Colorado State University – Pueblo Undergraduate & GraduateProgram Assessment Report for AY 2011-2012   **Due: June 1, 2012**

Program: Leadership Studies (President's Leadership Program)   **Date:** May 17, 2012

Completed by: Patricia (Trish) Orman, Ph.D., Academic Director

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, minor, certificate, and graduate program (e.g., B.A., B.S., M.S.) in your department and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2012. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/Resources/Pages/default.aspx. Thank you.

I. Program student learning outcomes (SLOs) assessed in this cycle, processes, results, and recommendations.

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 last assessed?	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? Please attach a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.	D. Who was assessed? Please fully describe the student group.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many students should be at it?	F. What were the results of the assessment?	G. What were the department's conclusions about student performance?	H. What changes/improvements to the program are planned based on this assessment?
Self-Leadership: PLP scholars will understand, synthesize, and evaluate their personal readiness for leadership by communicating effectively through written and oral means as measured by course assignments and a final portfolio. **Critical Thinking:** PLP scholars will	Self-leadership SLO resulted from self-study and evaluated internally during 2006. Not evaluated via systemic assessment. Critical thinking not previously assessed.	For pilot testing, the attached rubric was used to review portfolios at sophomore and senior levels.	14 PLP scholars enrolled in senior level capstone US 460 or US 489 during Fall 2011 and Spring 2012 semesters, and 10 of 13 PLP scholars enrolled in second year course, US 260. (Only 10 portfolios were available for program review.)	**Self-Leadership:** Projection of 90% meeting or exceeding minimum level of performance— "adequate" on the quality leveling of rubric. **Critical Thinking:** 80% of scholars would meet or exceed minimum level of performance— "adequate" on	**Self-Leadership:** 13/14 seniors met or exceeded minimum level of performance. Nine of 10 sophomore portfolios met or exceeded the minimum level of performance. **Critical Thinking:** 13/14 seniors met or exceeded minimum level of performance. 9/10 sophomore	No absolute conclusions drawn during pilot, however, changes to program assessment rubric, further examination of leveling expectations, and more focus on co-currricular activities should help us to determine necessary actions to improve assessment process and student achievement.	Faculty will make key changes in course syllabi to reflect firmer understanding of outcomes— including full notes about goals, outcomes met by course content, changes in assignments, more appropriate assignment and portfolio rubrics to align with program goals, outcomes, and assessment rubric. Additional program rubric changes will also account for "missing" measures of ethical behavior and multicultural competence. Also see comments below.

				the quality leveling of rubric.	portfolios met or exceeded minimum level. *See comments below.		
understand the methods and skills needed for critical thinking and decision making and be prepared to interpret situations/cases beyond surface arguments. Students will observe and understand the critical thinking habits of mentors and leaders.							

Comments: Because this was a pilot year for the Leadership Studies minor (limited entirely to the scholars in the President's Leadership Program), our results were based heavily on portfolios that were generated in Fall 2011 when our outcome language, rubrics, and assignments were still in flux. Clearly, our portfolio assessments are still somewhat subjective and do not include all elements of our program—such as our leadership summits, lecture series, voluntarism, and other activities required for PLP scholars. As noted above, changes in the program rubric(s) will better measure the six leadership studies outcomes and we will have additional opportunities for data-gathering, observation, and evaluation. Clearly, changes to the program rubric will allow us to examine critical thinking more carefully. Finally, we were only able to access 10 of 13 sophomore level portfolios for the pilot review since three students picked up portfolios before the review could be completed.

B. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this cycle that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) did you address? Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.	B. When was this SLO last assessed?	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. Were the recommendations for change acted upon? If not, why?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
In 2011-2012, PLP faculty addressed self-leadership and critical thinking during our first cycle using the university's assessment process. In 2012-2013, we will re-address self-leadership to tease out components for class assignments and rubrics. We will also address civic engagement since it is a key component of our mission.	Self-Leadership was addressed internally in 2006 and during our pilot cycle in 2011-12. Civic Engagement was addressed internally during the first year of the Leadership Studies minor and has been re-evaluated every year since 2000. We are now using the university's assessment cycle to achieve more focused results.	In the 2011-2012 pilot cycle, it was obvious that we needed to spend additional review time on the structure and expectations of the two portfolio assignments (US 260 and US 460) since these are the obvious benchmarks for progress in the minor. Providing sample rubrics and preparing students for the process was recommended at the close of the first phase of the pilot—Fall 2011.	A portfolio assignment change was initiated in January 2012 for students enrolling in US 460 and US 489 to help prepare students for evaluation and assessment. Changes to US 260 expectations and requirements will occur in Fall 2012 since US 260 is not offered in the spring term.	PLP faculty agree that changes in the program rubrics, as well as changes in assignment rubrics and the assignments themselves will help us to better evaluate communication skills, organization, critical thinking, and ethical behavior. All faculty agreed that consistent application of rubrics for major assignments, as well as evaluation methods for co-curricular activities will help students guide themselves toward better results—especially around communication/presentation skills and critical thinking challenges. Changes to our annual retreat (August of each year) activities will also produce opportunities for observation and evaluation.

Comments: The President's Leadership Program at CSU-Pueblo is one of 11 such programs around the state. At our April directors meeting, I addressed the issue of assessment and it was a lively discussion. Since then several directors have shared resources and commentaries about the assessment process which we will be using to help identify possible improvements or changes to our program offerings. Further, we intend to take students to the International Leadership Association meeting in Denver (October 24-27) to help us locate further pedagogical strategies for leadership education. The theme of this year's event, "bridging the cultural divide," should provide ample opportunities to engage around the "future outcome" of diversity/multiculturalism which we see as missing from our program outcomes list.

2011-12 PLP Program Assessment Rubric (Pilot)

Please use this rubric to review the assigned **senior** level and **sophomore** level portfolios. You may want to test it with two or three portfolios to get comfortable with factors, descriptions, and quality leveling before you complete final scaling. You will recall that we are testing two Leadership Studies outcomes for 2011-2012: **Self-Leadership** and **Critical Thinking**. Please review the Curriculum Map and the full list of outcomes in the PLP Pilot Assessment Plan (2011-2012).

Outstanding=5; Very Good=4; Adequate=3; Inadequate=2; Not acceptable=1

Total Scoring: 18-20= A-level work; 16-17=B-level work; 14-15=C-level work; <13 Inadequate/Not Acceptable. Scholars would need a minimum average score of 14 to be considered adequate—our minimal level of performance.

Factor	Description	Quality Level/Factor
Content	Recognizes leadership qualities/behavior Understands ethical issues, organizational structures, leadership roles/expectations Organizes content around assigned values.	Outstanding Very Good Adequate Inadequate/Needs Attention Not acceptable
Analysis	Utilizes critical thinking; Analyzes arguments and issues thoughtfully and logically. Leadership characteristics analyzed using theoretical principles.	Outstanding Very Good Adequate Inadequate/Needs Attention Not acceptable
Synthesis	Uses leadership resources; Draws upon experiences to develop conclusions and offer new ideas. Comments about leadership show growth in knowledge of leadership principles and behaviors.	Outstanding Very Good Adequate Inadequate/Needs Attention Not acceptable

Communication Qualities   Strong writing mechanics. Uses leadership language and communicates clearly in written or oral work. Presentation of work is professional in organization and appearance utilizing technology and other communication tools.

Outstanding
Very Good
Adequate   both
Inadequate/Needs Attention
Not Acceptable

Conclusion and Comments: