Completed by:____Jeff Piquette, Associate Dean_____

Assessment contributors (other faculty involved): _____

Please describe the 2019-2020 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., B.A.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 Executive Director for Assessment as an email attachment by June 1, 2020. You'll also find this form on the assessment website at https://www.csupueblo.edu/assessment-and-student-learning/resources.html. Thank you.

Brief statement of Program mission and goals:

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 2019-2020 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 last reported on prior to this cycle? (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 (N).	E. What is the expected proficiency 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 program are planned based on this assessment?
All SLOs (Standards) were assessed in 2019-2020. Teacher Education uses the term	2019-2020; because the state accrediting bodies for teacher education require the	See table 1 (below); program rubrics used by faculty to assess performance would take up over 50 pages of	All Liberal Studies students admitted to TEP, 2019-2020; all students completing	Expections include all of the following: a) all program completers should receive ratings of 3.00 or higher on	Details of assessment results are summarized below in table 1. In general, results indicated that a) >96% received proficient ratings; mean ratings were	Although mean ratings always showed student proficiency was on the average above 3.00 across program outcomes, disaggregating this	1. Continue working with social studies faculty on aligning content knowledge and the application of that knowledge in the field. Also continue to develop our support

"Standards" for program SLOs because that is the term used by its accrediting bodies. Standards/SLOs are included in the Assessment Plan and table 1 (below). See comments.	program to monitor all program outcomes to determine students' eligibility for program completion and recommendation for licensure, all SLOs were assessed in 2019-2020	space so are not included. Complete performance rubrics are available on the TEP web site at https://www.csupueblo.edu/teacher-education-program/goals-and-standards.html.	TEP, 2019-2020; first year teachers in 2019-2020(grads in 2018-2019). Please note: admission data for students in Spring 2020 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.	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. All three expectations/ benchmarks are considered in drawing conclusions on strengths and SLOs needing to be further addressed	always above 3.00; Although 2 of 46 program completers received ratings below 3.0 on specific standards, both were proficient on others and had sufficient success to be recommended for licensure.Weaknesses had been identified for both students early in their program, and both were on support plans during their program. Across all students, strengths in performance were seen in a number of outcomes related to applications of knowledge, especially literacy, and understanding of diversity. Weaker performance was noted in skills in mathematics, understanding of cognitive processes and their application, and in students' professional writing. 100% of program completers and 87% of individual takers	information did indicate strengths and challenges (see table 1): performance in social studies, including application of knowledge in teaching is a relatively weak area. Data were more positive than last year, but still need work. Data on student teachers showed much greater variability across ratings than in any year over the last 5 years. This may indicate a need to better train supervisors who are rating these students on our rubrics. Losing our Director of Student Teaching was a likely reason for these data.	structures for Praxis in conjunction with our new coordinator. What she is doing is clearly working, and so we just need to get more students to take advantage of her services. 2. Conduct reliability training among supervisors of student teachers to strengthen reliability of assessment data.

| | | | | | had passing scores on the Elementary Education content exam (b). Strengths on this exam were scores in English Language Arts and in Science areas; performance in math declined.

Additional information on specific strengths and weaknesses is listed below in table 1. | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | | |

Comments on part I: The program has identified 8 goal areas that summarize the SLOs for all teacher education candidates. Within each of these goal areas are 5-10 more program standards, aligned with the Colorado Performance Standards, 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. 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 an indication of "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 2019-2020.

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards/SLOs	Measures/Tools	Major Results
1. **Acquisition of Knowledge. Graduates are broadly educated in the liberal arts and sciences:** 1. understanding the significant ideas, concepts, structures and values within disciplines, including theoretical, ethical, and practical implications. 2. mastering content knowledge in all areas taught in elementary schools: the arts, math, literature and language, social sciences, sciences, and human development and learning. 3. balancing a breadth of knowledge in the liberal arts and sciences with depth of knowledge within a discipline.	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)	• *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	At admission to education: When compared to junior students at regional comprehensive institutions nationally, LS students scored within the average range on the *PP* (within the SEM for each subtest and for overall performance). The overall mean *PP* scaled score in Fall 2019 was higher than those for the previous nine years. However, the students' subscore in math continued to decrease, with the lowest average score in the last 6 years. Faculty ratings based on recommendations and eportfolio documents indicated that 91% 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 in eportfolio documents and weak faculty recommendations. Cum mean GPA (3.338) was above the GPA required (2.6) and higher than avgs. for the last two years. Average GPAs in courses in writing (3.8), math (2.7), and speech (3.8) exceeded benchmarks. Spring 2020 scores were not complete at the time this report was written. Licensure Exam Scores: 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 were 65% (overall), 70% (1st), and 87% (last). Strengths in subtest performance were seen in scores in English Language Arts and Science.

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
2. **Construction of Knowledge. Graduates demonstrate habits of thinking, including analytical skills, independent thinking, reasoned judgment, mature values, and imagination**: 4. utilizing the tools of inquiry of the humanities, arts, mathematics, and behavioral, social, and natural sciences to understand and evaluate ideas. 5. developing habits of critical intellectual inquiry, including self-direction and self-reflection. 6. making connections from different intellectual perspectives and multiple viewpoints to form cross-disciplinary connections.	2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning. 3.3 Establishes a learning environment that promotes educational equity and implements strategies to address them (2a, 2c, 4e) 5.3 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic units, interdisciplinary/ integrated units, literature-based units (2c) 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) 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) 8.7 Demonstrates flexibility in thinking and behavior; remains open-minded, reserving judgment for evidence (2b)	• 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 *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.	At admission to education (2.10, 3.3, 8.7): Mean eportfolio ratings were in the "developing" range or higher for 95% of students, the benchmark for all three standards/outcomes evaluated at admission to education. Faculty ratings are based on both recommendations and eportfolio documents; incomplete self-evaluations/reflections accounted for the majority of low ratings in these areas. At program completion: • Mean performance ratings (for standards at left) all exceeded the 3.00 benchmark for "proficient;" mean ratings were 3.61(Standard 2.10), 3.76(3.3), 3.70(5.3), 3.58(5.10), 3.73(6.5), and 3.82(8.7). • For all standards/outcomes, the benchmark was met or exceeded by >95% of the students. Among the 2 (of 46) students not meeting proficiency, 2 received a rating of <3.0 on standards 2.10; one of these students received a rating <3.0 on standards 5.3, 5.10, and 6.5; 100% of students reached proficiency on standards 3.3 and 8.7. • Performance on standards 3.3, 5.3, 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.
3. **Communication of Knowledge. Graduates communicate effectively:** a. writing clearly in a variety of academic and practical formats. b. speaking effectively in a variety of	8.9 Communicates through speaking, writing, and listening in a professional level (3a,b) 7.3 Uses technology to manage and communicate information (3c)	• *Proficiency Profile* (PP) • Faculty Recs. • Field Experience Teacher Evaluations • GPA in math, composition,	At admission to education (8.9, 7.3): Mean eportfolio ratings for 7.3 for all LS students were in the "developing" range, the benchmark for this outcome. Among the 9% who did not meet the benchmark for

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results
settings. c. utilizing technology as a tool to inform and communicate.		and speech courses • Eportfolio rating of these areas at admission to education* • Student Teacher Performance Ratings* *Tool = Program Rubrics Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.	standard 8.9, weaknesses were cited in errors in writing among documents in the eportfolio. *Proficiency Profile* scores were within 1 SEM of those of peers at other comprehensive universities. Spring 2020 scores have not arrived as this report is written, but the mean standard score on the writing subtest for admitted LS students in Fall 2019 was 114.87, an increase over the past 2 years (113.60, 113.70) . The avg. score for the national sample is 114.45. Mean GPAs remained above admission requirements; all eportfolio ratings were above the benchmark of 2.00; 91% met or exceeded the benchmark rating of 2.00 ("developing") on Standard 2.10. At program completion: Mean student teacher ratings were at or above benchmark levels. The average ratings in 2019-2020 for these 2 standards were 3.62 and 3.81. All but one student teacher received a rating of 3.00 or greater.

