

Program: Liberal Studies

Date report completed: 5/26/17

Completed by: Jeff Piquette

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved in this program’s assessment): _____

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, save and submit it to both the Dean of your college/school and to the Assistant Provost as an email attachment before June 1, 2017. You’ll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>.

Please describe the 2016-2017 assessment activities for your program in Part I. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2017-2018 based on the assessment process. In Part II, please describe activities engaged in during 2016-2017 designed to close-the-loop (improve student learning in the program) based on assessment activities and the information gathered in previous cycles. Thank you.

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

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 that level?	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	2016-2017; because the state and national accrediting	For most SLOs, the program uses multiple measures to draw conclusions about student	All el ed students admitted to TEP, 2016-2017; all el ed students	<u>Expectations</u> include all of the following a) all program completers should	Details of assessment results are summarized below in table 1. In general,	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was on the average above 3.00 across program	Goals for 2017-2018 include: 1. Monitor literacy carefully to see if dip in performance is a fluke or maybe tied to something more significant.

<p>its accrediting bodies. SLOs are included in table 1 below, aligned with the program's broader goals for students.</p>	<p>bodies for teacher 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>and program success. See 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: https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html.</p>	<p>completing TEP, 2016-2017; first year teachers in 2016-2017 (grads in 2015-2016). Please note: first year teacher data for last year's grads have not yet been returned and are not included.</p>	<p>receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on assessments of performance on all 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</p>	<p>results indicated that a) 100% received proficient ratings; mean ratings were always above 3.00; all were proficient enough to be recommended for licensure.</p> <p>Across all students, strengths in performance were seen in a number of outcomes related to applications of knowledge, especially science. Weaker performance was noted in skills in literacy and social studies (mostly related to</p>	<p>outcomes, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and challenges (see table 1): performance in social studies continues to be a relatively weak area. We met with the new chair of the department (Grant Weller) and discussed the assessment results. He is going to take the information back to his colleagues for consideration. They are also going to change the world history sequence to be more like other institutions.</p> <p>However, this is the first year in several years that mathematics is not an area of weakness. We have been working on it for a while, so it is satisfying to see all of the renovation and</p>	<p>2. Continue to monitor social studies as an area of weakness. Continue collaboration with history faculty to address these areas of weakness by mapping content on the exams to course content.</p> <p>3. Collect data on new PRAXIS tests (PLACE tests were dropped by the state in 2016-2017) so that new correlations can be made for all content areas within the Liberal Studies major.</p>
---	---	--	--	--	---	---	---

	<p>of a rating for each SLO for each student teacher during his/her final semester.</p>			<p>(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 needing to be further addressed.</p>	<p>knowledge and application of economics and U.S. History), but the performance in math is better than previous years.</p> <p>100% of program completers and 89% of first time test takers had passing scores on the Elementary Education content exam (the overall pass rate was 45%)</p> <p>(b). Strengths on this exam were scores in English Language Arts and in</p>	<p>efforts finally result in student performance that is not alarming.</p> <p>Unfortunately, scores in literacy dropped. More specifically, the standard that measures student performance on the 5 components of reading were down significantly this year. This might be due to having an adjunct teach the course while a faculty member was on sabbatical, but that is hard to say for sure without doing a lot more digging into the scores.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>Science; performance in math and social studies was lower than we'd like, but math was up enough to be removed as a significant weakness area.</p> <p>Additional information on specific strengths and weaknesses is listed below in table 1.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Comments on part I: 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 <https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html>) 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 2016-2017.

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"> • Proficiency Profile (PP) • 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 2016 was about the same as last year, and just above the national average.</p> <p>Faculty ratings based on recommendations and eportfolio documents indicated that 92% 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 (3.38) was above the GPA required (2.600) and a bit lower than last year (which was a high year). Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.6), math (2.8), and speech (3.7) exceeded benchmarks.</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 45% (overall), 89% (1st), and 92% (last). Strengths in subtest performance were seen in scores in English Language Arts and Math.</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 2017.</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 86% 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 3.76(Standard 2.10), 3.84(3.3), 3.92(5.3), 3.80(5.10), 3.90(6.5), and 3.76(8.7). For all standards/outcomes, the benchmark was met or exceeded by 100% of the students. Performance on standards 5.3 and 6.5 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 2.10 were among the lowest for performance on all standards. Standard 5.10 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 academic and practical formats.</p> <p>b. speaking effectively 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 information (3c)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Proficiency Profile</i> (PP) Faculty Recs. Field Experience Teacher Evaluations GPA in math, composition, 	<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, the benchmark for this outcome.</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
<p>settings.</p> <p>c. utilizing technology as a tool to inform and communicate.</p>		<p>and speech courses</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eportfolio 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 2017.</p>	<p><i>Proficiency Profile</i> scores were within 1 SEM of those of peers at other comprehensive universities. Spring 2017 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 2016 was 114, exactly the same as last year. The avg. score for the national sample is also 114.</p> <p>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.</p> <p><u>At program completion:</u> Mean student teacher ratings were at or above benchmark levels. The average ratings in 2016-2017 for these 2 standards were 3.88 and 3.92.</p>

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results																								
<p>4. Application of Knowledge. Graduates create standards-based learning experiences that make knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students:</p> <p>Using multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and link them to students' prior understandings.</p> <p>Using different viewpoints, theories, "ways of knowing," and methods of inquiry in teaching of subject matter content.</p> <p>a. Evaluating curriculum for their comprehensiveness, accuracy, and usefulness for representing particular ideas and concepts.</p> <p>b. Engaging students in generating 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>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>2.5 Utilizes Academic Standards in Reading and Writing for the improvement of instruction</p> <p>2.6 Develops students' understanding and use of: number systems, geometry, measurement, statistics/ probability, functions, use of variables.</p> <p>2.7 Utilizes Colorado Standards in Math for the improvement of instruction</p> <p>2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction (4f)</p> <p>2.9 Enhances content instruction through a thorough understanding of all CO standards and bases long-term and lesson planning on standards (4c)</p> <p>2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning (4a, b, d)</p> <p>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</p> <p>5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic, interdisciplinary, literature-based (4c, 4f)</p> <p>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)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eportfolio Ratings at Admission to Education (2.10)* 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 2017.</p>	<p>At admission to education (2.10): See results related to standard 2.10 in Goal 2.</p> <p>At program completion: 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 2016-2017. Standards receiving the highest mean ratings (above 3.80) and those receiving the lowest (below 3.70) are highlighted.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1522 565 1837 958"> <thead> <tr> <th>Standard</th> <th>Student Teacher MN Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2.3</td><td>3.71</td></tr> <tr><td>2.4</td><td>3.81</td></tr> <tr><td>2.5</td><td>3.92</td></tr> <tr><td>2.6</td><td>3.63</td></tr> <tr><td>2.7</td><td>3.95</td></tr> <tr><td>2.8</td><td>3.77</td></tr> <tr><td>2.9</td><td>3.77</td></tr> <tr><td>2.10</td><td>3.76</td></tr> <tr><td>3.1</td><td>3.62</td></tr> <tr><td>5.3</td><td>3.92</td></tr> <tr><td>5.4</td><td>3.75</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating	2.3	3.71	2.4	3.81	2.5	3.92	2.6	3.63	2.7	3.95	2.8	3.77	2.9	3.77	2.10	3.76	3.1	3.62	5.3	3.92	5.4	3.75
Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating																										
2.3	3.71																										
2.4	3.81																										
2.5	3.92																										
2.6	3.63																										
2.7	3.95																										
2.8	3.77																										
2.9	3.77																										
2.10	3.76																										
3.1	3.62																										
5.3	3.92																										
5.4	3.75																										

PART II. Follow-up (closing the loop) on results and activities from previous assessment cycles. In this section, please describe actions taken during this 2016-2017 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?
2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.11	2016-2017	Continue monitoring whether the revisions to enhance mathematics content knowledge will influence students under the new program.	Yes. The department completed a thorough analysis of math scores and their correlations to success on PLACE and PRAXIS tests, ratings at the end of the program, etc.	The TEP has been working on math as an area of weakness for some time. For the first time in about 5 years, I am happy to say that it did not show up as an area of concern. It appears that all of the renovations that were implemented have finally resulted in some significant progress. The only issue related to math that came up was how confusing the admission requirement is. The language in the catalog is not clear. For this reason, the admission requirement language will be refined in the next CAPB cycle.
2.11	2016-2017	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.	Yes. The department completed a thorough analysis of licensure subtest performance and student teaching ratings to compare students in the new concentration areas to those in the old.	So far, the new concentration areas do not seem to have a significant impact on licensure test performance or on student teaching ratings. Numbers are still low, though, so it could be that we simply do not have enough degrees of freedom to detect any difference that might be there.
Standards from goal 2, 3.1, 5.3, and 5.4	2016-2017	We have enough test takers now to see if performance 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	Yes. The department completed a thorough analysis of all content areas for MAPP and PLACE/PRAXIS.	The analysis resulted in some significant indicators. The trend was especially clear for elementary education. A cut-off score on the MAPP test was identified and students were notified of the risk if they scored below that mark. These students were encouraged to attend test preparation workshops that were sponsored by

		MAPP test at admission.	<p>the TEP, and were also provided other advice about bolstering their areas of weakness. Although we are not able to require students to participate in remedial measures, most are willing to do it if they know that it will help them pass the required state test. Initial indicators are that the pre-emptive notification is making a difference for some students. Two students who were at risk of failure, but participated in two of the extra sessions, passed the test on their first attempt. It certainly went against the trend we were expecting. Unfortunately, the state just changed the version of the PRAXIS (which is now the only test approved for teacher licensure) for several of the licensure areas, and so we do not know how well our correlations will work with the new versions of the test. We will continue to monitor this issue and adjust as necessary.</p>
--	--	-------------------------	---

Comments on part II: