	66	5
Fall 2019 %	93%	7%
Spring 2019 Point totals	42	4
Spring 2019 %	91%	9%
Fall 2018 Point totals	49	2
Fall 2018 %	96%	4%
Spring 2018 Point totals	41	4
Spring 2018 %	91%	9%
Fall 2017 Point totals	46	1
Fall 2017 %	98%	2%
2016-2017	**ND	**ND

\* ND (No Data): Engagement Point-Scoring Experience were suspended due to the Covid-19 shutdown.

\*\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

**Table Two:**

Spring 20-Fall-20-Spring 21	Mentions
*ND	*ND

Fall 2019	Mentions
Honors Day in OKC	35
ECU Chorale Concert	7
Lunches	6
Sorting Hat	6
Honors Showcase	6
ECU Jazz Concert	5
Convocation	4
ECU Bands Concert	4

Tigerpalooza/ Bron Warren	3
ECU Screens: All About Eve	2
Honors Homecoming	2
Telling Amy's Story	2
The Nerd	2
ECU Screens: Fleabag	2
ECU Screens (generic)	2
5 other events	1

**Spring 2019 Events****Mentioned**

Shen Yun (OKC)	17
Scissortail/Tracy Smith	12
Kansas City Road Trip	11
Spring Showcase	7
Foreign Film Festival/Ask Me About the World/The Guilty	6
Band Concert	6
Man of La Mancha (ECU Theatre)	6
Jazz Ensemble	5
Louise Young Diversity Lecture: Beverly Gooden	5
Foreign Film Festival/Anna Karenina	3
Ramadan Research Symposium	3
Great Plains Honors Conference	2
All the Great Books (ECU Theatre)	2
Ten other events	1

**Fall 2018 Events****Mentioned**

Honors Day in OKC	27
Sorting Hat	13
Curious Incident of a Dog ... (ECU SCREENS)	11
Honors Showcase	8
Honors Convocation	6
Honors Lunch	5
Oka Water Institute/Dr. Ananga Presentation	5
Jazz Ensemble Concerts	4
Local Candidates Forum/Debate	4
The Government Inspector (ECU Theatre)	4
Chorale Concert	4
Wind River	4
Go Global	3
Originals Interest Party	3
Cosi Fan Tutte	2
Honors Homecoming	2

---

Earn Your Stripes!	1
Macbeth	1

**Spring 2018 Events**

Global Faiths Tour	34
Scissortail	9
Honors Showcase	9
Honors Lunch	6
Ramadan Research Symposium	4
Pizza Caucus	3
ECU SCREENS: Yerma	2
Noises Off!	2
5 other events	1

**Fall 2017 Events****Mentioned**

OKC Road Trip	28
Honors Sorting Hat	10
Scott Joplin Tribute	9
Sustainability Conference	7
ECU Screens	7
Rothbaum Lecture	5
Honors Convocation	4
Honors Showcase	4
Romeo & Juliet (ECU Theatre)	3
Honors Homecoming	3
Elephant Man (ECU Theatre)	3
Go Global event	3
Dr. Pierson's inauguration	3
September Poetry Series	3
Honors Lunch	2
Banned Books Talk	1

**2016-2017**

\* ND (No Data): Engagement Point-Scoring Experience were suspended due to the Covid-19 shutdown.

\*\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.

**Analysis:** Due to Covid precautions, we suspended the class requirement that students participate in university-sponsored academic, fine arts, and cultural events throughout the 2020-2021 academic year.

**Faculty/Staff Meeting:** (to discuss assessment results; list the date and attach minutes, if taken)

Assessment results will be discussed at the next meeting of the Honors Board on September 15, 2021.