Liberal Studies Goal Area	Program Standards (SLOs)	Measures/Tools	Major Results

4. **Application of Knowledge. Graduates create standards-based learning experiences that make knowledge accessible, exciting, and meaningful for all students:**
 	
7. Using multiple representations and explanations of disciplinary concepts that capture key ideas and link them to students' prior understandings.
 	
8. 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 knowledge and testing hypotheses according to the methods of inquiry and standards of evidence used in the discipline.
  c. Developing and using curricula that encourage students to see and interpret ideas from diverse perspectives.
  d. Creating interdisciplinary learning experiences that allow inquiry from several subject areas
	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 variables.
	2.7 Utilizes Colorado Standards in Math for the improvement of instruction
	2.8 Integrates literacy and mathematics into content area instruction (4f)
	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 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning (4a, b, d)
	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 Creates and implements a range of standards-based long term plans, including thematic, interdisciplinary, literature-based (4c, 4f)
	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)
		• 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
		
		* Tool = Program rubrics
		
		Ratings by graduates and their supervisors are not available until June 2020.
			At admission to education (2.10): See results related to standard 2.10 in Goal 2.
			
			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 2019-2020. Standards receiving the highest mean ratings (above 3.65) and those receiving the lowest (below 3.56) are highlighted.

Standard	Student Teacher MN Rating
2.3	3.60
2.4	3.61
2.5	3.71
2.6	3.64
2.7	3.66
2.8	3.60
2.9	3.64
2.10	3.61
3.1	3.68
5.3	3.70
5.4	3.55

II. Closing the Loop. Describe at least one data-informed change to your curriculum during the 2019-2020 cycle. These are those that were based on, or implemented to address, the results of assessment from previous cycles.

A. What SLO(s) or other issues did you address in this cycle? **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 column H and/or feedback?	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?
SLOs 2.10 & 2.11 2.10 Applies expert content knowledge to ensure, enrich and extend student learning. 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)	2018-2019	1. Continue to meet with content knowledge departments and explore ways to enhance knowledge acquisition in writing, math, and social studies.	Representatives from the Teacher Education Program met with representatives from the content departments in social studies, English, and math to discuss content in required courses. The discussions ended up covering both the knowledge candidates need in their respective disciplines, but also how aligned it is to the new PRAXIS tests. Teacher Ed shared the expectations of the PRAXIS tests with the departments so that courses could be changed.	Writing and math scores/ratings have increased nicely in just one year. Social studies continues to be a problem, but that is looking more and more like an issue with the test that the state has chosen for licensure (Praxis).
Continue to monitor student pass rates on the PRAXIS tests to watch for correlations, strengths and weaknesses.	2018-2019	Examine the content in courses related to PRAXIS content areas.	Representatives from the Teacher Education Program met with representatives from other IHEs across the state to compare Praxis data and do a "deep dive" into the data in conjunction with representatives from ETS (Praxis) and the Colorado Department of Education (CDE). This analysis resulted in a few important revelations about the elementary and social studies Praxis tests.	Pass rates for elementary improved this year – especially the final pass rate. Most significant is that many students who had attempted to pass the test multiple times and failed got the support they needed to finally pass the test and student teach. Our pass rates are now above the rest of the state by a significant margin on these tests. Our initial pass rate is still

| | | | First, CSU-Pueblo is not the only institution struggling with this. It is virtually across the state. It is so universal that CDE is going to pursue additional meetings with ETS to make sure that the test is aligned with state standards.

Additionally, the Title V grant that we received allowed us to hire a Praxis Coordinator. She has been in place most of this last academic year and has already made a huge difference. She provides test preparation materials, group and individual tutoring, test anxiety mitigation, and some other services as needed. | not as strong as we would like, but at least this is no longer holding students back from student teaching like it was over the last few years. We have a robust support structure in place and it is only getting better. I'm sure we will continue to improve even more as our Praxis Coordinator gets even more established and connected to our students. |

Comments on part II: