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## Course Intended Learning Outcomes (CILOs)

Students will be able to:

* 1. Plan mitigation and response measures appropriate to specific problems. [PILO 2.2]
	2. Support proposals and conclusions with theory and experience. [PILOs 1.3 & 2.2]
	3. Critique plans. [PILO 2.2]
	4. Write reports in conformance with industry standards. [PILO 4.1]

### CILO Elaboration

**CILO 1: Plan mitigation and response measures appropriate to specific problems.**

*Core question:* To what extent are students able to describe a problem and propose plans in response to that problem that incorporate both mitigation and response measures?

*Competencies:* For this CILO, students will be able to define a problem by identifying relevant hazards and discussing associated vulnerabilities and risks. Students will be able to plan strategies for both mitigation and response, describing how these strategies might be implemented, and the organizational deployment required for successful implementation.

Table 1: CILO 1 Competencies & Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Competencies | Criteria |
| Identify hazards relevant to the problem, associate these with specific vulnerabilities and discuss associated risks. | Problem |
| Identify multiple initiatives (i.e. an act or strategy to resolve a difficulty or improve a situation) and give detailed descriptions of implementation (e.g. specifications for resources; step-by-step protocol; time frames, etc.) and explain contingencies (i.e. foreseeable events considered to be outside the anticipated scenario). | Measure |
| Assign and describe roles and responsibilities for response and mitigation strategies, detail communication and coordination protocols, and discuss potential overlaps and/or gaps in roles and responsibilities. | Role |

Table 2: CILO 1 Performance Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Unsatisfactory | Baseline | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| *Problem**[2.2.1]* | No hazards identified. | One hazard identified. | Multiple hazards identified | …and linked to specific vulnerabilities | …and consequent risks discussed. |
| *Measure**[2.2.3]* | No initiatives identified. | One initiative identified (either mitigation or response). | Multiple initiatives identified (including both mitigation and response) | …with appropriate and realistic implementation detailed | …and contingency plans developed including discussion of why/when they are necessary. |
| *Role**[2.2.3]* | No roles assigned. | One role/ responsibility apportioned. | Multiple roles/ responsibilities apportioned | …with communication/ coordination plan detailed | …and potential overlaps/ gaps discussed. |

*Context:* This CILO revisits the concepts from *Hazard, Risk, and Vulnerability Assessment* in the guise of problem definition. The course CILOs are built around aspects of a central product of an emergency management plan. This CILO focuses on the proposal, identifying three important strands. First, the problem the plan is in response to needs to be clearly laid out; second, the measures being proposed need to be set out, with due regard to both mitigation (i.e. steps taken to reduce the likelihood of an event) and response (i.e. steps taken to reduce the severity of outcomes); third, organizational deployment issues need to be explained. CILOs 2 and 3 provide support to this proposal.

**CILO 2: Support proposals and conclusions with theory and experience.**

*Core question:* How well can students ground their proposals in reasoned fact and precedent?

*Competencies:* For this CILO, students will support their own proposals and assertions with reference to both theoretical and practical knowledge, linking theory to practice and vice versa. They will explain multiple aspects of both theory and practice that are clearly relevant to the proposals from CILO 1; support assertions regarding both theory and practice with a range and variety of sources; and discuss the relevance of this theory and practice to specific features of their proposals.

Table 3: CILO 2 Competencies & Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Competencies | Criteria |
| Link specific initiatives identified in CILO 1 to multiple aspects of theoretical knowledge (e.g. academic frameworks, deductive reasoning, established fact), supported by specific sources (e.g. academic papers, news articles etc.). | Theory |
| Link specific initiatives identified in CILO 1 to multiple events (e.g. previous emergency incidents etc.), referencing specific sources (e.g. academic papers, news articles etc.) to support the level of detail required. | Experience |

Table 4: CILO 2 Performance Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Unsatisfactory | Baseline | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| *Theory**[1.3.1]* | No element identified. | Identify one element of relevant theory. | Explain multiple elements of relevant theory | …with reference to specific sources | …and discuss relevance to specific initiatives. |
| *Experience**[2.2.2]* | No example identified. | Identifies one relevant past example. | Describe multiple relevant past examples | …with details supported by reference to specific sources | …and discuss relevance to specific initiatives. |

*Context:* Twinned with CILO 1, this CILO focuses on the provision of support for proposals that would otherwise appear as unfounded (or untested) assertions, reinforcing concepts from *Critical Inquiry* and associated research skills. The CILO distinguishes between theoretical and empirical support: facts and precedent. In this way, the CILO links both theory to practice, and support to argument (CILO 1). These skills are repeated throughout the BSS program, and should by now be second nature to students.

**CILO 3: Critique plans.**

*Core question:* How well can students evaluate emergency management plans (of others or their own) in terms of compliance with best practice, comprehensiveness against the problem, and effectiveness of the solution?