Summary Table of Student Learning Outcomes/Criteria				
Student Learning Outcomes	Criteria/Instrument	Direct/ Indirect Measure	Met	Not Met
SLO1: Honors students demonstrate high-level writing and critical thinking skills.	1.1: Honors Project and Thesis proposals should be clear, logical, easy to follow, polished and demonstrates attention to detail. Instrument 1: Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #1 (attached): "Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow." Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.	Direct	x	
	Instrument 2: Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #2 (attached): "Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail." Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.	Direct	X	
	1.2: Critical Thinking. Honors Project and Thesis proposals should demonstrate an awareness of the complexity of the issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic. They should also describe a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable. Instrument 1: Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #3 (attached): "Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic." Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.	Direct		X
	Instrument 2: Rubric for Project or Thesis Proposal, item #4 (attached): "describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable." Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.	Direct	X	
SLO 2: Honors students conduct scholarly research or produce creative work in areas of their major areas of interest.	2.1: Communication Skills. Honors Showcase presentations of Project and Thesis work should be clear, logical, easy to follow, polished and demonstrates attention to detail. Instrument 1: Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #1: "Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow." Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate.	Direct	X	

	Instrument 2: Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #2: "Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail". Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate.	Direct	X	
	Instrument 3: Rubric for Showcase Presentation: Research (attached) items #1-5: 1. Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow; 2. Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail; 3. Use of body language is effective; consider: eye contact, posture, gestures; 4. Use of voice is effective; consider: pacing, fluency, volume, tone; 5. Conveys intellectual enthusiasm. Honors Board and Honors Faculty attending Showcase will evaluate.	Direct	X	
	2.2: Critical Thinking. Honors Projects and Theses demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic and describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable. Instrument 1 Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #3: "Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic." Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate	Direct	X	
	Instrument 2: Rubric for Honors Thesis or Project (attached), item #4: "Describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable." Thesis Committees and Project Directors will evaluate.	Direct	X	
	Instrument 3: Rubric for Showcase Presentation: Research (attached) items #6-7: 6) "Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research contributed by others on topic" and 7) "Describes a scholarly or creative objective or research question that is original and valuable." Members of the University Honors Board will evaluate.	Direct	X	
SLO 3: Honors students participate in approved extra-curricular experiences and	3.1: Honors students make effective Showcase presentations about their Engagement experiences. Instrument 1: Rubric for Showcase Presentation:	Direct	X	



evaluate its enrichment of their ECU education.	Engagement (attached), items #1-5: 1. Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow; 2. Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail; 3. Use of body language is effective; consider: eye contact, posture, gestures; 4. Use of voice is effective; consider: pacing, fluency, volume, tone; 5. Conveys intellectual enthusiasm. Honors Board and Honors Faculty attending Showcase will evaluate.			
	Instrument 2: Rubric for Engagement Honors Experience (attached). Honors students complete Engagement Experiences will use rubric to evaluate experience.	Indirect	X	
	Criterion 3.2: Honors students enrolled in EQ courses attend a wide array of university-sponsored academic, fine arts and cultural events and reflect on those that are most meaningful to them. Instrument : Chart tracking attendance and experiences deemed most meaningful by students.	Direct (attendance) & Indirect (reflection)		X*

\* ND (No Data): Due to Covid precautions, we suspended the class requirement that students participate in university-sponsored academic, fine arts, and cultural events throughout the 2020-2021 academic year.

#### **Sharing with Stakeholders:**

1. Stakeholders for this Program include:  
ECU Faculty, Honors students, parents, and alumni.
2. Current program assessment reports will be made available on the website of the Office of Institutional Effectiveness:  
[https://myecu.ecok.edu/ICS/Institutional Reporting/Assessment Reporting and Outcomes.inz](https://myecu.ecok.edu/ICS/Institutional%20Reporting/Assessment%20Reporting%20and%20Outcomes.inz)

---

**Summary of Actions Related to Assessment Data**
**CURRENT ACTIONS AND/OR CHANGES**

Improving project and thesis proposals instrument 1.2.1—“Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on the topic”—is priority #1. We saw significant improvement in this domain in 2020-2021 and we hope to continue that trajectory in the coming academic year. We will have a new EQ4 instructor in the spring of 2022 who has a successful track record teaching EQ4 courses and in supervising Honors theses. We will deploy some of the strategies that helped raise scores in this domain in the 2020-2021 academic year. Priority #2 will be to maintain standards for Projects and Theses. This will be a challenge because in the fall of 2021 we have more students (18) launching theses and projects than we have ever had before.

- Honors Director will meet with EQ4 instructor during the fall semester to produce a plan for helping students produce proposals that demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion.
- Honors Director will provide the EQ4 instructor with ideas solicited from Honors Board members for helping students produce proposals that demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion.
- Honors Director will meet with EQ4 instructor during the first half of the spring semester to discuss progress of plan for helping student produce proposals that that demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion.
- Honors Director will host a Thesis Launch Party for students launching theses and their faculty thesis advisors during week four of the semester and distribute best practices handout to faculty and students who are unable to attend.
- Honors Director will host monthly Thesis Support Team progress-report meetings in the fall with students working on theses (may continue in spring)
- A Thesis Support Team student coordinator will host separate monthly progress-report meetings in the fall with students working on theses (may continue in spring) so that support team is checking in every two weeks.
- Honors Director and Thesis Support Team student coordinator will coordinate progress-report group email check-ins every two weeks with students who do not attend Thesis Support-Team progress-report meetings.
- Honors Director will distribute multiple progress report surveys during the fall semester to faculty supervising student theses.

**SUMMARY OF LAST 5 YEARS' ACTIONS/CHANGES & UPDATES**

Academic Year	Current Actions/Changes	Annual Reviews
2019-2020	Improving project and thesis proposal scores was priority #1 moving forward (Criteria 1.1 and 1.2).	Assessment report was approved in June 2020.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honors Director will meet with EQ4 instructor during the latter half of the fall semester to produce a plan for helping students produce proposals that: are clear, logical, and easy to follow; are polished and demonstrate attention to detail; that demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion. <b>Update: Meeting was held and successful (9/30/20). Appendix F.</b></li> <li>• Honors Director will provide the EQ4 instructor with ideas solicited from Honors Board members and from previous EQ4 instructors for helping students produce proposals that: are clear, logical, and easy to follow; are polished and demonstrate attention to detail; that demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion. <b>Update: Board’s suggestions were communicated and enacted.</b></li> <li>• Honors Director will meet with EQ4 instructor during the first half of the spring semester to discuss progress of plan for helping student produce proposals that that: are clear, logical, and easy to follow; are polished and demonstrate attention to detail; that demonstrate awareness of complexities of issue under discussion. <b>Update: Meetings were held and successful</b></li> <li>• Honors Director will distribute engagement experience evaluations to students when Internship proposals are approved by the Honors Board (current practice is to distribute</li> </ul>	
--	--	--

	<p>them only at the end of the semester). <b>Update: Evaluation forms were not distributed when proposals were approved, but all internship evaluations were returned.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Require submission of Engagement Experience evaluations before OSLEP grades are submitted. <b>Update: Engagement experience evaluation forms were not distributed before OSLEP grades were submitted, but 5 of 6 students completing OSLEP course returned evaluations.</b></li> </ul>	
<p>2018-2019</p>	<p>In consultation with Assessment coordinator, goals were clarified; full academic year (e.g. "2018-2019") was added where previous report simply listed the last year (e.g. "2019"); a more specific way to identify and gather data on students not enrolled in a specific course was identified: all Honors active students are coded as "Honors" in the Jenzabar system and that list may be accessed at any time'; a short note was added under each table to explain the NDs.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase emphasis in EQ4 classes on preparing proposals that are polished and demonstrate greater attention to detail. <b>Update: Scores did not increase. Campus shutdown in spring 2020 may have been factor.</b></li> <li>• Increase emphasis in EQ4 classes on preparing proposals that demonstrate awareness of the complexities of their projects or work contributed by others to the topic. <b>Update: Scores did not increase. Campus shutdown in spring 2020 may have been factor.</b></li> </ul>	<p>Assessment report was approved in June 2020. Listed areas of concern were addressed: "Need to identify goals— statement given in description of how to do this;" "Need AY which is 2018-2019;" "more specific way to identify and gather data on students who are not enrolled in a specific course . . . e. g., students completing Honors Thesis of Project"); "need short note under tables to explain the NDs".</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase emphasis in Showcase presentation workshops on prepared presentations that are polished and demonstrate greater attention to detail. <b>Update: Scores increased in Fall 2019.</b></li> <li>• Increase emphasis in Showcase presentation workshops on demonstrating awareness of complexities and prior research related to projects and theses. <b>Update: Scores increased in Fall 2019.</b></li> </ul>	
2017-2018	The Honors Program Director met with the Assessment Coordinator in June 2019. Rubrics were subsequently revised and Student Learning Outcomes were made more precise.	Assessment report was approved with conditions in June 2019. Listed areas of concern were: "The Honors Program should meet with the Assessment Coordinator and review the following. Rubrics should be revised and assessment plan updated accordingly. Make outcomes more concise."
2016-2017	*ND	
2015-2016	*ND	
2014-2015	*ND	

\*ND (No Data): The Honors Assessment Plan was first approved in 2017. The data used for that plan was first collected during the 2017-2018 academic year.



**APPENDIX A**

Faculty Evaluation of  
**Project or Thesis Proposal**

Assign an evaluative number, 1-5, for each of the criteria specified below.

- 5—excellent
- 4—commendable
- 3—satisfactory
- 2—notable deficiencies
- 1—inadequate

Name of student: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Score	<b>Communication: Writing</b>
	1. Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow
	2. Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail.
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	
Score	<b>Content: Critical Thinking</b>
	3. Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic
	4. Scholarly or creative objective or research question is original and valuable
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	

**Global Score (1-5):** \_\_\_\_\_ (need not be an average of the four scores listed above)  
 (5=exemplary/could be used as a model text; 4=accept as is; 3 = accept with minor modifications; 2 = accept only with major modifications; 1=needs to be reconceived)

rev. 04/01/2016

**APPENDIX B**

Faculty Evaluation of  
**Honors Thesis or Project**

Assign an evaluative number, 1-5, for each of the criteria specified below.

- 5—excellent
- 4—commendable
- 3—satisfactory
- 2—notable deficiencies
- 1—inadequate

Name of student: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Score	<b>Communication: Writing</b>
	1. Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow
	2. Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	
Score	<b>Content: Critical Thinking</b>
	3. Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic
	4. Scholarly or creative objective or research question is original and valuable
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	

**Global Score (1-5):** \_\_\_\_\_ (need not be an average of the four scores listed above)  
 (5=exemplary/could be used as a model text; 4=accept as is; 3 = accept with minor modifications; 2 = accept only with major modifications; 1=needs to be reconceived)

rev. 04/01/2016



**APPENDIX C**

Faculty Evaluation of  
**Honors Showcase Presentation:  
Research**

Assign an evaluative number, 1-5, for each of the criteria specified below.

- 5—excellent**
- 4—commendable**
- 3—competent**
- 2—notable deficiencies**
- 1—inadequate**

Name of student: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

Circle one: Project / Thesis

Score	<b>Quality of Communication</b>
	1. Organization of presentation is logical and easy to follow
	2. Delivery of presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail
	3. Use of body language is effective (Consider: eye contact, posture, gestures)
	4. Pacing, fluency, volume and tone of delivery are effective
	5. Conveys intellectual enthusiasm
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	
Score	<b>Quality of Content (Critical Thinking)</b>
	6. Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic
	7. Scholarly or creative objective or research question is original and valuable
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	

rev. 06/10/2016

**APPENDIX D**

Faculty Evaluation of  
**Honors Showcase Presentation:  
Engagement**

Name of student: \_\_\_\_\_

Faculty advisor: \_\_\_\_\_

- 5—excellent
- 4—commendable
- 3—competent
- 2—notable deficiencies
- 1—inadequate

Name of student: \_\_\_\_\_ Circle one: Study Abroad/ OSLEP/Other

Score	Quality of Communication
	1. Organization of presentation is logical and easy to follow
	2. Delivery is polished and demonstrates attention to detail
	3. Use of body language is effective (Consider: eye contact, posture, gestures)
	4. Use of voice is effective (Consider: pacing, fluency, volume, tone)
	5. Conveys intellectual enthusiasm
Areas of strength	
Areas of potential development	

rev. 06/10/2016

**APPENDIX E**

Student Evaluation of  
**Honors Engagement Experience**

Evaluate your Honors Engagement experience.

- 5—excellent
- 4—commendable
- 3—satisfactory
- 2—deficient in notable ways
- 1—inadequate

Name of student: \_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Experience (Study Abroad/OSLEP/Internship, etc.): \_\_\_\_\_

Score	
	Gave me new knowledge about the complexity of the issue under discussion (OSLEP/Internship, etc.) or the different cultures I encountered (Study Abroad)
	Helped me develop my own perspective
	<b>General comments:</b>

**Global score:** \_\_\_\_\_ (need not be average of scores listed above)

**APPENDIX F****Honors Board Meeting Minutes September 28, 2020**

1. Elect a President and a Secretary.
  - a. *Andrew Wells discussed the roles and responsibilities of each of the officer positions and nominations/volunteers were accepted.*
    - i. *Andrew Wells was re-elected as President.*
    - ii. *Julie Lee will serve as Secretary.*
2. Discuss the Assessment Report (attached).  
 Executive summary: The assessment data suggests that we need to focus on improving the project and thesis proposals that come out of EQ4 in these three areas: 1) "Description of project is clear, logical, and easy to follow;" 2) "Presentation is polished and demonstrates attention to detail;" and 3) "Demonstrates awareness of complexities of issue under discussion, including research or creative work contributed by others on topic."  
 Suggestions are welcome.
  - a. *Suggestions included:*
    - i. *Emphasizing the project proposal as a mini-project that includes preliminary research efforts*
    - ii. *Faculty mentor training/orientation opportunities*

**PAYING FACULTY WHO MENTOR PROJECTS AND THESES**

3. Budget
4. Faculty who worked with students who completed a thesis in Spring of 2019 but did not submit finished thesis until Fall of 2019
5. Proposal to change faculty handbook so that faculty who mentor theses are paid even if students do not successfully complete theses.
  - a. *Dr. Benton discussed the issues outlined above and indicated that he is scheduled to meet with the Provost conserving funding options*
  - b. *Related to Item 5. – There was discussion about the possibility of paying faculty a prorated portion of pay at various stages of theses completion.*

**2020 SENIOR TRIP**

6. Refunds for students who donated money to help pay for our planned trip to Mexico City last spring.
  - a. *Dr. Benton will be communicating with students. Refunds will be evaluated on a case-by-case basis as each student's situation with regards to payments made is unique.*

**UPPER DIVISION REQUIREMENTS**

7. December 3<sup>rd</sup> Showcase options
8. Students who have to submit articles for publication or make off-campus presentations to fulfill Honors Project requirements
9. Reduced OSLEP opportunities
  - a. *There was a discussion of possible virtual conference options for fall and spring to satisfy the off-campus presentation requirement for projects. This will be discussed at a*

*subsequent meeting when more information about Oklahoma Research Day and other conferences is made available.*

#### RECRUITING CONTINUING STUDENTS

10. Recruiting continuing students when current EQ classes are full

- a. *Dr. Benton explained that EQ classes are limited and currently full which is creating recruitment challenges.*

Minutes: Honors Board Fall 2019 Meeting

Tuesday September 3rd 2019

9:30 PM in Faust Hall

Present: Andrew Wells, Houston Mount, Julie Lee, Marc Klippenstine, Alisha Howard, Nicholas Jacob, Sarah Peters, Steve Benton, Ken Andrews

1. Elections Andrew Wells was elected as President. Nicholas Jacob was elected as Secretary
2. Project and Thesis Proposals are due on Wednesday, should be a small number to evaluate as most were submitted last spring. Look for them in your inbox this weekend. These may not be from your discipline or college. The goal as evaluators is to help anticipate problems that might arise with the proposals. Numbers are required for report but there is no need to average for the global score.
3. Showcase Presentations Thursday 12/5/2019 at 3:30 and Tuesday 4/21/2020 at 3:30 not the same night as the banquet.
4. Spring Honors Journey Meant to be impactful for students and help promote the program. Will be going to Mexico City during spring break with 17 seniors.
5. Work Plan and annual assessment report discussed (a) Study abroad will be covered with Mexico trip; (b) "Reacting to the Past" will be implemented; (c) Honors alumni relations is enhancing social media presence
6. Recruiting an email will go out soliciting honors nominations from the faculty and staff
7. Early Interviews may have increased freshman enrollment up to 47
8. Expansion has possibility of third EQ1 class but would like for Steve not to be the only face of honors
9. Convocation discussed ideas for increasing participation and promotion. Including speakers, ceremonial book signing, student winner of contest speaking, utilizing house divisions, and using trip as a carrot for participation by upper division students