

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2014-2015**Due: June 1, 2015****Program:** President's Leadership Program**Date:** May 30, 2015**Completed by:** Patricia (Trish) Orman, Ph.D.**Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment):** Shelly Moreshchini, PLP Executive Director; Steven Trujillo, Adjunct Instructor

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 submit it to the dean of your college/school as per the deadline established. The dean will forward it to me as an email attachment before June 2, 2014. You'll also find the form at the assessment website at <http://www.colostate-pueblo.edu/Assessment/ResultsAndReports/Pages/default.aspx>.

Please describe the 2014-2015 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2015-2016 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2014-2015 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2013-2014. 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? Please indicate the 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.	E. What is the expected achievement level and how many or what proportion of 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: PLP scholars	Fall 2013	(Also See attachments) Portfolios; Oral	9 students enrolled in US 260 (F	90% of PLP students will meet or	7/9 sophomores met or	Senior students met or exceeded in all categories.	Both cohorts were evaluated according to an existing oral presentation

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.		Presentation Finals (Seniors); In class presentations (sophomores). Program assessment rubrics, plus grading rubrics are attached. Oral presentation rubric included as well.	2014). The same 9 students were also reviewed for developing oral presentation skills through in-class delivery in Fall 2014. 11 senior portfolios* (with oral presentation) were reviewed by 3 faculty. 3 Students were enrolled in US 489 S/SS 2014; the remaining 8 were enrolled in US 460-Fall 2014.	exceed our minimum level of performance	exceeded minimum levels in portfolio content & delivery. Of the 7, however, only 5 exceeded expectations . The remaining 2 were deficient. In oral delivery, 5 clearly met expectations ; 4 needed considerable work. (See comments under Part II)**	Sophomores are struggling and need considerable work in communication skills (oral & written) as well as content. Because self-leadership is assessed annually, we are developing new assignments (with appropriate rubrics) to measure this skill development.	rubric. This rubric is used to maintain consistency from class to class, and to review student growth as well as value added by the program itself. This template is now in revision to better capture skill levels and provide more clarity for faculty and students regarding future needs. Further, because several informal reviews are used—tracking forms, supervisor or leader feedback, peer review, and observation—a more consistent means of capturing a 360-degree reading is desirable to evaluate the program mission, course offerings, and specific perspectives. We also need to look closely at the rubrics in use for all cohorts on the issue of ethical behavior.
Ethics: PLP scholars will manifest an understanding of leadership	First Assessment PLP has been		13 juniors enrolled in US 360. All students submitted	80% will meet or exceed minimum level of	All 13 juniors responded to leadership issues and teambuilding	Because this project encountered many issues around problem-solving	Based on results noted, we need to look closely at the rubrics used across cohorts, and consider developing a separate

ethics and service to others, and illustrate, analyze and assess ethical behaviors as demonstrated in written work and oral presentation.	participating in university program assessment since 2012.		final papers in December. Five other students provided responses in interview or via email discussion. 11 senior portfolios reviewed for commentary on leadership ethics.	performance .	in final papers, however, only 3 students specifically addressed specific ethical behavior. A follow-up analysis should reveal more detail.***	and civic engagement, the real focus of the responses zeroed in on teamwork, professionalism, and logistics. A conference rubric was not developed. (See comments below.***)	ethics post-test to examine this important dimension of leadership more closely.
---	--	--	---	---------------	--	--	--

Comments:

II. 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? Please indicate the semester and year.	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?
Civic Engagement: PLP scholars will	Fall/Spring 2014	Readers appreciated our work to find appropriate measurements for this	Yes. We began a civic engagement database, changed the parameters	Civic engagement (CE) is a challenging outcome to measure. Many leadership programs seek out means to better

understand and demonstrate the importance of civic engagement and community activism as measured through volunteerism, community and campus service, team projects and class assignments.		outcome—including the tracking forms, feedback, etc.—but at least one reader felt that we needed more clarity in evaluating this outcome. We agreed.	for selecting both community leaders (shadowing) and community organizations (internships). Further, we sought and received more specific feedback from community partners, and other professional observers (advisory board members, campus and community offices and agencies who “use” our students as volunteers and ambassadors, faculty advisors). In addition, because of comments encouraging our use of oral presentation, we increased the use of such presentations in both the first year (US 160) and sophomore (US 260) courses, and will require—beginning in Fall 2015—portfolio “oral exams” similar to the presentations required of the seniors in US 460. As noted elsewhere, this requires a more comprehensive rubric which is currently in revision.	identify placements and feedback, as well as ways to measure the CE value to their programs. To that end, the executive director and the academic director have joined a national association—Association of Leadership Educators—and will be attending the national conference in July 2015. The AD been directly involved with the university’s experiential education task force and the PLP director (and faculty member) was selected as an EE scholar for the Spring 2015 semester. Both have participated extensively in EE activities, accessed new resources, and researched new rubrics to better examine the experiential components of the program—especially as they apply to our civic engagement outcome.

Comments: *Portfolios include contract forms (with outcomes), journals, project summaries and other artifacts, student self-evaluations, and supervisor or leader reviews.

**The sophomore to senior comparison of leadership growth provides numerous opportunities to build in challenging assignments and additional measures to assure that program activities and course assignments meet program outcomes, as well as the missions (program and university) and vision. Faculty attempt to provide grading rubrics and expectations for all assignments and presentations, however, the issue of communication skills—the abilities to share in varied oral and written formats—and how best to evaluate them is an ongoing process. Because we work with students from thirteen or more majors, we also realize that learning styles and writing styles vary considerably. Addition of a required speech course and the hiring of adjuncts with strong public speaking skills and perspectives appears to be making inroads, but written work is often lacking in strong mechanics, style, organization, and structure.

***As noted above, a rubric to evaluate the student final papers in US 360's ethics conference was not developed during this process. Students completed other tracking materials—journals, class discussion summaries or reports, individual final papers, and an evaluation form for conference attendees—but a rubric to assess both the process, content, and execution of the conference was not formulated. Additionally, three students spoke specifically to ethical content and behavior, but several suggested that a front-end refresher of ethics might have been helpful. We will continue to gather follow up data to update this important conference topic. US 460/US 489 students were less attentive to ethical issues in portfolio essays as well, so additional focus in the senior internship process would make additional use of an ethics-specific rubric.

Finally, the plan to establish an ongoing student focus group to address SLOs and related program-wide ideas was not completed as planned in 2014-15. We have put this on the docket for 2015-16.

Leadership Studies Program Assessment Rubric 2014-15

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.

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: