

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2019-20** Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.

**Unit/Program Name:** Higher Education Leadership Program **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Kandace Hinton – kandace.hinton@indstate.edu

**Part 1a: Summary of Student Learning Outcomes Assessment**

**NOTE: If data from Spring 2020 is missing due to COVID-19 transition issues, please describe these issues, their impact on your ability to assess student learning, and what, if anything, will change as a result.**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>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?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</b></p>
<p>1. 1.1.2 Critical Reflection 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.</p>	<p>EDLR 755 – Seminar in Education Law Course readings and class discussions included consideration of the roles that sexism and racism play in current higher education legal issues such as sexual assault/harassment and campus hate speech. EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership allowed the students to interview a college president and assess her/his leadership lens. The culminating reflective project was a philosophy of leadership.</p>	<p>Students were expected to demonstrate both understanding of complex social-legal theory, and the ability to consider how the theory might inform higher education policy and their own practice within the constraints of law and policy. Students are expected to clearly articulate their leadership philosophy and understanding of the current higher education environment based upon leadership frames, leadership theories, governance, and current trends in the field.</p>	<p>Students' comments and questions during class discussions showed complex and nuanced reflection about the relationship between social inequities, the law, and higher education. Students were able to demonstrate sufficient knowledge and application of the social-legal concepts taught in class and applied to actual higher education scenarios.</p> <p>Students were able to connect the leadership theories and organizational concepts to the case scenario on the preliminary exam</p>	<p>We will continue to infuse critical reflection about socio-political contexts and application.</p> <p>Give students more theory application projects in other courses.</p>
<p>2. Leadership skills, professional development, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in</p>	<p>EDLR 891 – Internship Students practice and harness their ability to observe, listen, shadow leaders in higher education administration as well as communicate with a mentor in academic affairs or</p>	<p>Students were expected to complete an EDLR internship experience, shadowing three higher education leaders, writing 10 journal reflections on their experiences and observations as well</p>	<p>All students were able to complete the internship experience and produce final portfolios reflecting on their leadership skills as well as those who were observed. Their internship mentor</p>	<p>Final product submitted by the students as well as the mentor's evaluations provided an analysis of the students' growth over 16 weeks. Moreover this was an assessment that can be used to</p>

academic and higher education administrative environments.	higher education administration.	completing a final product. Students must work with campus professionals and a mentor who is an academic upper level administrative leader.	evaluations indicated an ability to synthesize their experiences in the journals and apply the Bolman and Deal as well as Kouzes and Posner’s leadership models to their observational experiences.	gauge professional growth based on a comparison in the first semester and at the end of the academic program.
3. Exercise Leadership ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.	EDLR 752 – Organizational Theory and Leadership	Students completed a consultation project with an academic unit on campus. The students were the experts or leaders and worked with a selected administrative unit on campus to resolve or solve an issue or complete a project.	Students gained experience communicating, deliberating, and collaborating with a consultee or higher education leader as well as that individuals department to address a “problem” and create a solution and outcomes for that area.	We will continue to find projects that will allow the students to enhance their research, consultation, and presentation skills.

Note: If you would like to report on more than three outcomes, place the cursor in the last cell on the right and hit “tab” to add a new row.

#### Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference. Note any alignment with professional standards, as applicable.
- b. Each outcome should be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam should be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses. Describe or attach any evaluation tools such as rubrics, scales, etc.
- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.)
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., 85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark).

### Part 1b: Review of Student Success Data & Activities

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you). A dashboard has been created in the Chairs view:

- 1) Cohort Sizes **AY 19-20 cohort 1) 16; cohort 2) 8**
- 2) Year-to-Year Retention 85%
- 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate (undergraduate); Average time to completion (graduate) 5 years

What worked well in supporting student success this year?

Professional development opportunities for students, doctoral writing workshop for candidates in their proposal phase of the dissertation process, the research proposal class had all faculty in the department and higher education administrators in attendance to hear the student’s proposal concepts and ideas. Individual faculty met in small cohorts with their candidates in University Hall and facilitated a writing weekend to help motivate them in the research process.

We encouraged students to submit their research projects to the Association for the Study of Higher Education Annual Convention in Portland, OR. Two students, Kelsey Bogard and Laura Harlow, presented their work and one won an award for her research poster.

Revamped the philosophy course to include community college research and literature, exclusively.

What are the most significant opportunities for improvement upon which to focus in the coming year?

Creation of a certificate in higher education, reviewing the higher education curriculum for updates and revision in course content, expand recruitment to campus administrators as well as administrators at Rose Hulman, Ivy Tech, and St. Mary's of the Woods, prepare adjunct faculty to teach key courses in the curriculum, and create an Advisory Board in combination with the Student Affairs and Higher Education Program.

### **Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities – required for undergraduate programs; optional for graduate programs**

**If you submitted a report last year, you only need to resubmit if there are changes to your current career readiness competencies map.**

If you have not previously done so, please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. You can find the template here: <https://www.indstate.edu/assessment/plan-components>

### **Part 2: Continuous Quality Improvement**

**Reflect on the information shared above regarding student learning, success, and career readiness. In no more than one page, summarize:**

- 1) the discoveries assessment and data review have enabled you to make about student learning, success, and career readiness (ex: What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? What evidence can you provide that learning is improving? How might learning, success, and career readiness overlap? What questions do your findings raise?)**
- 2) findings-based plans and actions intended to improve student learning and/or success (expansion of Part 1a, box e as needed)**
- 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year**
- 4) how this information will be shared with other stakeholders**

We discovered that the students are synthesizing the content taught to them by the last semester of the program. They have a solid working knowledge of student development theories, organizational theories, leadership models, and research methods. There was an improvement in the content provided in their written preliminary exams and the oral preliminary exam allowed them to demonstrate their theory to practice intersections further. The number of students struggling or not passing the preliminary exams has decreased. The faculty who engage in the preliminary exam process discuss the work of students who fail the exam. The faculty create another exam, based upon the student's areas of weakness, and administer it giving the student two weeks to finish the product. The student has a one-on-one conversation with the advisor after the faculty grade the exam. This process gives the student an opportunity to receive in-depth feedback as well as support.

Program faculty will collaborate in completing the assessment grid annually. During the assessment days scheduled by the Bayh College of Education the faculty will meet afterwards to review the SAOS report as well as the external review document and determine what curricular areas need improvement so that all doctoral students can successfully complete the preliminary exam.

The assessment plan will focus on the data collected from students after finishing the preliminary exam and how their suggestions and recommendations have been infused and implemented into the curriculum as well as overall program design. Because there are fewer full time faculty teaching in the Higher Education Leadership Program, adjuncts are being hired to teach many of the significant content courses. Thus, there will be an intensive on-boarding and peer evaluation process for the adjunct instructors so that they will teach the courses in a manner that will enhance student learning.

Program faculty will participate in the assessment process by administering related assignments; evaluating students' demonstrated skills, dispositions, and knowledge; generating course and program assessment evaluations; examining assessment outcomes; and revising the assessment process as needed.

Program faculty members will make changes to course offerings, instruments, and instruction based on assessment outcomes. We will assist students in developing and succeeding with the assigned learning outcomes by clearly stating expectations during recruitment and orientation activities, ensuring that the curriculum helps to support and cultivate satisfaction of the objectives, and providing additional direction for students who struggle to fulfill the specified objectives.

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2019-20 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: PhD Educational Leadership – Higher Education	Overall Rating: Developing (1.88/3.00)
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Multiple outcomes are assessed and are, for the most part, measureable and relevant.</li> <li>• High-impact practices such as problem-based learning, portfolios, and internship are used as intended measures of student learning, and great detail is provided about the design of these measures.</li> <li>• Good idea to use portfolios and evaluations to demonstrate student growth over time and provide opportunities for learning from periodic formative assessment feedback.</li> <li>• Great information about how faculty are involved in every aspect of the assessment process – data collection, student evaluation, discussion and sharing of findings, and using results to improve the program and student learning.</li> <li>• Good note about the importance of strong onboarding for the growing number of adjunct faculty to ensure course alignment to the overall program outcomes and quality of pedagogy and evaluation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Note the updated rubric that was sent out with the report template to see changes primarily in the last dimension, “Sharing &amp; Using Results for Continuous Improvement.” Since this report is nearly the same from last year but has a lower score, I wanted to be sure you knew what had changed so there was no confusion.</li> <li>• Note how the outcomes align to the Graduate Student Learning Outcomes (these can be found at <a href="http://www.indstate.edu/assessment/learning-outcomes-library">www.indstate.edu/assessment/learning-outcomes-library</a>). This will make providing data for your next Graduate Program Review much simpler and evidences the graduate-level rigor occurring in the program.</li> <li>• The second outcome is missing the action that describes level of performance. This might just be an omission from copying it in.</li> <li>• Expectations for student performance are unclear in the sense of how many students will perform to what level of proficiency regarding the outcomes. From the way expected student performance is described, is it reasonable to assume that it is expected that 100% of students will be able to fully demonstrate the outcome? Clarifying this is helpful when you look back on previous data to consider how students are performing relative to expectations from cohort to cohort, and it will help you better know where to spend energy targeting improvements or identifying the most successful aspects of the program.</li> </ul>

- Limited information is provided about how student performance is evaluated. While qualitative data such as professor observations of student proficiency in class discussion, etc are valuable points of data, the use of an evaluative tool to document level of performance, number of students reaching levels of performance, and examples of student behavior that qualify would be helpful in increasing the trustworthiness of any qualitative results. Consider sharing information about any checklists or rubrics used by faculty to evaluate student performance, as well as the actual number of students performing at/above the threshold level, or the actual number of students performing at each potential level if that's more helpful.
- Some concrete direct measures (prelim exam case scenario, internship mentor evaluations, problem-based assignment in EDLR 752) are described in the actual results section, but the data is not included (about scores, number of students earning each score level, number of students meeting/exceeding expectations, etc.). It's also noted that a Philosophy of Leadership was the culminating project for the 1<sup>st</sup> outcome, but is it not listed in reference to the actual findings.
- Because findings are described more generally, it is difficult for an outsider to interpret whether actions linked to the findings are data-informed. It seems that overall, students are performing well. There are some action notes, such as giving more theory application projects and projects aimed at research, consultation, and presentation skills, but it is unclear if this is because students demonstrated a need for these or if this is because these things have been recently increased and it has proven fruitful in student performance gains.

Evaluation Criteria	3 Exemplary	2 Mature	1 Developing	0 Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes directly integrate institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>More than one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why they were selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Identified, aligned learning outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, and program-level. Outcomes support institution or college-level learning goals.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcome is assessed this cycle, and rationale is provided for why it was selected for assessment.</p>	<p>Learning outcomes are identified and alignment with courses is demonstrated.</p> <p>Outcomes are consistent across modes of delivery (if applicable).</p> <p>At least one outcomes is assessed this cycle.</p>	<p>No <b>(program)</b> learning outcomes are identified, and/or alignment of learning outcomes to courses is not demonstrated (e.g. – curriculum map).</p>
<p><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate, and rationale is provided for why these were selected.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Licensure exams and high-impact practices are reflected in measures (if applicable).</p>	<p>Performance goals are clear and appropriate.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Performance goals are identified vague, with little rationale or clarity.</p> <p>Identified measures are poorly suited to performance goals, underdeveloped, or are solely indirect measures.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes are identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results. The process is useful to those collecting and/or interpreting data.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with thoughtful discussion of analysis and description of conclusions that can be drawn.</p>	<p>Data collection process is clear and designed to produce valid/trustworthy results.</p> <p>Data is collected and analyzed with clear rationale and description.</p> <p>Results are provided with some discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>Description of data collection is unclear as to process and quality.</p> <p>Some data is collected and analyzed with little rationale or description.</p> <p>Some results are provided with no discussion of analysis.</p>	<p>No information is provided about the data collection process, and/or no data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reflection if offered about results or plans moving forward, and <i>(in some cases)</i> compares prior year plans to current outcomes in an effort to foster continuous improvement as a result of assessment process.</p>	<p>A plan for sharing information broadly across program faculty is detailed and enacted.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>Information is provided about sharing results, but sharing is limited in scope or content.</p> <p>Plans for improvement or change based on results are incomplete, vague, or not clearly connected to results.</p> <p>Little reflection is offered about results or plans moving forward.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing results and/or plans for improvement or change based on results.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided.</p>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Please see reviewer notes for more details.