

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

**Program: Leadership Students (President's Leadership Program)**

**Date:** May 30, 2016

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

**Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program's assessment):** PLP Executive Director/Faculty Member Shelly Moreschini, MA; Adjunct Faculty members Steven Trujillo, MBA, and Shanna Farmer, MA.

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? <b>Please include the outcome(s) verbatim from the assessment plan.</b>	B. When was this SLO last assessed? <b>Please indicate the semester and year.</b>	C. What method was used for assessing the SLO? <b>Please include a copy of any rubrics used in the assessment process.</b>	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?
<b>Self-Leadership:</b> PLP scholars will understand, synthesize, and evaluate their personal readiness for leadership by communicating effectively through	Fall 2015	Portfolio assessment + Oral "defense" (See rubrics attached to Assessment Plan- Updated 2016)	<b>Grp 1:</b> 13 Senior leadership studies minors completing their final course requirement for the minor. <b>Grp 2:</b> 15 sopho-more	<b>Grp 1:</b> 90% of PLP seniors will meet or exceed our minimum level of performance. <b>Grp 2:</b> 80% of PLP sophomores will meet or	<b>Grp 1:</b> As measured by portfolio review, 12/13 senior students reached or exceeded the minimum standard of B- on the self-leadership scale. 10/13 seniors made significant gains in self-leadership related	<b>Grp 1:</b> Regarding self-leadership, as measured by portfolios and oral presentations, all students display growth and understanding of leadership readiness. Only one student missed the mark on both	PLP faculty will continue the dual defense strategy to allow comparisons between written portfolios and the oral components. Further, parallel preparation guidelines will accompany both rounds of portfolios to better assess

written and oral means as measured by course assignments and a final portfolio.			leadership studies minors completing US 260—the halfway course marker for the minor.	exceed our minimum level. The minimum level of performance for any group is 80% or “B-”*	skills and maturity of expression as developed in their written portfolio. Based on oral presentations, all students performed well, but without a sophomore benchmark for this group, comparative skill level growth cannot be measured from defense to defense.** <b>Grp 2:</b> 11/15 Sophomores met or exceeded the minimum expectation for the US 260 portfolio. 4/15 students were close to minimum levels, but require stronger organizational guidelines and better writing skills to reach their peers. All sophomores exceeded faculty expectations on the piloted oral presentations, although the same 4 students require additional oral presentation practice.***	elements in combination. While organizational skills and most content have improved, writing skills still need work. The oral presentations were strong. In two cases, the overall speaking skills had improved significantly from previous oral markers. While there is not a sophomore year “defense” measure for comparison, opportunities for public speaking made some anecdotal observations about growth fairly easy to note. <b>Grp 2:</b> Sophomore portfolios were, as a group, well developed, thoughtfully produced, and useful as benchmarks for later comparison. 11/15 met or exceeded the adequate range. More importantly, the oral “defense” presentations were original PowerPoint or Prezi slides with well scripted oral commentaries that aroused curiosity, initiated questions and discussion among audience members. The overall quality of presentations was close to or equal to the senior	specific outcomes in the contexts of the course objectives.  As noted in the comment below, four seniors presented “early” during our summer orientation and retreat. This was a pilot project to expose incoming first year students to the expectations of senior scholars. We plan to continue this presentation cycle during any summer program where seniors are completing the internship process.
---	--	--	--	--	---	---	--

						level presentations given during the same time period. ****	
<b>Problem Solving:</b> PLP scholars will apply problem-solving skills by taking on volunteer and community service projects, through case management activities, and through tasks assigned in internship placements.	Fall 2015; Spring 2016	In 360: Participant observation, peer review, and final reports submitted by students.  In 460: Evidence provided in final portfolio and oral defense presentation, including reflective journals.	In 360: 10 third-year students in oral presentations and 10 final papers.  In 460: 13 seniors completing the final requirement for the Leadership Studies minor.	In 360: 80-85% should meet minimum performance level.  In 460: 85% of scholars should be meeting minimum performance levels at this stage.	<b>In 360:</b> Through observation, peer review commentaries and papers, only 50% of students excelled at problem solving based on evidence communicated. However, all 10 students credited their classmates for overcoming the organizational, financial, and completion challenges faced by the group as a whole. <b>In 460:</b> 9 of 13 students addressed specific examples of problem solving techniques used during their placements as evidenced in their journals and major essay. Four students did not address this outcome with any clarity or focus.		

Comments: \*Because PLP students enter the university from strong academic and leadership roles in high school or community college, the expectations are high: Students must maintain a 3.000 cumulative GPA to maintain “scholar in good standing” status or to be awarded PLP scholarships or other assignments (CLA scholar or El Pomar scholar status, for example) during their tenure on campus. Thus, our minimum is at 80% for all students—or a B- level performance. \*\*Although all students should achieve in the A-B range for individual courses, our levels of performance standard remains at 80%. We expect, however, that at least 80% of sophomores will reach our minimums. The growth of strong, high motivated cohorts may force us to re-evaluate our expectation levels. The new oral presentation pilot was successful. The rubric attached to the assessment plan was drawn from experiential education models and revised several times before the December 2015 trial. With one exception, this template was used for both groups. The exception included four summer internship students who were asked to present at the PLP First Year Orientation and Scholar Retreat in August 2015. \*\*\*\*The surprisingly strong oral presentations resulted in a score average of 92% (out of 100 points) among sophomores, as evaluated by four reviewers.

**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?
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.	This outcome is assessed annually, so 2014-15.	Recommendations included review and changes to our oral presentation rubric, more clarity in the assessment plan to reflect the actual expectations and results of program development. PLP staff had begun work on the sophomore level oral defense piece—one reader concurred. Unfortunately, one piece of last year's template report was omitted, resulting in some confusion for at least one reader.	Yes. The oral presentation rubric was re-developed for programmatic assessment. Additional assignments were added to each course to build on public speaking skills. The assessment plan was updated to reflect changes and aspirations.	It is clear that at least two outcomes need to be re-written for clarity and evaluation: Both problem solving and critical thinking expectations need review so that journals and other assignments can better guide students to dig deeper and produce richer written products that are both evidence-based and leadership focused. Oral presentations, however, have improved markedly. The addition of the COMR 103 requirement for all scholars, plus the hiring of a strong team-teaching duo for the US 260 course provide added focus on the ability of students to create focused texts from 30-second elevator speeches to persuasive presentations to locate grants, to oral defenses of their experiential work. Both sophomore and senior groups exceeded our expectations in 2015, and we anticipate that with more practice, the skills will improve from student to student. With the addition of EE designated guidelines as well, specific language and new expectations will also provide structure and focus on a more consistent basis.

Comments: PLP staff continue to seek affordable options for nationally-normed leadership instruments that will help us to continue the assessment process with more quantitative elements. We have been challenged to develop our own instrument, and may follow that path in future months.