

Colorado State University – Pueblo Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2015-2016

Program: __ Liberal Studies _____

Date: __ 5/27/16 _____

Completed by: __ Jeff Piquette _____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment): __ Massey, Piazza, Peters, Pettit _____

Please describe the 2015-2016 assessment activities for the program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2016-2017 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2015-2016 designed to close-the-loop (improve the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in 2014-2015. 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?
Liberal Studies uses the term "Standards" for program SLOs because that is the term used by its accrediting bodies. SLOs are	2015-2016; because the state and national accrediting bodies for teacher	For most SLOs, the program uses multiple measures to draw conclusions about student and program success. See	All el ed students admitted to TEP, 2015-2016; all el ed students completing TEP, 2015-	<u>Expections</u> include all of the following a) all program completers should receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all	Details of assessment results are summarized below in table 1. In general, results indicated that a) >96% received proficient ratings;	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was on the average above 3.00 across program outcomes, disaggregating this information did	Goals for 2015-2016 include: 1. Continue monitoring whether the revisions to enhance mathematics content knowledge will influence students

included in table 1 below, aligned with the program's broader goals for students.	<p>education require the program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students' eligibility for licensure, all SLOs are assessed every year.</p> <p>To determine eligibility, the state of Colorado requires completion of an assessment of graduates and their employers each year, as well as completion</p>	<p>table 1 (below). The program has attached the program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance for some SLOs. However, including all rubrics would take over 50 pages of space. To review all rubrics, please see: http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/StandardsAndGoals/Pages/default.aspx.</p>	<p>2016; first year teachers in 2015-2016 (grads in 2014-2015). Please note: first year teacher data for last year's grads have not yet been returned and are not included.</p>	<p>program standards and avg. ratings by the group should be >3.00, b) 100% of program completers and >80% of individual students during the year who took the exam received passing scores, and c) >80% of graduates' and their supervisors'/ principals' ratings of performance are proficient (3.00 or >) and avg. ratings are >3.00 on evaluations of all standards for the group after one year of teaching.</p> <p>All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs</p>	<p>mean ratings were always above 3.00; Although 1 of 36 program completers received ratings below 3.0 on specific standards, all were proficient enough on other standards to be recommended for licensure. Weaknesses had been identified for these students early in their programs, and were put on support plans to help ensure success. Although the plans did not yield final ratings above 3.0, there was still great growth from where the students started.</p>	<p>indicate strengths and challenges (see table 1): performance in mathematics, continues to be a relatively weak area. The math program was revised for Liberal Studies two years ago, but not all students in the program are following it yet. Many of the students completing the program and being evaluated at admission are still under the old program. It is our hope that the new math program will benefit the newer students and turn this trend around. We should know more about this starting next year because those students will be admitted to the program and can be evaluated more completely.</p>	<p>under the new program.</p> <p>2. Continue to monitor effects of changes in LS major (new concentration areas) on licensure subtest performance and performance during student teaching in all areas, disaggregating performance for students completing the newly designed concentrations.</p> <p>3. We have enough test takers now to see if it is correlated with our admission test (the MAPP test) to see if we can implement a more aggressive remediation plan for those who score lower on the MAPP test at admission.</p>
---	--	--	---	--	---	---	--

	of a rating for each SLO for each student teacher during his/her final semester.			needing to be further addressed.	<p>Across all students, strengths in performance were seen in a number of outcomes related to applications of knowledge, especially literacy and science. Weaker performance was noted in skills in mathematics and social studies (mostly related to knowledge and application of economics).</p> <p>100% of program completers and 68% of individual takers had passing scores on the Elementary Education content exam (b). Strengths on this exam were scores in English Language Arts and</p>	<p>Average licensure test scores for students (especially in some concentration areas) were lower than those of others. Again, this is partly due to a timing issue. The Liberal Studies program revised its curriculum, but we have only had a few students other than new students entering the program decide to adopt it. For this reason, several of the students in the old program are still affecting this data. However, in the students who have adopted the new concentration program, there is some indication of improvement compared to those in the old program.</p> <p>In addition, one of the two licensure test options (PRAXIS) was</p>	
--	--	--	--	----------------------------------	--	--	--

					<p>in Science; performance in math and social studies stayed pretty consistent (but still lower than we'd like).</p> <p>Additional information on specific strengths and weaknesses is listed below in table 1.</p>	<p>modified during the 2014-2015 year. Students are now being asked to take a new version of the test with a higher cut score. So far, our students have a lower pass rate than on the previous version.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--	--

Comments: Liberal Studies has identified four goal areas aligned with the eight teacher education program goals and standards that address more specific SLOs for all students. Program standards are aligned with the Colorado Performance Standards for Teachers, as well as the standards of professional and learned societies, and performance on the standards is the crucial level of assessment in terms of student outcomes, not program goals. Teacher Education has developed rubrics (available at <http://ceeps.colostate-pueblo.edu/TEP/StandardsAndGoals/Pages/default.aspx>) that outline in considerable detail the specific criteria and dimensions of performance that define outcomes required for each standard, and these outcomes are aligned with Liberal Studies goals (see table 1). Also included on the rubrics are benchmarks for performance at three different points in the program – admission to education, admission to student teaching, and program completion. Ratings based on this evidence are completed by faculty using a scale of 1-4, with a rating of 3.00 as an indication of minimally “proficient” on a standard. Formal evaluations are conducted and recorded for each student at admission to education and program completion based on multiple types and sources of evidence.

Table 1. Overview of methods and tools used to assess student outcomes, as well as major conclusions/results of assessment in 2015-2016.

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards/SLOs	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>1. Acquisition of Knowledge. Graduates are broadly educated in the liberal arts and sciences: understanding the significant ideas, concepts, structures and values within disciplines, including theoretical, ethical, and practical implications. mastering content knowledge in all areas taught in elementary schools: the arts, math, literature and language, social sciences, sciences, and human development and learning. balancing a breadth of knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences with depth of knowledge within a discipline.</p>	<p>2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which s/he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education (1a,b,c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Proficiency Profile (PP)</i> • Faculty Recommendations • Field Experience Teacher Evaluations • GPA in math, composition, and speech courses • Cumulative GPA at admission • GPA in major at admission to student teaching • Licensure Exam Scores 	<p><u>At admission to education:</u> When compared to junior students at regional comprehensive institutions nationally, LS students scored within the average range on the <i>PP</i> (within the SEM for each subtest and for overall performance). The overall mean <i>PP</i> scaled score in Fall 2015 was slightly lower than last year, and just under the national average for the first time in several years.</p> <p>Faculty ratings based on recommendations and eportfolio documents indicated that 90% met or exceeded the benchmark rating of 2.00 ('developing') on Standard 2.11. Those not meeting the benchmark were cited for difficulties in writing and math.</p> <p>Cum mean GPA (3.485) was above the GPA required (2.600) and significantly higher than last year. Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.6), math (2.7), and speech (3.7) exceeded benchmarks, but math is very close.</p> <p><u>Licensure Exam Scores:</u> 100% of program completers passed the licensure exam; the program uses 3 statistics to track student progress: 1) the overall pass rate (average score for all takers; since some students take the test more than once, repeated takers can skew results), 1st time pass rate (average score for each student the first time the test was taken), and last time pass rate (average score of students using the last test rather than first test taken). Averages for test administrations during the academic year were 60% (overall), 72% (1st), and 90% (last). Strengths in subtest performance were seen in scores in English Language Arts and Science.</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>2. Construction of Knowledge. Graduates demonstrate habits of thinking, including analytical skills, independent thinking, reasoned judgment, mature values, and imagination:</p> <p>utilizing the tools of inquiry of the humanities, arts, mathematics, and behavioral, social, and natural sciences to understand and evaluate ideas.</p> <p>developing habits of critical intellectual inquiry, including self-direction and self-reflection.</p> <p>making connections from different intellectual perspectives and multiple viewpoints to form cross-disciplinary connections.</p>	<p>2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning.</p> <p>3.3 Establishes a learning environment that promotes educational equity and implements strategies to address them (2a, 2c, 4e)</p> <p>5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/ integrated units, literature-based units (2c)</p> <p>5.10 Works in cooperation with library, media and other resource specialists in providing student instruction on how to access, retrieve, analyze, synthesize, and evaluate information literacy skills (2d)</p> <p>6.5 Draws upon a variety of sources as supports for development as a learner and a teacher, including colleagues and professional literature (2a, 2d)</p> <p>8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence (2b)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education* Faculty and Field Experience Teacher Recommendations Student Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors* Ratings by Graduates after one year of teaching Ratings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.</p>	<p><u>At admission to education (2.10, 3.3, 8.7):</u> Mean eportfolio ratings were in the “developing” range or higher for 96% of students, which is the benchmark for all three standards/outcomes evaluated at admission to education. Faculty ratings are based on both recommendations and eportfolio documents. Low ratings were mostly related to students simply not including or having incomplete work and/or artifacts in the portfolio so that faculty had to award lower ratings.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mean performance ratings (for standards at left) all exceeded the 3.00 benchmark for “proficient;” mean ratings were 3.64(Standard 2.10), 3.56(3.3), 3.53(5.3), 3.57(5.10), 3.81(6.5), and 3.78(8.7). For all standards/outcomes, the benchmark was met or exceeded by >97% of the students. One of 36 students did not meet proficiency, receiving a rating of <3.0 on all standards except 6.5 and 8.7. Performance on standards 3.3, 6.5, and 8.7 were among those receiving the highest mean ratings among all standards/outcomes evaluated for elementary student teachers. Although above benchmark level, the average ratings for standard 5.10 were among the lowest for performance on all standards. Standard 5.3 had an average rating that was about right in the middle.
<p>3. Communication of Knowledge. Graduates communicate effectively:</p> <p>a. writing clearly in a variety of</p>	<p>8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level (3a,b)</p> <p>7.3 Uses technology to manage and communicate</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Proficiency Profile</i> (PP) Faculty Recs. Field Experience Teacher 	<p><u>At admission to education (8.9, 7.3):</u> Mean eportfolio ratings for 7.3 and 8.9 for all LS students were in the “developing” range,</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results										
academic and practical formats. b. speaking effectively in a variety of settings. c. utilizing technology as a tool to inform and communicate.	information (3c)	Evaluations <ul style="list-style-type: none">GPA in math, composition, and speech coursesEportfolio rating of these areas at admission to education*Student Teacher Performance Ratings* <p>*Tool = Program Rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.</p>	the benchmark for this outcome. <i>Proficiency Profile</i> scores were within 1 SEM of those of peers at other comprehensive universities. Spring 2016 scores have not arrived as this report is being written, but the mean standard score on the writing subtest for admitted LS students in Fall 2015 was 114, a slight decrease from last year. The avg. score for the national sample is 115. Mean GPAs remained above admission requirements; all eportfolio ratings were above the benchmark of 2.00; 100% met or exceeded the benchmark rating of 2.00 (“developing”) on Standards 8.9 and 7.3. <u>At program completion:</u> Mean student teacher ratings were at or above benchmark levels. The average ratings in 2014-2015 for these 2 standards were 3.70 and 3.84.										
4. <u>Application of Knowledge.</u> Graduates create standards-based learning experiences that make knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students: Using multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and link them to students’ prior understandings. Using different viewpoints, theories, “ways of knowing,” and methods of inquiry in teaching of subject matter content. a. Evaluating curriculum for their comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness for representing particular ideas and concepts. b. Engaging students in generating	2.3 Develops reading comprehension and promotion of independent reading, including: comprehension strategies for a variety of genre, literary response and analysis, content area literacy, and student independent reading. 2.4 Supports reading through oral and written language development including: developing oral proficiency in students; development of sound writing practices, including language usage, punctuation, capitalization, sentence structure, and spelling; the relationships among reading, writing, and oral language; vocabulary, and structure of standard English. 2.5 Utilizes Academic Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction 2.6 Develops students’ understanding and use of: number systems, geometry, measurement, statistics/ probability, functions, use of	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education (2.10)*Faculty and Field Experience Teacher RecommendationsStudent Teacher Performance Ratings by Supervisors*Ratings by Graduates after one year of teachingRatings by Supervisors after One Year of Teaching <p>* Tool = Program rubrics</p> <p>Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2015.</p>	<u>At admission to education (2.10):</u> See results related to standard 2.10 in Goal 2. <u>At program completion:</u> Mean ratings on performance at completion of student teaching were at or above benchmark levels for all standards. The table below summarizes the mean ratings of student teachers in 2015-2016. Standards receiving the highest mean ratings (above 3.75) and those receiving the lowest (below 3.65) are highlighted. <table><tr><th>Standard</th><th>Student Teacher MN Rating</th></tr><tr><td>2.3</td><td>3.67</td></tr><tr><td>2.4</td><td>3.67</td></tr><tr><td>2.5</td><td>3.73</td></tr><tr><td>2.6</td><td>3.63</td></tr></table>	Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating	2.3	3.67	2.4	3.67	2.5	3.73	2.6	3.63
Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating												
2.3	3.67												
2.4	3.67												
2.5	3.73												
2.6	3.63												

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results	
<p>knowledge and testing hypotheses according to the methods of inquiry and standards of evidence used in the discipline.</p> <p>c. Developing and using curricula that encourage students to see and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives.</p> <p>d. Creating interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow inquiry from several subject areas</p>	variables.		2.7	3.75
	2.7 Utilizes Colorado Standards in Math for the improvement of instruction		2.8	3.70
	2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction (4f)		2.9	3.76
	2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all CO standards and bases long-term and lesson planning on standards (4c)		2.10	3.64
	2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning (4a, b, d)		3.1	3.75
	3.1 Employs a wide range of teaching techniques to match the intellectual, emotional, physical, and social level of each student, and chooses teaching strategies and materials to achieve different curricular purposes		5.3	3.85
	5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic, interdisciplinary, literature-based (4c, 4f)		5.4	3.63
	5.4 Understands the cognitive processes associated ... learning (e.g., critical/ creative thinking, problem structuring and problem solving, invention, memorization and recall) and uses these learning processes so that students can master content standards (4d)			

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?
The following SLOs in Goal 1: 2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which s/he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education (1a,b,c)	2015-2016	1. Continue monitoring whether the revisions to enhance mathematics content and instruction will influence student under the new program.	Yes. Significant gains were made with the pedagogy side of math instruction. ED 380 and ED 417 were successfully revised. The new math program was evaluated and correlated to MAPP and PLACE/PRAXIS scores.	Performance on some of these standards did improve. They are still not quite what we would expect, but it is more related to student math content knowledge than pedagogy. We plan to evaluate the curriculum for elementary majors to see if it is something worth changing. In particular we are wondering about requiring college algebra. This might help pass rates go up. We also have enough test takers to correlate MAPP test scores at admission with performance on PLACE/PRAXIS. We will refine this and use it to develop support plans for students who score lower on the MAPP test.
The following SLOs in Goal 4: 2.6 Develops students' understanding and use of: number systems, geometry, measurement, statistics/ probability, functions, use of	2015-2016	2. Continue to monitor effects of changes in LS major (new concentration areas) on licensure subtest performance and performance during student teaching in all areas, disaggregating performance for students completing the newly	Yes. Students are choosing new concentration areas that area a better match to program goals. The most popular are science, social studies, and English.	The numbers of students with each kind of concentration are still a bit low to know whether any changes are statistically significant. However, there are enough in science to see a positive result there. We expect to continue this analysis as more and more completers have the new concentration areas.

variables. 2.7 Utilizes Colorado Standards in Math for the improvement of instruction 2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction (4f)		designed concentrations.		
SLO in Goal 1: 2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which s/he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education (1a,b,c)	2015-2016	3. Analyze the test scores of students taking the new version of the PRAXIS test to see if our curriculum needs additional revision to help better prepare student to be successful on this test.	Yes. All test takers have been tracked.	We now have a good idea of what subscores are needed to pass the new version of the test. Our program has strengths in science and English Language Arts. However, some test takers don't have critical courses completed when they take the test, so it hurts them on the test. For example, students really need to have RDG 410 before they take the test to be as successful as possible. For students who do not pass the test, we now have the ability to suggest a course of action to help with their particular weaknesses.

Comments: