



(Due: May 24, 2019)

Date report completed: May 3, 2019

Completed by: Patricia “Trish” Orman Ph.D.

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): Shelly Moreschini, Shanna Farmer, Steven Trujillo, Jason Falsetto (student)

Please describe the 2018-2019 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department. Please copy any addenda (e.g., rubrics) and paste them in this document, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2018. You’ll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

A. Which of the program SLOs were assessed during this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO <u>last</u> reported on prior to this cycle? (semester and year)	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group(s) and the number of students or artifacts involved (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency level and how many or what proportion of students should be at that level?	F. What were the results of the assessment? (Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.)	G. What were the department’s conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
SLO #2: Ethics --PLP scholars will manifest an understanding of leadership ethics and service to others, illustrate, analyze, and assess	Spring, 2018	Portfolio review and student interviews in Fall 2018; Focus group and final portfolio review in Spring, 2019. Program Portfolio review	15 senior PLP students registered in either PLP 460 or 489, plus one senior registered for PLP 491. (15	85% of PLP seniors will meet or exceed our minimum level of performance; 80% of sophomores	80% (12 of 15) of seniors met or exceeded expectations. The remaining 3 either missed the ethical focus, or did	Ethics SLO remains hard to measure—as noted in our 2018 report. More discussion of this topic required in the classroom. Results of ethical focus group plus re-development of	Based on observations in 2017-2018, plus results of focus groups, conversations with adjunct faculty and students, reviews of internet sources available to develop syllabi changes, and attendance at 2019 assessment workshops, we agree that a re-writing of this SLO and appropriate changes in

ethical behaviors as demonstrated in written work and oral presentation in the classroom and in community or public settings.		rubric attached to these templates. (Focus group summary noted in Comments for Part 1 and Closing the Loop.)	Total portfolios reviewed: 4 Summer 2018; 9 Fall 2018; 2 Spring 2019); 15 sophomores registered for PLP 260 in Fall 2018.	should meet or exceed that performance level.	not cover the topic as successfully as their peers.*	recording these observations and reflections need to be included in each PLP course. (Also see Comments/Part 1 and Closing the Loop below.)	course slyabi, will help us focus more accurately on the important elements around ethical behaviors and leadership. We have already investigated specific class assignments that can be addressed in each required PLP course to improve both the depth and frequency of attention to ethical principles.
SLO #4: Critical Thinking Skills— PLP Scholars will understand the methods and skills needed for critical thinking and decision-making and be prepared to interpret situations and cases beyond surface arguments. Students will observe and understand the critical thinking habits of mentors and leaders as evaluated through the shadowing and reflection experiences of PLP 260 and through the junior class (PLP 360) project.	Spring, 2018	Portfolio reviews and student interviews in Fall 2018; Focus group and final portfolio reviews in Spring 2019. Program Portfolio review rubric attached to these templates. (Focus group summary noted in Closing the Loop & Comments for Part 1.)	15 senior PLP student portfolios (4 Summer 2018; 9 Fall 2018; 2 Spring 2019). Note: Sophomores were not evaluated specifically on SLO #4 in this cycle because this element was not a focus of portfolio development in the fall.** See Comments below.	80% of PLP students will meet or exceed our minimum level of performance.	73% (11 of 15) met/exceeded expectations. The remaining 4 did not sufficiently address this SLO in their portfolio work.*	Again, critical thinking skills are difficult to measure, but not impossible. The portfolios alone do not address all discussions and reflections on leadership assignments for the semester or as an aggregate of student growth. More attention to classroom discussions, exercises, and specific journal entries should be added to the assessment process where possible.	As a result of Spring 2019 focus groups, discussions with other faculty, attendance at assessment workshops and use of existing materials tested elsewhere, the PLP directors have agreed to build in more robust measures of critical thinking skills in all four base courses (required of all students). Also see Comments below regarding specific results of critical thinking focus group discussions.) As noted in the comments below, we are anxious to include team work completed in PLP 360-Team Practicum as a more serious component of assessment in the critical thinking and reasoning area.

Comments on part I: *We are aware that 2018 students may not have had enough classroom/syllabus-directed focus on specific observations/reflections/discussion on the ethical behaviors of their leaders and mentors. Further, several students did not develop observations or arguments beyond surface levels of discussion. Part of the exercise in 2017-18—examining all six outcomes—illustrated a need for better measures of ethics and of critical thinking skills. Fall 2018, in particular, was somewhat experimental in our focus on these two outcomes. **However**, the remaining four SLOs are measured via our Program Portfolio rubric and in nearly every case, students met or exceeded expectations. As noted in Closing the Loop

below, our challenge this year was to examine opportunities, discuss options with students and faculty, and to stage two focus groups to gain student insights around these important concepts and skills for emerging leaders. **Because we are evaluating two SLOs and changing the method of data collection over the next year, we did not focus on critical thinking in the sophomore portfolio development or review this cycle. However, we did look more closely at the critical thinking/reasoning activities developing in the re-structured PLP 360/Team Practicum course, so we will be analyzing that carefully as we re-structure all portfolios for Fall 2019. For in-house use, we continue to measure student leadership growth from sophomore to senior levels and we are particularly encouraged by the strength of those gains between PLP 260 and PLP 460/489—especially since 2015 as syllabi and rubrics were rewritten to reflect observations and recommendations during assessment review.

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2018-2019 cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment column H and/or feedback?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
SLO#2; Ethics-- PLP scholars will manifest an understanding of leadership ethics and service to others, illustrate, analyze, and assess ethical behaviors as demonstrated in written work and oral presentation in the classroom and in community or public settings.	Summer & Fall 2018; Spring 2019	Find additional resources for measuring ethical skills and behaviors. During discussions with other faculty and our dean, several suggested developing our own documents and pilot assignments. See comments below.	After discussions with students, a focus group was held in February 2019 to capture feedback from students who had completed college level ethics courses. A senior PLP student (Jason Falsetto) facilitated and recorded the focus group, reported and summarized the results, and drew conclusions regarding expectations and recommendations for strengthening the discussion of ethics—as well as specific activities to illustrate the importance of ethics in	Faculty met to discuss the results, including specific recommendations for writing assignments, class exercises and discussion points that could be developed for each of the four required PLP courses. These changes will be written into syllabi for use in Fall 2019 and beyond. Several students spoke to specific techniques used in a course on business ethics, and others offered through philosophy and EXHPR courses. The SLO itself and its measurement expectations will be re-written to more accurately reflect our academic program goals.

<p>SLO#4: Critical Thinking Skills—PLP scholars will understand the methods and skills needed for critical thinking and decision-making and be prepared to interpret situations and cases beyond surface arguments. Students will observe and understand the critical thinking habits of mentors and leaders as evaluated through the shadowing and reflection experiences of PLP 260 and through the junior class (PLP 360) project.</p>	<p>Summer & Fall 2018; Spring 2019</p>	<p>See above. We also got suggestions from faculty previous campus attempts to strengthen critical thinking. We have encouraged students to take campus inventories regarding critical thinking skills. Further, we initiated a focus group on critical thinking/critical reasoning skills, inviting students who had completed a college level course and/or had discussed the topic extensively in a college course. This focus group was held in April 2019. Again, a senior PLP student facilitated the group, recorded feedback, summarized responses, and reported results to directors in recent weeks.</p>	<p>leadership. Because the focus group results just came in, we have not had a full faculty meeting to address the results. However, several excellent suggestions were derived from this recent discussion, including the development of a PLP/leadership based course on critical thinking for leaders. The students suggested opening this course to the general population of students as well as the PLP cohorts to engage and “mix” perspectives. As the conversation continued, the idea of co-creating the course came to the table: Having students both design and offer significant portions of the class with faculty guidance appeared to be a positive idea—one that ties with experiential education expectations as well.</p>	<p>Faculty are now considering the PLP-focused course concept and will meet to discuss this possibility before the CAP Board meets in the fall. Further, specific pedagogical suggestions emerged from this session that will be explored fully as faculty write syllabi for the fall semester. In the meantime, PLP directors will continue to recommend existing critical thinking courses to students in the program and work with other faculty to shore up required course syllabi.</p>
--	--	--	---	--

Comments on part II: OTHER DATA-INFORMED CHANGES since June 2018:

- 1) A move to digital portfolios was piloted in Fall 2018. All sophomores and seniors delivered their written work and artifacts via digital upload to an established googledocs platform. Adam Pocius in the CSU-Pueblo IT department facilitated this move, meeting with each cohort and/or faculty member to establish ease of access to student work. While a glitch or two occurred in the first run, faculty and students agreed that a digital upload was far more suitable than a bulky three-ring binder of materials. Faculty have met with Adam several times this term with a goal of establishing PLP-googledoc accounts for all students so that individual assignments may be uploaded throughout a student’s tenure in the program.

- 2) The oral presentation rubric (attached to this template) has been standardized for all PLP courses. A separate program-focused oral rubric did not prove to be effective for evaluating sophomore and senior level portfolio presentations. Because the current program/SLO rubric was

written to examine both written and oral content, it does not appear necessary to change the oral rubric at this time. Further, because we will be re-writing two of our current SLOs and perhaps combining two others, the program assessment rubric will need to be modified in 2019-2020 to reflect those changes.

- 3) As noted earlier, focus groups have helped us to attain important student information regarding expectations and suggestions regarding two SLOs. In addition, a third focus group—actually set up in early February—reviewed and evaluated elements of our annual first-year orientation and scholar retreat. This three-day event includes a number of activities and exercises to help students meet, bond and prepare for cohort life. A number of exercises look at team-building and problem-solving, but also include activities around ethics and critical thinking. A review of this focus group material will help to add SLO-focused exercises to strengthen these important leadership attributes.
- 4) On May 2, 2019, Shelly Moreschini and I held a final meeting/data discussion with student assistant Jason Falsetto to review the conclusions he drew from three focus groups discussed earlier, and the final distribution of the PLP alumni survey that Jason developed with us during the month of April. This instrument will be delivered via the CSU-Pueblo foundation and through the PLP facebook page. Once this data is gathered and summarized, we will develop a current-student document for circulation later in the year. As appropriate, we will go through IRB protocols to clarify the purpose and use of this formative data for program course delivery.
- 5) Beginning in May or June 2019, the President’s Leadership Program will merge with the Honors Program at a cost-center level to create a Center for Honors and Leadership. Each program will operate with separate curricula, although some students may be enrolled in both programs simultaneously. This merger may also yield greater opportunities to create joint courses, greater access to speakers and special events, as well as opportunities for faculty on campus to be exposed to both programs.

Leadership Studies Program Assessment Rubric 2018-19

CSU-Pueblo President's Leadership Program

Factor	5 - Outstanding	4 – Very good	3 - Adequate	2 – Needs attention	1 – Not acceptable
Self-Leadership	Demonstrates self-leadership skills daily and continually works to improve, knowing that "leading oneself" involves both the utilization of behavioral and mental techniques. Is committed to personal and professional competence.	Applies the concept of "leading from the inside out" by applying the skills learned and demonstrating them on a regular basis in their own personal life to become a better leader for others.	Recognizes the value and skills involved in self-leadership and applies certain aspects but does not go "above and beyond" in applying or committing to personal and professional competence.	Recognizes the value and skills involved in self-leadership but does not actively work to develop or apply those concepts in his or her own life.	Has begun to understand the concept of self-leadership but does not recognize how it applies to him or herself.
Ethics	Recognizes that ethical issues when presented in a complex, multi-layered (grey) context AND can recognize cross-relationships among the issues.	Recognizes that ethical issues when issues are presented in a complex, multilayered (grey) context OR can grasp cross-relationships among the issues.	Recognizes obvious ethical issues and grasps the complexities or inter-relationships among the issues.	Recognizes basic and obvious ethical issues and grasps (incompletely) the complexities or inter-relationships among the issues.	Recognizes basic and obvious ethical issues but fails to grasp complexity or inter-relationships.
Leadership theory	Connects and extends knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Analyzes knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline making relevant connections to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Is able to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own study/field/discipline to civic engagement and starts to shape his/her own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to connect knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.	Begins to identify knowledge (facts, theories, etc.) from one's own academic study/field/discipline that is relevant to civic engagement and to one's own participation in civic life, politics, and government.
Critical thinking	Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies the salient arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Thoughtfully analyzes and	Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and claims) pro and con. Offers analyses and	Begins to correctly interpret evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Starts to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments.	Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially	Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of others. Fails to identify or hastily

	<p>evaluates major alternative points of view. Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.</p>	<p>evaluations of obvious alternative points of view. Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.</p>	<p>Begins to evaluate obvious alternative points of view. Understands what warranted or correct conclusions are. Begins to see how one justifies results or procedures, starts to explain reasons.</p>	<p>evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.</p>	<p>dismisses strong, relevant counter-arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Argues using fallacious or irrelevant reasons, and unwarranted claims. Does not justify results or procedures, nor explain reasons.</p>
<p>Problem solving</p>	<p>Achieves, clear, unambiguous conclusions from the data. Employs creativity in the search for a solution. Recognizes and values alternative problem solving methods, when appropriate.</p>	<p>Focuses on difficult problems with persistence. Can work independently with confidence. Sees the real world relevance of problem. Provides a logical interpretation of the data.</p>	<p>Focuses on more complex problems with persistence. Can work under supervision with confidence. Begins to see the real world relevance of problem. Understands examples of a logical interpretation of data.</p>	<p>Begins to identify problem types. Relies on standardized solution methods, rather than guesswork or intuition. Understands the level of complexity of a problem.</p>	<p>Cannot identify problem types. Relies on guesswork or intuition rather than standardized solutions. Does not understand the level of complexity of a problem.</p>
<p>Civic engagement</p>	<p>Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a reinforced and clarified sense of civic identity and continued commitment to public action.</p>	<p>Provides evidence of experience in civic engagement activities and describes what she/he has learned about her or himself as it relates to a growing sense of civic-identity and commitment.</p>	<p>Understands that involvement in civic engagement activities is generated from a sense of civic-identity, not so much from course requirements</p>	<p>Assumes that involvement in civic engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic-identity.</p>	<p>Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic-identity.</p>

Oral Presentation Rubric

Presenter's Name: _____

Topic _____

Evaluator's Name: _____

CATEGORY	4	3	2	1
Preparedness	Speaker is completely prepared and has obviously rehearsed.	Speaker seems pretty prepared but might have needed a little more time to rehearse.	The speaker is somewhat prepared, but it is clear that rehearsal was lacking.	Speaker does not seem at all prepared to present.
Speaks Clearly at a good pace	Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, kept a good, steady pace, and mispronounced no words.	Speaks clearly and distinctly all (100-95%) the time, but was sometimes too slow or fast, and/or mispronounced a word or two.	Speaks clearly and distinctly most (94-85%) of the time, but went too slow or too fast and /or mispronounced a number of words.	Often mumbles or cannot be understood. Spoke way too slow or too fast, and/or mispronounced a lot of words.
Stays on Topic	Stays on topic all (100%) of the time.	Stays on topic most (99-90%) of the time.	Stays on topic some (89%-75%) of the time. Somewhat confusing.	It was hard to tell what the topic was. Very confusing. Speaker rambled.

Posture and Eye Contact	Stands up straight, looks relaxed and confident. Establishes eye contact with everyone in the room during the presentation.	Stands up straight and establishes eye contact with everyone in the room during the presentation. Could be more confident.	Sometimes stands up straight and establishes eye contact. Needs to be more confident in presenting.	Slouches and/or does not look at people during the presentation. Seemed very nervous and/or not very interested.
Content	Shows a full understanding of the topic.	Shows a good understanding of the topic.	Shows understanding of parts of the topic.	Does not seem to understand the topic very well.
Volume	Volume is loud enough to be heard by all audience members throughout the presentation.	Volume is loud enough to be heard by all audience members at least 90% of the time.	Volume is loud enough to be heard by all audience members at least 80% of the time.	Volume often too soft to be heard by all audience members.
Audio-Visual	The audio-visual used enhanced the understanding of the presentation extremely well.	The audio-visual helped enhance the understanding of the presentation.	The audio-visual helped enhance parts of the topic. Presenter could have utilized it better.	The audio-visual did not enhance the meaning of the presentation. Presenter did not use well.

Constructive Feedback: