

Academic Program:	Higher Education Leadership Program	Date:	9/30/22
Author(s):	Kandace Hinton		
Verify that each of the following documents is correct and current on the ISU Assessment Results Webpage by marking with an "X." Please submit any updated documents and/or corrections as soon as possible to Kelley Woods-Johnson, Assessment & Accreditation Coordinator at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu .		<input type="checkbox"/> Learning Outcomes <input type="checkbox"/> Curriculum Map <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment Plan	
Is this program offered on-campus AND distance? If "Yes," reported data should include students of both, disaggregated.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Hybrid	

Instructions: The narrative format of this report will contain the same information as the table format, but the structure of the narrative is flexible. An outline has been provided for guidance on what to include, but the structure of the narrative need not follow the outline. When applicable, detailed notes from program faculty meetings where assessment was discussed may be copied into this report as the narrative. Please cite to indicate when this is the case.

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment

Program Student Learning Outcomes Assessed this Year

The Higher Education Leadership Doctoral Program assessed several learning outcomes. Each year we assess comprehensive student learning through providing them the opportunity to demonstrate their knowledge of core components of the curriculum. The preliminary examination covers topics such as: organization theory, governance, leadership theory, student development theory, advanced leadership, and inquiry. This past summer (2022) only six students sat for the exam; of the six only two did not require additional assessment or rewrite of certain components. This small cohort of students spent their entire first year online rather than in the hybrid format of the program because of COVID 19 restrictions. This group did not have the opportunity to experience a face-to-face orientation which sets the tone for the entire program. We were very introspective as to why this cohort missed the mark and whether we failed to provide them the necessary tools to demonstrate proficiency in the core areas of the curriculum. We determined that this group did not congeal as a cohort in the same way as others and therefore did not prepare for the exam together by sharing resources. Once they were given the chance to rewrite, after the oral exam, each of the four students improved to the point of demonstrating proficiency in all areas of the core curriculum.

For Each Student Learning Outcome Assessed:

Assessment Strategies for Each Student Learning Outcome (courses where learning took place, assignments used, tools for evaluation – i.e. rubrics, etc.) Leadership, critical race, and student development theories, understanding governance or higher education organization, statistics, inquiry, higher education law, and resource management.

Established Benchmark for Proficiency – Generally, students must complete the entire curriculum with an overall gpa of 3.33. Specifically, students must complete EDPSY 612 and 712 or 710 with B average.

Actual Student Performance Relative to Established Benchmark (provide specific data rather than general observations) (I'm awaiting access to Blue Reports)

Comparison to any Prior Data, if Available



Student Success Activities

Use the “Academic Chair” tab in [Blue Reports](#) to view your program’s data related to retention, persistence, time to/rates of graduation, etc., as applicable (undergraduate v. graduate). Share reflections and activities of program faculty in the table below. Consider curricular, pedagogical, advising, co-curricular, and student support efforts.

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

Based on Blue Reports data and review of current activities, what are the primary areas to focus on improving next year?

Continuous Quality Improvement

Describe primary insights gained from analysis of findings. *What was learned? What questions did it raise? How does current performance compare to past (if applicable), and how might any prior action plans have influenced performance?*

What findings-based actions are planned to maintain strong performance and/or improve student learning and success?

What learning outcomes will your assessment plan focus on next year, and what changes, if any, are planned to improve assessment strategies and yield stronger data?

Describe faculty involvement in this assessment, and how will findings be shared with faculty/stakeholders (as applicable)? There is only one faculty member engaged in this assessment (one faculty member is on sabbatical, another who taught in the program left the university, and faculty who are teaching this semester are first year or adjunct status). However, the findings will ultimately be shared with full departmental faculty during our next retreat.

The purpose of SOAS Report evaluation is to promote high quality academic program assessment that results in relevant, useful, and accurate data about student learning outcome achievement that faculty can use in planning for and monitoring efforts toward continuous improvement. Faculty are encouraged to incorporate feedback they find useful into assessment practices, and resources are available to support assessment development.

Evaluation Key: Exemplary=Meets all standards, exceeds some; Mature=Meets all/most standards, no serious concerns; Developing=Meets some standards, multiple recommendations for improvement; Undeveloped=Meets few/no standards, serious concerns noted; Cannot Evaluate=Missing information prevents evaluation

Component of Practice	Areas of Exemplary Practice	Standards of Practice Highlighted practices were clear in the SOASR	Recommendations for Improvement (serious concerns highlighted)	Evaluation Relative to Standards
<p>Learning Outcomes Strong learning outcomes use language that focuses on what students will achieve and can be measured to demonstrate achievement.</p>		<p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle</p> <p>Outcome(s) is specific as to what students will be able to know/do as a result of their learning</p> <p>Outcome(s) is measurable</p> <p>Outcome(s) is consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable)</p>	<p>The narrative form is new, so it may have been overlooked. It is noted that outcomes were assessed, but there is no information on which outcomes were assessed.</p>	<p>Cannot Evaluate</p>
<p>Assessment Strategies Strong assessment strategies are designed to produce data of high enough quality to be useful to faculty trying to understand student learning outcome achievement, uncover potential issues, and determine next steps to support continuous improvement. They do not rise to the rigor of research methods, though they may draw on some related tenants and strategies.</p>		<p>Assessment measure(s) is designed for precise alignment to designated outcome(s)</p> <p>Overall assessment strategy relies primarily on direct assessment measure(s)-comprehensive exams can be good assessment measures, especially when paired with analytical rubrics to inform on specific LO mastery; passing or not passing is not the best measure of a specific LO.</p> <p>Indirect assessment measure(s) is included to provide supplemental perspectives</p> <p>Assessment data comes from multiple sources, either within a significant course or across the curriculum</p> <p>Assessment measures include rich and/or relevant displays of student learning (i.e. experiential learning, intensive writing, problem-based learning, licensure exams, etc.)</p> <p>Tools for evaluating student achievement are clearly described when necessary (i.e. rubrics, exam alignment key, preceptor evaluation, etc.)</p>	<p>Because the specific outcomes were not described, I'm unable to give much feedback on the assessment strategy. The only thing I would suggest is taking some assessment measures from assignments earlier in the curriculum, especially when there are students who don't pass prelims the first go-around. While cohort study groups are incredibly important (as a part-time PhD students I was well-aware of this myself), we don't want that to be the default success factor. Earlier points of assessment can facilitate opportunities for faculty to intervene through teaching strategies, advising, etc. with students who are falling behind.</p>	<p>Cannot Evaluate</p>

<p>Results & Analysis Clear depiction of results and strong analysis pairs with strong assessment strategies to allow faculty to determine appropriate interpretation of data and use of findings. Use of student achievement data rather than anecdotes, comparison to thresholds of proficiency, and thoughtful use of disaggregation to uncover potential group differences that might exist are all good practices.</p>		<p>The threshold for proficiency for each outcome is clearly stated relative to the measure/evaluation tool used</p> <p>The threshold for proficiency reflects reasonably high expectations for the program</p> <p>Actual student performance data on assessment measures is shared relative to the stated threshold for proficiency and (when applicable) the evaluation tool used</p> <p>Thoughtful discussion of faculty insights gained from findings is included</p> <p>When appropriate, student performance data is disaggregated by group, without identifying any specific student (ex: on-campus & distance cohorts in a program offering both forms of delivery)</p> <p>When applicable, missing data or significant limitations to how data may be interpreted or applied are described</p>	<p>Again, because the LOs were not provided and the measure was passing a comprehensive prelim rather than assessing LOs independently, I'm not able to provide much useful feedback here. Comprehensive exams are great summative measures and important doctoral milestones, and they can be analytically useful if assessed in ways that produce data that informs on isolated LOs. The discussion on student success post-pandemic overall is really insightful, but these are not tied to LO assessment findings directly.</p>	<p>Cannot Evaluate</p>
<p>Continuous Improvement Assessment is about sharing and use of results to celebrate strong performance and improve in intentional ways. Assessment for continuous improvement includes engaging multiple faculty in assessment, comparing prior results to current results to examine our interventions, using findings to plan for the future, and sharing what we have learned.</p>		<p>Multiple program faculty are involved in the assessment process</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are clearly driven by assessment findings</p> <p>Plans for maintaining strong performance and/or improving student learning are within reasonable purview of program faculty</p> <p>If data from prior assessments is provided, reflection on changes over time and the possible impact any prior interventions is discussed</p> <p>A commitment to ongoing assessment is demonstrated in clear plans for upcoming assessment</p> <p>Assessment findings are shared with program faculty and any applicable stakeholders</p>	<p>This section of the report was not completed.</p>	<p>Cannot Evaluate</p>

Contact Kelley Woods-Johnson at kelley.woods-johnson@indstate.edu or x7975 with questions or for support.