Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2020-21

Unit/Program Name: __Ph.D. Program in Educational Leadership **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Steve Gruenert steve.gruenert@indstate.edu

Part 1: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year? If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.	b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?	c. What were your expectations for student performance?	d. What were the actual data/results?	e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? *See also Part 2 of summary.*
1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency. Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: **Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.**	This outcome is measured using the following assignments: A conceptual model of human relations in EDLR 755 An advanced model of educational philosophy in EDLR 806, Completion of **Preliminary Examinations** at End of Coursework.	At prelims, we established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome. This performance model is in alignment with the model used in the Masters in Educational Administration (MED) and the Educational Specialist (Ed.S.) in Educational Administration for accreditation as educational licensure programs.	EDLR 755 Outcomes n=12: Exceeds Expectations; 7 (55%) Meets Expectations; 4 (33%) Developing; 1 (16%) Did not meet expectations; 0 EDLR 806 Outcomes n=12: Exceeds Expectations; 1 (8%) Meets Expectations; 10 (84%) Developing; 1 (8%) Did not meet expectations; 0 Student Outcomes at Prelims n=27: Exceeds Expectations; 2 (7%) Meets Expectations; 22 (81%) Developing; 3 (11%) Did not meet expectations; 0	Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that all but three our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 1.1. We have recently experienced many personnel shifts in our department and anticipate faculty returning to our programs in the spring, thus allowing us to build on opportunities to modify/expand our curriculum and instructional delivery methods to better meet the needs of our candidates. At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to

				allow for more consistent assessment.

Opportunities for candidates to remediate low scores are directed by the dissertation chair who oversees the academic growth of candidates after prelims. |

2.4 An Understanding of Research understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.

Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: **Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.** | This outcome is measured using the following assignments: A conceptual model of human relations in EDLR 755

An advanced model of educational philosophy in EDLR 806,

Completion of **Preliminary Examinations** at End of Coursework. | At prelims, we established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome. | EDLR 755 Outcomes: Exceeds Expectations; 4 (33%) Meets Expectations; 7 (60%) Developing; 1 (8%) Did not meet expectations; 0

EDLR 806 Outcomes: Exceeds Expectations; 4 (33%) Meets Expectations; 7 (58%) Developing; 1 (9%) Did not meet expectations; 0

Student Outcomes at Prelims: Exceeds Expectations; 1 (3%) Meets Expectations; 22 (82%) Developing; 4 (15%) Did not meet expectations; 0 | Scores on Oral Preliminary Examinations indicate that four of our candidates are at the development stage of this standard element while others met or exceeded embracing the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 2.4.

We have recently experienced many personnel shifts in our department and anticipate faculty returning to our programs in the spring, thus allowing us to build on opportunities to modify/expand our curriculum and instructional delivery methods to better meet the needs of our candidates. While most tend to meet expectations in this standard, it is still one that most candidates "fear" and rarely exceed expectations.

At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to |

				allow for more consistent assessment. Opportunities for candidates to remediate low scores are directed by the dissertation chair who oversees the academic growth of candidates after prelims.
4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice. Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: **Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.**	This outcome is measured using the following assignments: A conceptual model of human relations in EDLR 755 An advanced model of educational philosophy in EDLR 806, Completion of **Preliminary Examinations** at End of Coursework.	At prelims, we established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a "3" (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.	EDLR 755 Outcomes: Exceeds Expectations; 11 (92%) Meets Expectations; 0 (0%) Developing; 1 (8%) Did not meet expectations; 0 EDLR 806 Outcomes: Exceeds Expectations; 11 (92%) Meets Expectations; 0 Developing; 1 (8%) Did not meet expectations; 0 Student Outcomes at Prelims: Exceeds Expectations; 1 (3%) Meets Expectations; 26 (97%) Developing; 0 Did not meet expectations; 0	Scores on all three measurements indicate that all of our candidates have embraced the theoretical and practical aspects of doctoral level study for Standard Element 4.1. We have recently experienced many personnel shifts in our department and anticipate faculty returning to our programs in the spring, thus allowing us to build on opportunities to modify/expand our curriculum and instructional delivery methods to better meet the needs of our candidates. The differences between 755 and 806 are revealing and suggest a review of those assessments, with a focus on interrater reliability or project rigor. At the monthly K-12 program meetings curriculum review changes were discussed and initiated. The assessment process for student learning outcomes was addressed to allow for more consistent assessment.

Cohort sizes for:

	Campus Residency Cohort	Regional Distance Education Cohort
2020-2021	11	16
2019-2020	11	19

2021 Program Report Summary: Part 1

In the past, each year two new cohorts began with the Campus Residency Educational Doctorate (CREDS) program beginning in the summer and the Regional Educational Doctorate Program (REDS) beginning in the fall semester. In 2019-2020 the CREDS program replaced the original Wednesday residency program that had been in place for 30 years. the Wednesday Residency program required students to come to campus every Wednesday for the fall and spring semesters and to take four courses each semester while on campus. While this had been a very successful and popular program for years, the enrollment began to decrease significantly. Most of the students in both programs are working K-12 school administrators who are trying to balance their professional position with the Ph.D. program. The students and the sending districts that allowed the student to attend on the 36 required Wednesdays felt it was no longer feasible to allow leaders to miss that much time from their position. After much assessment and discussion, the change was initiated to create a program that still had residency on campus but become more "user friendly" to the working professional. The year 2020-2021 provided additional challenges to enrollments, content delivery, as well as retirements. The faculty workload has forced us to rethink cohort sizes which ultimately manifest in heavy dissertation loads. Thus, we have decided to only have one PhD cohort commencing in the Fall of 2022, using methods of student selection that mirrors our department's SAHE program.

For purposes of this report, we have two cohorts to report on. The CREDS program ($N = 11$) begins with two courses during the summer session. Students work mainly on-line with the instructors for both courses but are required to come to campus for on-campus session four consecutive days. This allows for group work, and other face-to-face activities. During the fall and spring semesters, the students enroll in three courses. One of the three courses (the required statistics courses) is on-line. The other two courses are partly on-line and meet on campus three Thursdays, three Fridays, and three Saturdays each semester. The following summer students again take two courses in the same manner as the first summer session. The CREDS program requires a total of 26 days on campus for face-to-face instruction. But students who are working professionals are absent from their schools only six school days. Given the COVID restrictions we had to modify many of the face-to-face classes. The Ph.D. curriculum of 30 hours is covered in 15 months.

 The REDS program ($N = 16$) that had been in place for a decade had become much more popular. Again, most of the students in both programs are working K-12 school administrators who are trying to balance their professional position with the Ph.D. program. This program began in the fall semester and continued over five consecutive terms. Students enrolled in two of the required Ph.D. courses each term. The two fall and spring semesters include one on-line course and one course that is partly on-line but requires an all-day Saturday face-to-face meeting each month, or four during each semester. The summer session is identical to the CREDS summer session with most work of the two required courses being conducted on-line but students meet on campus for four consecutive days for face-to-face sessions. This totals a total of 20 face-to-face sessions with 16 off-campus and four days on campus. The Ph.D. curriculum is covered in 20 months. Again, COVID forced us to make temporary changes to some of the classes originally scheduled to meet face-to-face.

The low overall numbers for 2021 are attributed to the COVID-19 virus issues. Discussion and adjustments were made as the school year developed. Overall the students and instructors felt comfortable with the program. However, as the school year progressed students and instructors struggled with the three consecutive days on campus. Missing two school days, and for high school administrators, missing Saturday's extra-curricular activities after being gone the previous two school days placed a burden on the students. The decision was made to adjust the 2020-2021 cohort to meet only on Fridays and Saturdays, eliminating the Thursday meetings. This would also mean both the REDS and the CREDS cohorts would commit to the same total (20) of face-to-face sessions. Again, COVID has made this effort a challenge as we have students on campus and some zooming in.

Similar to last year, this year we required students in the regional REDS program to also come to campus in the summer for the four-day intensive sessions for two courses. This was initiated in 2020 because in our assessment of the program we saw a disconnect with the students and the resources of campus. Students were struggling to make the necessary connections with resources such as the library, the staff at the educational leadership department, and even knowing all the faculty who were available as possible dissertation committee members. In this past summer's sessions, cohort members form the REDS program also began discussion how the four-day intensive brought the cohort members closer together. Many of the out-of-town cohort members stayed in Terre Haute during the intensive sessions. This created social activities for cohort members to get better acquainted and feel as if the program had more of a personal meaning. It has been suggested that we consider beginning the regional cohort with the intensive four-day summer session as a better orientation to the program. However, still, the COVID Delta variant created some anxiety and thus, much of what happened was virtual.

As for program content, careful curriculum mapping continues to occur. As new knowledge and research develops the faculty strives to bring the current research to students. This requires constant communication to assure courses do not overlap with similar content yet continue to have basic knowledge included. We continue to meet with our adjuncts to assure integrity in our program delivery, as well, we continue to elicit feedback from our students at the end of each course. Our program ratings are among the highest in the Bayh College of Education. We look forward to our faculty members who have been tapped to serve in administrative roles at ISU to return to our department (this program specifically), and to use these data to reveal opportunities for improvement.

Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement

This program continues to focus on a scholarship-practitioner model, with the purpose to develop school leaders who are well versed in scholarship and current research that can be put to use in the schools. Graduates of the program continue to be public school leaders at the Pre K-12 levels in the roles of superintendents, assistant superintendents, and principals with a few moving on to positions on higher education. This year's assessment continues to indicate that our students are successful K-12 educational leaders at the building and district levels, who are making academic gains and building a strong practitioner/scholarship knowledge base as indicated by the outcomes assessed. They continue to experience pressure to attain a high level of student performance accountability and through the program are exposed to knowledge and research that requires them to seek practical solutions to the problems and challenge they face though the development of higher-order thinking skills. The Ph.D. program challenges their practices, especially those based on only experiences and the values and beliefs developed through the culture of their experiences. This challenge comes through the theory and research of educational leadership and the foundations of education. The true learning happens at the edge of discomfort, with a healthy level of positive anxiety, and the assessment of their performance that they may rise to our expectations for research and scholarship, under the performance standards we have established. The result is leaders who lead based on scientifically-based research and not based solely on cultural norms and experiences.

As we look at the data from past years we are able to identify some trends, revealing strengths and areas for improvement. We have data from coursework as well as from the preliminary examinations (prelims). We use the coursework data as baseline, even though some assessments are deep into the program, and use that baseline against data from the prelims. In the future, as we evolve into a more selective program, we may select to use prelim questions as interview questions for those who seek to enroll in this program. Those data could serve as true baseline indicators.

As we mine the data, the past year specifically reveals some areas where candidates did not do a well in the past and areas where we may have improved. Given the COVID-19 dynamic, we hesitate to claim any findings as absolute. We take what we find and use that information to serve as areas to watch rather than as areas to fix, until we are back into a normal situation. In general, areas where we seemed to increase our "exceeds" also had drops in our "meets." Standard 2.4 showed the largest change in any standard, moving from 12 "as developing" and 15 as "meets" to 4 "as developing" and 22 "as meets." In this same standard, we find a drop in "exceeds" from 5 to 1. Standard 2.4 is an understanding of research. The changes that demonstrate improvement may be from having students start their dissertation inquiries at an earlier time (EDLR 761), thus, the language and properties of the various types of research are better understood, relevant, and given context. While in the past a candidate may have already considered a topic and identified a dissertation chair by the time of prelims, in the two courses 761 and 859, we challenged instructors and students to delve further into their topics. Their ability to articulate limitations of research designs seemed to make a difference as we reflect on the actual student responses given at prelims. While some students may claim to be qualitative researchers, we still challenged them with quantitative prompts throughout the program, and vice versa. This overall, expanded knowledge of research properties may have become manifest in Standard 2.4 assessments.

The scores on the course assessments for EDLR 755 and EDLR 806 were used as baseline data. Not all student data from these courses were available. One student, who demonstrated the weakest performances at the classroom levels, did not complete the prelims. If we look at the course-based assessments and compare those with the assessments at prelims we find a few students who greatly improved, however, most maintained the levels they started with, within one point. This suggests a few notions, 1) the program did not create many opportunities for students who came in meeting the standards to improve much, 2) the baseline was not a true baseline and actually captured candidates who were already deep into the program, 3) faculty scoring candidates were inconsistent, or 4) the instruments used to assess the standards lacked sufficient precision to reveal changes.

Whenever we experience candidates who struggle at prelims but did well in the coursework (relevant to the standards being assessed) we do not assume there was a regression in capacity, rather, it is assumed the structure of prelims did not reveal what was known. In the rare occasion when a candidate exhibits an inability to continue the work we discuss options with the candidate. Typically, we share these data with the dissertation chair(s) of those who did not do well in prelims, offering suggestions as to how one might support future work in those standards. In the past, we have offered candidates pathways to remediate a low score on a standard, such as course audits, additional readings, a second prelim experience, and/or a conference with the dissertation chair to discuss the issue and other options.

One issue from our last program report questioned whether the expectation levels of the faculty had changed. Are faculty members consistent in their expectations of the levels of "meets expectations" and "exceeds expectations"? Are students being measured by the rubric or being compared to the performance of past cohorts? Conversations among faculty did not reveal any changes in their expectations per cohort so much as the challenge *when the best students go first*. The prelim scores are the outcomes that are determined through a final assessment after they have completed all coursework and have taken the preliminary examinations for admission to candidacy to the Ph.D. The expectation will continue to be to not accept anything less than meets expectations for our Ph.D. program. Thus, one potential solution will be to better screen candidates when entering the

program. This procedure mirrors what the Higher Education PhD program (in EDLR) does, and it works well for them. Another potential solution to creating a more robust assessment system could be to build a stronger pre/post assessment alignment as a way to improve both validity and reliability of what we are striving to measure and improve. We should look into the course-based assessments for opportunities to create diverse/creative experiences that reflect the essence of the standards.

In prelims, we realize the setting is quite different for students when taking a course compared to when being questioned in an oral setting with time limits. In courses, students have the opportunity to see a rubric of expectations. Time is allowed to research and identify scholarly work that supports the projects being graded. They benefit from the guidance provided by discussion and the knowledge of the instructor. This gives some indication that course ratings would assume to be greater than oral preliminary examinations. Yet, here we also must consider the effect of COVID-19 on forcing prelims to, once again, occur via zoom. In-person opportunities seem to bring forth better responses and also allows for conversations to have necessary pauses and reflections without the increased "wait time" issue being perceived as weak.

More specifically, for the next year we shall focus on the following three standards:
1.2 Comprehensive Knowledge
knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
2.4 An Understanding of Research
understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education
theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.

We look at 1.2 as we find candidates unable to replace personal experiences with research when defending a practice. Standard 2.4 has always been a challenge in the past and may be the weakest of all standards at the prelims. Standard 4.1 got our attention as it is a strong standard in the program, yet in EDLR 806 there was a large jump in the Exceeds Expectations category.

New challenges face K-12 leaders every school year. Discussions continue with present alumni, school superintendents, principals, and cohort members to determine the needs in the schools and for educational leaders. Presently issues such as COVID-19, virtual learning, and social justice have become critical issues for school leaders. Continuing challenges such as teacher shortage, social-emotional learning, child trauma, and new academic achievement testing and standards continue to be issues that need addressed with new research and the development of higher order thinking skills. As we mentioned in our report last year, we must continue to reach out to the K-12 leaders and find what skills we may need to address or what areas the program needs to focus. This will be done through the use of our advisory council of school superintendents. They will be asked for input in terms of what skills are needed for future Ph.D. students in K-12 leadership. This is also accomplished by our presence in consulting opportunities, internships in the school districts, continuing to be a presence at all leadership conferences as well as working with faculty form other universities and attending national leadership conferences.

With the national focus on social justice, a very significant opportunity comes this year to attempt to add more diversity to our program in terms of student population. A large majority of White leaders dominate the field of educational administration, especially in district-level positions. As we stated last year, the goal is to at least have education leadership positions be held by a percentage of minority leaders equal or greater than the percentage of minority population of the State of Indiana. Recruitment dinners, depending on the COVID-9 restrictions are planned to be a part of the accreditation process of our MED and Ed.S. licensure programs for educational leaders. The desire is to attract minority candidates to these dinners and encourage their enrollment in the Ph.D. program. Efforts to recruit minority candidates will also take place at the leadership conferences by

having tables and booths with faculty members present to encourage minority enrollment. We have made improved efforts in this area. We have hired a pre-doctorate fellow who is currently co-teaching a few of the MED courses as a start. We have also presented diversity recruiting seminars in both our MED internship program as well as at the Indiana Association of School Principals Winter Conference. We hope to do the same at an Indiana Association of Public School Superintendents conference in the near future. We also hope to make recruitment efforts at the 2022 Black Expo held in Indianapolis.

	Enrollment Totals	Graduation Totals	Ave. Yrs. To Graduate
2020-2021	122	18	5.0
2019-2020	124	27	5.0

PhD Master Assessment Rubric

Student's Name: _____

Please evaluate and score your student's ability on each of the following outcomes.

	Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), and Does Not Meet Expectations (1)
1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge	Displays knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
1.2 Critical Reflection	Displays ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
1.3 Articulate a Philosophy	Displays ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
1.4 Exercise Leadership	Displays ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments	Displays ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames	Displays facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
2.3 Critically Read and Review Research	Displays ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
2.4 An Understanding of Research	Displays understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills	Displays communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.
4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education	Displays theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.
4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs	Displays ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2020-21 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment practice and use in your program.

This report will be shared with the Associate Dean(s) and Dean of your college and summarized findings will be shared as composite college/institutional data with the President's Office and the Provost's team.

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: K-12 Educational Leadership Ph.D.	Overall Rating: Exemplary (3.00/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
• Learning outcomes are clear, measurable, and aligned with professional standards and CGPS outcomes to demonstrate graduate level of rigor. • Assessment data is taken from multiple types of learning performances at different points throughout the curriculum. • A holistic rubric is included that is used to evaluated student performance relative to specific outcomes. Expected and actual performance data are reported in terms of the levels of performance on the rubric. • Expected performance is clear and reasonable. Actual data is clearly described relative to rubric levels and expectations. • Clear information if provided about faculty engagement in assessment and discussion of assessment findings. It is clear that faculty are invested in understanding, supporting, and where necessary, improving student learning relative to the outcomes. Examples include coaching by the dissertation chair, consideration of curriculum structure and format of offerings, and opportunities to sample performance data at additional points in the curriculum to better monitor growth. • Thorough discussion provided about the overall strengths and weaknesses in student performance, strategies for supporting strong performance and improving lagging performance, and ways to gain better data in the future. Great information is also included	• In terms of the way the rubric may better support precise and accurate evaluation data, consider if there are any dimensions on the rubric that would be worth breaking down into more specific analytical rubrics. For instance, knowing that research skills is an area to target for improvement, an analytical rubric could isolate the various dimensions of research skills (making an argument, developing a research question, literature review, methods, etc.) that will help faculty better target the areas that really need developmental focus and whether these are common among students or more tied to individuals. This is a great tool for providing effective feedback to the students as well. • Performances for each dimension on the rubric could also be described in a way that consistently differentiates each level (exceeds, meets, etc.) so that faculty have a better sense of consistency across students and can provide clearer feedback. It was interesting to see that the influence of the best students going first might have had an effect in evaluation.

| about program goals relative to the changing needs of the field and changing populations of students in the schools. | |

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
Student Learning Outcomes	Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.	Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). At least one outcome is assessed this cycle.	Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated. Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable). At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.	No learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).
Performance Goals & Measures	Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected. Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and rationale and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). Most are direct measures, and their design enhances the validity of findings. Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).	Performance goals are clear and appropriate. Identified measures and tools are assigned to each outcome, are clear and intentionally designed to address student performance on aligned outcomes, and examples are provided (e.g. – rubrics, checklists, exam keys). At least one direct measure is included.	Performance goals are identified with little rationale or clarity. Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.	No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.

Analysis & Results	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.	Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description. Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.	Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality. Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description. Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.	No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected. No results are provided.
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	A plan for sharing information and included program faculty and appropriate staff in discussion and planning is detailed and enacted. Outcomes and results are easily accessible on the program website or other appropriate designated area. Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans. Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.	A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted. Plans for improvement or change based on results are clear and connected to results. If few students met performance goals, this is included in discussion and plans. Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content. Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results. Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.	No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No evidence of reflection on results in provided.
Overall Rating	□ **Exemplary**	□ **Mature**	□ **Developing**	□ **Undeveloped**