*Competencies:* For this CILO, students will assess mitigation and response plans against external standards such as best practice, internal regulations, directives etc., and resolve tensions and contradictions among competing standards. They will assess the scope of problem coverage, clearly linking individual initiatives to different aspects of the problem and discuss the trade-offs that can prevent a “perfect” solution. Students will discuss emergent risks associated with specified mitigation and resolution strategies and consider the advantages and disadvantages of competing strategies.

Table 5: CILO 3 Competencies & Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Competencies | Criteria |
| Assess plans for compliance with external standards and requirements (e.g. best practice, local regulations, directives, etc.) and discuss divergence from standards or regulations (e.g. why divergence should be tolerated in this instance). | Standards |
| Link plan initiatives (see definition used in CILO 1) directly to identified elements of the problem to give an overview of comprehensiveness, discussing how trade-offs (e.g. limited resources etc.) may constrain the feasibility of complete solutions. | Scope |
| Discuss how proposed solutions create new risks and how resolutions require decisions to be taken on the basis of evaluated trade-offs between different risk profiles. | Risk |

Table 6: CILO 3 Performance Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Unsatisfactory | Baseline | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| *Standards**[2.2.4]* | No criterion identified. | One criterion identified. | Identify multiple external criteria | …explain the extent of plan’s compliance | …and justify divergences from criteria. |
| *Scope**[2.2.4]* | No aspects of coverage identified. | One aspect of coverage identified. | Identify multiple aspects of coverage | …and explain how the plan addresses these aspects | …and discuss trade-offs involved in extending coverage that limit feasibility. |
| *Risk**[2.2.4]* | No risks identified. | One risk identified. | Identify multiple new risks created by strategy | …and compare magnitude and probability of suite of risks before and after | …and discuss why new risk profile represents the best available outcome in terms trade-offs in risk profiles. |

*Context:* This CILO completes the triptych in which a plan is proposed (CILO 1); supported with referenced theory and precedent (CILO 2); and evaluated for compliance, comprehensiveness and effectiveness (CILO 3). As such, the CILO is closely linked to CILO 1, but can also be seen to stand alone: students should be able to assess both their own plans and those of others. Further, CILO 3 can be seen as a precursor to the other CILOs: security institutions may well believe they already possess a plan, but critical evaluation can expose flaws that demand a new plan be prepared. This idea of periodic review and revision picks up on a core theme found throughout the BSS: that environments are dynamic and require dynamic responses.

**CILO 4: Write reports in conformance with industry standards.**

*Core question:* How well can students write documents in the style, format and template expected by professionals in the appropriate sector?

*Competencies:* Students will habitually apply standard, discipline/industry specific conventions to their writing by following established presentation formats for a range of written forms (i.e. reports including research reports, briefings, memos, emails, letters, etc.). They will express their ideas and opinions clearly and objectively, in conformance to a style and register that is appropriate for their field or relevant discipline.

Table 7: CILO 4 Competencies & Criteria

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Competencies | Criteria |
| Ideas are clear and internally coherent, focus and clarify the argument, and frame the argument within a broader context. | Cogency |
| Format appropriate for the type of communication (e.g. written report, memo, email, briefing, etc.) and applies appropriate conventions (e.g. paragraph length and breaks, bulleted and numbered lists, salutations, required headings, and referencing conventions, etc.). | Template |
| Vocabulary, syntax, and spelling conventions conform to professional expectations for formal written discourse (e.g. discipline specific terminology is used competently, opinions are expressed objectively, colloquialisms and informal word forms are avoided, contractions are avoided, passive voice is used to focus attention on actions rather than actors, etc.). | Style |

Table 8: CILO 4 Performance Standards

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Unsatisfactory | Baseline | Developing | Good | Exemplary |
| *Cogency**[4.1.2]* | No apparent organization of ideas. | One link between ideas is clear. | Links among ideas make message clear and easy to follow | …and provide focused, relevant, explanation and support to the argument | …and frame the argument within the context of a broader discourse. |
| *Template**[4.1.3]* | No apparent observance of standards. | Irregular observance of a limited range of standards. | Regular observance of all common standards | …with demonstrated attention to detail | …and skillful adaptation to specific contexts. |
| *Style**[4.1.1]* | No apparent observance of standard conventions of formal written style. | Irregular observance of the most obvious and common conventions of formal written style. | Consistent observance of most conventions of formal written style | …with word choice appropriate to the intended audience | …and constructions displaying variety, suitability and fluency. |

*Context:* This CILO links to skills acquired throughout the WOC chain, specifically *Technical Communication and Presentation*. It is included in the terminal criminal justice, homeland security, intelligence studies and law courses. The intent is to ensure that students are and able to communicate their insights effectively and to do so in compliance with the conventions and expectations of the different security sectors.

