



Academic Program Assessment Report for AY 2017-2018

Program: Liberal Studies Major

(Due: June 1, 2018)

Date report completed: May 31, 2018

Completed by: Jeff Piquette, Associate Dean

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____

Please describe the 2017-2018 assessment activities and follow-up for your program below. Please complete this form for each undergraduate major, 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, 2018. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at <https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html>. Thank you.

I. Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) in this cycle. Including processes, results, and recommendations for improved student learning. Use Column H to describe improvements planned for 2018-2019 based on the assessment process.

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 <u>last</u> assessed? (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? Include the proportion of students meeting proficiency.	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?
All SLOs (Standards) were assessed. Teacher Education uses the term "Standards" for program SLOs because that is	2017-2018; because the state and national accrediting bodies for teacher education require the	See table 1 (below). Including all rubrics would take up over 50 pages of space. Complete performance rubrics are available on the	All Liberal Studies students admitted to TEP, 2017-2018; all completing TEP, 2017-2018; first year teachers	Expectations include all of the following: a) all program completers should receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on	In general, results indicated that a) mean ratings for program completers were almost always above 3.00;	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was above 3.00 across all standards, disaggregating this information did indicate strengths and weaknesses	1. Examine the content in courses related to SLOs 2.3, 2.6, and 2.10) and address the weaknesses identified in 2017-2018. 2. Continue to monitor student pass rates on the PRAXIS tests to watch for correlations, strengths and weaknesses.

<p>the term used by its accrediting bodies. Standards/SLOs are included in the Assessment Plan and table 1 (below), aligned with the program's broader goals for students.</p>	<p>program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students' eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in the current year.</p>	<p>TEP web site at https://www.csu.pueblo.edu/teacer-education-program/goals-and-standards.html.</p>	<p>in 2017-2018 (grads in 2016-2017). Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2018 are not complete at the date of this report and are not included (PP scores have not been returned by ETS); first year teacher data for last year's grads have not yet been returned and are not included.</p>	<p>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 receive 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>however, mean ratings for program completers as well as ratings of graduates' supervisors were lowest for standards focusing on content knowledge (2.3, 2.6, and 2.10); b) 100% of program completers had passing exam scores, however, the pass rates on the new elementary exam have dropped significantly; and c) mean ratings by graduates' and supervisors performance were at or above 3.00. See table 1 for details.</p>	<p>within particular groups and teaching areas (see table 1). Weaknesses in goal 2 (content knowledge of literacy, math, and general knowledge) are more significant than in previous years. One significant positive finding is that the pass rate on the math section of the elementary state test (PRAXIS 5003) went up dramatically. Math has been a difficult area for us in the past, but appears to be changing as far as the state test can measure. We continue to see a decrease in the pass rates on the required state tests. This is alarming for elementary especially. Part of the problem is that the state has had 3 different versions of the test over 3 years. That has made it difficult to track. Thankfully, it appears</p>	
--	--	---	---	---	---	--	--

				All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed		that the state has settled on PRAXIS as the sole test provider and that the versions of the test that are in place now will stay that way. We will continue to examine this issue carefully to see if a more aggressive intervention strategy might help.	

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 2017-2018.

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 2017-2018 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 88% 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 (3.33) was above the GPA required (2.600) and a bit lower than last year (3.38). Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.7), math (2.9), and speech (3.7) exceeded benchmarks and were at or slightly above last year.</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 30% (overall), 44% (1st), and 65% (last). Strengths in subtest performance were seen in scores in Math (72% 1st time pass rate), English Language Arts (64% 1st time pass rate), and Science (60% 1st time pass rate). Social Studies was a clear weakness area (44% 1st time pass rate). The overall pass rate is clearly correlated with the pass rate on this subtest.</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 2018.</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 84% 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 3.30(Standard 2.10), 3.54(3.3), 3.80(5.3), 4.00(5.10), 4.00(6.5), and 4.00(8.7). • For all standards/outcomes, the benchmark was met or exceeded by 100% of the students. • Performance on standards 5.10, 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 2.10 were among the lowest for performance on all standards.
<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. The mean standard score on the writing subtest for admitted LS students in 2017-2018 was 113, exactly the same as the national average and consistent with last year's performance.</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 for these 2 standards were 4.00 and 3.90.</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 2018.</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 2017-2018. Standards receiving the highest mean ratings (above 3.80) and those receiving the lowest (below 3.50) are highlighted.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1522 565 1839 959"> <thead> <tr> <th>Standard</th> <th>Student Teacher MN Rating</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2.3</td> <td>3.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.4</td> <td>3.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.5</td> <td>3.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.6</td> <td>3.39</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.7</td> <td>3.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.8</td> <td>3.90</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.9</td> <td>3.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2.10</td> <td>3.30</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3.1</td> <td>3.54</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.3</td> <td>3.80</td> </tr> <tr> <td>5.4</td> <td>3.80</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating	2.3	3.30	2.4	3.80	2.5	3.80	2.6	3.39	2.7	3.90	2.8	3.90	2.9	3.68	2.10	3.30	3.1	3.54	5.3	3.80	5.4	3.80
Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating																										
2.3	3.30																										
2.4	3.80																										
2.5	3.80																										
2.6	3.39																										
2.7	3.90																										
2.8	3.90																										
2.9	3.68																										
2.10	3.30																										
3.1	3.54																										
5.3	3.80																										
5.4	3.80																										

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2017-2018 cycle. These are those 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 to generate the data which informed the change? Please indicate the semester and year.	C. What were the recommendations for change from the previous assessment?	D. How were the recommendations for change acted upon?	E. What were the results of the changes? If the changes were not effective, what are the next steps or the new recommendations?
<p>2.2 Develops phonological and linguistic processes related to reading including: phonemic awareness; concepts about print (e.g., print match, directionality); systematic, explicit phonics; other word identification strategies, and spelling instruction.</p> <p>2.3 Develops reading</p>	<p>2016-2017</p>	<p>Analyze literacy scores and explore the possibility of course revision.</p>	<p>The Associate Dean analyzed state test data from students in the program to identify weak areas and match them to specific course outcomes. RDG 410 and 411 were the courses where these topics are primarily addressed. The course content was then discussed with the instructors of those courses to see if changes were needed. Unfortunately, the Colorado Department of Education decided to change the state test that is used to evaluate preservice teacher knowledge of literacy for elementary teachers, so this confounded the</p>	<p>Pass rates on tests related to SLOs 2.2 and 2.3 did go up during 2017-2018 compared to 2016-2017. However, it is difficult to know if it had anything to do with course adjustments. Average scores returned to levels that were seen in 2015-2016. This may be the result of a series of changes to the state test being used to measure student content knowledge for this area. In 2015-2016, PRAXIS #5014 was being used. In 2016-2017, PRAXIS #5018 was used and had a lower pass rate. In 2017-2018, PRAXIS #5002 was used and had a pass rate that was similar to that of 2015-2016. We will continue to monitor literacy data in 2018-2019 for stability since PRAXIS #5002 will continue to be used.</p>

<p>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>process. The alignment to course objectives was still completed, but it was difficult to know if the changes made to the curriculum were effective as the summative test changed during 2017-2018.</p>	
<p>2.11 Is knowledgeable in literacy, math, and all content areas in which he is preparing to teach. For elementary education, content areas include: civics, economics, foreign language, geography, history, science, music, visual arts, and physical education.</p>	<p>2016-2017</p>	<p>Conduct correlational studies with MAPP test and PRAXIS tests in an attempt to identify early the students who will struggle and put them on a more aggressive support plan for success. Also attempt to connect PRAXIS score weak areas to curriculum issues across the program.</p>	<p>The data from MAPP and PLACE/PRAXIS were analyzed by the Associate Dean with some significant correlations found between MAPP scores and performance on the PLACE and PRAXIS tests. A typical “cut score” on the MAPP was identified and students who got that score or below were immediately brought in for advising related to trends on these important tests.</p>	<p>As with the previous improvement area, this item was difficult to address because of the shift from PLACE testing to PRAXIS testing and changes to the specific PRAXIS tests being used for elementary education. New correlations will have to be determined once enough test takers have completed the tests in each licensure area. We believe the interventions that were put into place have helped the students with their content knowledge, but it is difficult to know because of the change in summative assessment.</p>

Comments on part II: