

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2012-2013

Due: June 1, 2013

Program: President's Leadership Program (Minor)

Date: May 27, 2013

Completed by: Patricia Bowie Orman, Academic Director

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): Shelly Moreschini, Executive Director, PLP

Please complete this form for each undergraduate, 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, and return it to Erin Frew, erin.frew@colostate-pueblo.edu as an email attachment before June 1, 2013. 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 include 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 <u>program</u> are planned based on this assessment?
Self-Leadership	2011-2012 (pilot year)	Portfolio assessment plus SLPI*; 2 rubrics attached--the revised program assessment guide & a new portfolio review tool.	N=23. Eleven graduating seniors (from 3 cohorts**) who were enrolled in US 460 or US 489 in Summer or Fall 2012, and 12 sophomores enrolled in US 260 during Fall 2012.	90% of each cohort should meet or exceed minimum level of performance—"adequate" on the quality leveling of revised program assessment rubric.	11/11 seniors met or exceeded minimum level of performance based on portfolio review and oral presentation. 10/12 sophomores met or exceeded minimum level of performance	Based on changes employed after the 2011-2012 assessment cycles, the SLPI (see comments) results, and program-based rubric, faculty can now see that current students are "getting it" (understanding the components of self-leadership as noted in our outcomes) more quickly when assignments and	Faculty will offer optional assignments, encourage more diverse elective offerings outside the minor requirements, and provide more opportunities for co-curricular experiences on and off campus. A course in Ethical Leadership is in discussion and initial development. Students enrolled in both Honors and Leadership Studies may have opportunities for linked coursework to improve critical thinking and

					based on portfolio review.	experiential placements are closely aligned to student major, outcome-specific assignments, and student-led class discussion.	problem-solving skills. Further, use of SLPI data (plus SRLS* data), particularly at senior level, may reveal patterns and/or gaps in leadership education—pointing to students’ perception of leadership readiness.
Civic Engagement				80% of scholars would meet or exceed minimum level of performance—“adequate” on the quality leveling of the revised program assessment rubric. (Also see Part B and comments that follow.)	11/11 seniors exceeded minimum level of performance as demonstrated by portfolio review, oral presentation, and class discussion. Further, 8/11 seniors completed the final semester SLPI.*** 10/12 Sophomores met or exceeded expectations for civic engagement outcome. In both cohort groups, students clustered at the Very Good or Outstanding measures.	Sophomore and senior placements —frequently linked to major and to career orientation — provide links to jobs, other internships, graduate school, and other professional opportunities. Further, based on oral presentations and class discussion, these engaged students are able to discuss broader issues of civic responsibility and community service in new ways.	Greater use of professional supervisors’ reviews of student performance (and resulting feedback) while in observation phase or during internship will provide another way to reach 360 degree review of student’s progress toward leadership role.

Comments: *The Student Leadership Practices Inventory (SLPI) is administered when students enter the program and again during their final semester in the minor. Resulting “scores” are used to reveal weaknesses and strengths perceived leadership skills on an individual basis. SLPI data can then be the starting point for each student to “grow into” readiness for leadership through individual activities and through classroom assignments/experiences with others. By the senior year, students are re-tested to see if the gaps have closed and the weaknesses strengthened. This pre-test, post-test approach may also reveal legitimate changes in student perception skills as they become more aware of leadership challenges and how to evaluate their own performance more effectively. The Socially Responsible Leadership Scale (SRLS) is another instrument of value in testing leadership development and may assist us in improving student learning within specific courses.**Student cohorts are established when an entry class is accepted into the President’s Leadership Program; these cohorts are designated by anticipated graduation year, i.e. Class of 2013. Because of college level credits at entry point and expedited class scheduling, a number of students graduate early—by a year or more—creating a new class of graduating seniors who represent several individual cohorts, in this case three separate entry points. ***Both the results gathered from the SLPI and the oral presentation reviews have been added to the “data mix” to evaluate student learning and

performance. Seniors interviewed say that frequent presentations and development of public speaking skills have strengthened their confidence as student leaders, thus continued use of oral assignments, review of speeches by world leaders, and the added requirement of SpCom 103 appear to be useful in combination.

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?
Self Leadership	2011-2012 during pilot	Develop program-based rubrics that address more specific skills and behaviors across the minor. Review comments that address student learning rather than the assessment procedures per se.	Yes. Academic Director attended workshop on rubric development and led faculty work sessions on creating tools for program-based assessment rather than tool-based (portfolios, etc.) assessment. Two new rubrics developed. SLPI data and oral presentation results added to the evaluation mix.*	Although attached rubrics are somewhat “general” in language, they are stronger in addressing student learning issues. Program assessment rubric addresses each of the outcomes. Survey data added help to ratify student growth as evidenced via portfolios, class discussion, and oral presentations. A better rubric for US 260, specifically, would help us assess student learning more accurately. The academic director also recommends examining the CAS guidelines for use in collegiate leadership development programs.**

Comments: *During the planning stages for assessment, the leadership studies faculty voted to add SpCom 103- Public Speaking to the list of required courses for the minor. Although a number of seniors had not taken this course (or a college-level equivalent), most (9/12) of the sophomores in this assessment had completed or were completing this requirement during the fall semester. **CAS (Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education) has a set of guidelines based on national multi-institutional assessments of undergraduate leadership programs. These standards are based on a social change model of leadership, one of three theoretical frameworks used in the CSU-Pueblo PLP minor. A 2012 report on the design and assessment of leadership programs on campus, suggests that assessment and evaluation are difficult for a variety of reasons, not the least of which are lack of resources, lack of integration with other campus programs, and unclear guidelines for program sustainability. Although CSU-Pueblo’s leadership studies minor focuses heavily on servant leadership and relational leadership models, these guidelines could be helpful in growing the program across campus and programmatic boundaries, as well as providing additional ways to enhance student learning.

Leadership Studies Program Assessment Rubric 2013

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	Accurately interprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Identifies relevant arguments (reasons and	Begins to correctly interpret evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Starts to identify strong,	Misinterprets evidence, statements, graphics, questions, etc. Fails to identify strong, relevant counter-	Offers biased interpretations of evidence, statements, graphics, questions, information, or the points of view of

	claims) pro and con. Thoughtfully analyzes and evaluates major alternative points of view. Draws warranted, judicious, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies key results and procedures, explains assumptions and reasons.	claims) pro and con. Offers analyses and evaluations of obvious alternative points of view. Draws warranted, non-fallacious conclusions. Justifies some results or procedures, explains reasons.	relevant counter-arguments. 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.	arguments. Ignores or superficially evaluates obvious alternative points of view. Draws unwarranted or fallacious conclusions. Justifies few results or procedures, seldom explains reasons.	others. Fails to identify or hastily 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.
Problem solving	Achieves, clear, unambiguous conclusions from the data. Employs creativity in the search for a solution. Recognizes and values alternative problem solving methods, when appropriate.	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.	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.	Begins to identify problem types. Relies on standardized solution methods, rather than guesswork or intuition. Understands the level of complexity of a problem.	Cannot identify problem types. Relies on guesswork or intuition rather than standardized solutions. Does not understand the level of complexity of a problem.
Civic engagement	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.	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.	Understands that involvement in civic engagement activities is generated from a sense of civic-identity, not so much from course requirements	Assumes that involvement in civic engagement activities is generated from expectations or course requirements rather than from a sense of civic-identity.	Provides little evidence of her/his experience in civic-engagement activities and does not connect experiences to civic-identity.

US 460 – Working With Experienced Leaders-Portfolio Rubric
CSU-Pueblo President's Leadership Program

Factor	5 (Outstanding)	4 (Very Good)	3 (Adequate)	2 (Needs Attention)	1 (Not Acceptable)
Preparation, Organization, Completeness	All portfolio items included; Complete, thorough & organized. Professional work. Contract, paper & other key items present and well produced.	Generally strong organization and thoroughness, but some omissions or unprofessional appearance. Contract & other items present and well produced.	Organized, but an item or two is missing or poorly crafted. Portfolio seems incomplete or rushed to completion. Lack of student thoughtfulness limits overall value.	Most items included, but portfolio itself is disorganized and poorly crafted. Binder or other items damaged (or missing altogether). Unattractive, and unrepresentative of advanced PLP work.	Obvious lack of preparation; Incomplete and poorly crafted. Binder or other materials damaged, if present at all. Numerous missing items. Lack of attention to key components.
Communication & Writing Mechanics	Excellent, clear, polished, and edited writing throughout. College level discourse and discussion revealed through good use of English grammar, writing mechanics and punctuation.	Generally strong writing. Evidence of thoughtful discussion and clear discussion of ideas and conclusions. Some writing mechanics issues.	Clear but not polished writing. Average discussion and commentary, but lacks editing, attention to writing mechanics or writing flow. Some inconsistencies make value limited.	Inconsistent writing resulting in lack of clarity and meaning. Spotty discussion obvious lack of review to edit or proof work. Numerous mechanical errors and not college level work.	Poor writing throughout resulting in poor communication with reader. Numerous writing or mechanical errors, obvious lack of flow and maturity of writing skill. Not college work and not PLP quality at any level.
Content	Portfolio, including paper, reflects the discussion requirements outlined in the Syllabus, including a focus on critical thinking & self-leadership. Content is outstanding and professional. The paper particular shows personal growth. Clear to see how internship changed or engaged behavior.	Portfolio, including paper, reflects assigned elements, Including a focus on critical thinking & self-leadership, but content does not go beyond the basic scope of the assignment. Personal growth evidence is minimal. Internship value not as clear.	Content, including paper, is basically on point, but does not provide key focus on critical thinking or self-leadership. Basic scope of the assignment, but very limited on personal growth. Few or no examples of how the Internship provided value.	Content, including paper, lacks any focus above and beyond the basic assignment. No focus on self-leadership, personal growth, or critical thinking. Limited use of examples of how internship changed or engaged behavior.	Content does not reflect assignment, is limited in scope or clarity. No focus on personal growth, self-leadership, critical thinking, or value of the internship to the student's experience in PLP.
Creativity	Overall development is creative, appropriate to student's interest in the actual internship placement, revealing thoughtful and creative development of ideas. The portfolio reflects the interests and individuality of the student in engaging ways—photos, illustrations or other add-on items. Student has stretched through this assignment.	Student's personality is reflected in the portfolio content in creative ways, but is limited to segments of the portfolio. Shows some imagination and thought as illustrated through visual images, photos, or other items.	Some creative thought and development but limited to occasional comments rather than to the portfolio as a whole. Several ideas point to imagination and creative thought. Few or no illustrations or appendices to enhance reader's understanding of the placement.	Limited creative thinking evident. Lacks imagination and interest. Doesn't reflect placement or student particularly well. No added-value items to explain the student's experience.	No evidence of creative thinking in the preparation of the final portfolio.

--	--	--	--	--	--