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General Information (Program Outcomes Assessment)
Standing Requirements

Mission Statement

OUR MISSION: Our singular mission is to prepare today’s practicing and promising educator to be tomorrow’s complete administrative professional.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The 72 course hour Ph.D. program in Higher Education Leadership is designed to prepare students for positions of leadership in two and four year collegiate institutions. Following a scholar/practitioner philosophy, the program stresses knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for leading institutions of higher education in the twenty-first century. It is designed primarily for professionals currently working in higher educational settings who desire a quality educational experience that allows them to continue meeting family and work responsibilities.

Graduates of the program are prepared for administrative leadership positions at public or private, four-year colleges and universities, community colleges, technical schools, and for-profit post-secondary institutions.

Outcomes Library

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Mapping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments</td>
<td>No Mapping</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research
The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills
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.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Curriculum Map

Active Curriculum Maps

PhD in Higher Education Leadership (See appendix)
Alignment Set: PhD in Educad Adm (Ldrship Higher Ed) Outcome Set
Created: 01/03/2012 2:59:46 pm CDT
Last Modified: 01/03/2012 3:21:44 pm CDT

Communication of Outcomes

We plan to present our student outcomes in the following venues: 1) our website, 2) during a summer gathering of stakeholders (to include faculty, alumni, and current students), course syllabi, and 3) to new students each fall through the handbooks we provide for internships. These discussions center on outcomes in line with program Standards where applicable, along with the Unit’s Conceptual
Framework.
Archive (This area is to be used for archiving pre-TaskStream assessment data and for current documents.)
## 2010-2011 Assessment Cycle

### Assessment Plan

#### Outcomes and Measures

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge**

- **Measure:** Alumni Survey
  - Indirect - Survey
  - Details/Description:
  - Target:
  - Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
  - Responsible Individual(s): 

- **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
  - Direct - Exam
  - Details/Description: Written and oral
  - Target:
  - Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
  - Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

- **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
  - Direct - Student Artifact
  - Details/Description:
  - Target:
  - Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
  - Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

- **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
  - Direct - Student Artifact
  - Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
  - Target:
  - Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
  - Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**

- **No measures specified**

The ability to reflect critically on
historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**  
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**  
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**  
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames**  
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research**  
The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**  
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**  
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.
**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

**Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education**
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

*No measures specified*

**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

*No measures specified*

---

**Assessment Findings**

**Finding per Measure**

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge**
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

*Measure: Alumni Survey*
*Indirect - Survey*

**Details/Description:**
**Target:**
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Alumni Survey**

*No Findings Added*

*Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam*
*Direct - Exam*

**Details/Description:** Written and oral
**Target:**
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**
No Findings Added

## Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

---

### Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
No Findings Added

---

## Measure: Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:**

Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

---

### Findings for Student Exit Interviews
No Findings Added

---

### Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

---

### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

---

### Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

---

### OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

### Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

---
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames</th>
<th>No measures specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research</th>
<th>No measures specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research</th>
<th>No measures specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</th>
<th>No measures specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education</th>
<th>No measures specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</th>
<th>No measures specified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Recommendations</td>
<td>No text specified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Reflection</td>
<td>No text specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle

## Assessment Plan

### Outcomes and Measures

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

| Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge. | Measure: Alumni Survey  
Indirect - Survey |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**

Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper**

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Measure: Student Exit Interviews**

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**

The ability to reflect critically on

| Measure: Alumni Survey  
Indirect - Survey |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12
historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</td>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Written and oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Every three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Cultural Competency Assessment</td>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Written and oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Employer Survey</td>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Written and oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Every 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper</td>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Written and oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Student Exit Interviews</td>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Written and oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Alumni Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years
- **Responsible Individual(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Student Exit Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

### Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Alumni Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years
- **Responsible Individual(s):**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Details/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure: Employer Survey</strong>&lt;br&gt;Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure: Student Exit Interviews</strong>&lt;br&gt;Direct - Student Artifact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Details/Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure: Alumni Survey</strong>&lt;br&gt;Indirect - Survey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</strong>&lt;br&gt;Direct - Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Written and oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure: Crafting a Dissertation</strong>&lt;br&gt;Direct - Student Artifact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
<td>Crafting of a dissertation proposal &amp; defense of final product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure: Cultural Competency Assessment</strong>&lt;br&gt;Direct - Exam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Employer Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect - Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Every 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Student Artifact</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Student Exit Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Student Artifact</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames**

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Alumni Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Indirect - Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Exam</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Written and oral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Crafting a Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Direct - Student Artifact</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing
Responsible Individual(s):

**Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years
Responsible Individual(s): 

**Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

**Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research**

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

**Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
Responsible Individual(s): 

**Measure:** Cohort GPA averages
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: APSY 612 & 712 combined; EDLR 761
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): 

**Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Crafting a Dissertation</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Crafting of a dissertation proposal &amp; defense of final product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Employer Survey</th>
<th>Indirect - Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Student Exit Interviews</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Cohort GPA averages</th>
<th>Direct - Portfolio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>APSY 612 &amp; 712 combined; EDLR 761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</th>
<th>Direct - Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Written and oral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills
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.

**Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**
**Target:**
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years
**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral
**Target:**
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:**
**Target:**
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**
## Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every 3 years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

### Measure: Student Exit Interviews
- **Type:** Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

### Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

---

## OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

### Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

### Measure: Alumni Survey
- **Type:** Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

### Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

### Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
- **Type:** Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral

### Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

### Measure: Crafting a Dissertation
- **Type:** Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

### Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Ongoing

**Responsible Individual(s):**

### Measure: Cultural Competency Assessment
- **Type:** Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:**

### Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor
**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Measure: Alumni Survey**
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
Responsible Individual(s):

**Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

---

**Measure: Employer Survey**
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years
Responsible Individual(s):

---

**Measure: Employer Survey**
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years
Responsible Individual(s):

---

**Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper**
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

---

**Measure: Student Exit Interviews**
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

---

**Measure: Alumni Survey**
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
Responsible Individual(s):
**Measure**: Student Exit Interviews  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description**: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

**Target**:  
**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Annually  
**Responsible Individual(s)**: Course Instructor

---

**Assessment Findings**

**Finding per Measure**

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**  
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Measure**: Alumni Survey  
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description**:

**Target**:  
**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Every three years  
**Responsible Individual(s)**:  

**Findings for Alumni Survey**

**Summary of Findings**: summative remarks  
**Recommendations**: Add course component  
**Reflections/Notes**:

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions**:  
**Course revision**  
(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

**Measure**: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam  
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description**: Written and oral

**Target**:  
**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Annually  
**Responsible Individual(s)**: Course Instructor

**Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**

*No Findings Added*
**Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings** for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Student Exit Interviews  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings** for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Measure:** Alumni Survey  
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years
- **Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings** for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam  
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral  
- **Target:**
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings** for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added
Measure: Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment
No Findings Added

Measure: Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years
Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey
No Findings Added

Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
No Findings Added

Measure: Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews
No Findings Added
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Measure: Alumni Survey
**Indirect - Survey**

- **Details/Description:**
  - Target: 
  - Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years 
  - Responsible Individual(s):

- **Findings for Alumni Survey**
  - No Findings Added

### Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
**Direct - Exam**

- **Details/Description:** Written and oral
- **Target:** 
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

- **Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**
  - No Findings Added

### Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
**Direct - Student Artifact**

- **Details/Description:**
- **Target:** 
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

- **Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper**
  - No Findings Added

### Measure: Student Exit Interviews
**Direct - Student Artifact**

- **Details/Description:** Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
- **Target:** 
- **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
- **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

- **Findings for Student Exit Interviews**
  - No Findings Added
Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings** for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings** for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every 3 years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings** for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings** for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added
### OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure:</strong> Alumni Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Every three years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings for Alumni Survey</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Findings Added**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure:</strong> Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Findings Added**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure:</strong> Crafting a Dissertation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Findings for Crafting a Dissertation</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No Findings Added**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Measure:</strong> Cultural Competency Assessment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Annually</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment

No Findings Added

Measure: Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years
Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

Measure: Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational

Measure: Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Implementation Plan (timeline)</th>
<th>Responsible Individual(s):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Every three years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings for Alumni Survey**

*No Findings Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</th>
<th>Direct - Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description: Written and oral</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**

*No Findings Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Crafting a Dissertation</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Crafting of a dissertation proposal &amp; defense of final product.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings for Crafting a Dissertation**

*No Findings Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Employer Survey</th>
<th>Indirect - Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline):</td>
<td>Every 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Findings for Employer Survey**

*No Findings Added*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Student Exit Interviews</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td>Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Program Outcomes Assessment
PHD in Educat Adm (Ldshp Higher Ed)
## Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

### Measure: Alumni Survey
- **Indirect - Survey**

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
  - **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years
  - **Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Alumni Survey**
- **No Findings Added**

### Measure: Cohort GPA averages
- **Direct - Portfolio**

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
  - **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
  - **Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Cohort GPA averages**
- **No Findings Added**

### Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
- **Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:**
- **Target:**
  - **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
  - **Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**
- **No Findings Added**

### Measure: Crafting a Dissertation
- **Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:**
- Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.
Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research

**Measure:** Cohort GPA averages
Direct - Portfolio

---

Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Ongoing
**Responsible Individual(s):**

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every 3 years
**Responsible Individual(s):**

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:
Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target:
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually
**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Program Outcomes Assessment
PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Details/Description</th>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Responsible Individual(s)</th>
<th>Findings for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>APSY 612 &amp; 712 combined; EDLR 761</td>
<td>paradigms.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings for Cohort GPA averages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure</strong>: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</td>
<td>Written and oral</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure</strong>: Crafting a Dissertation</td>
<td>Crafting of a dissertation proposal &amp; defense of final product.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings for Crafting a Dissertation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measure</strong>: Student Exit Interviews</td>
<td>Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.</td>
<td>Annually</td>
<td>Course Instructor</td>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings for Student Exit Interviews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**
**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**

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.

**Measure: Alumni Survey**
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Alumni Survey**

No Findings Added

**Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**

No Findings Added

**Measure: Cultural Competency Assessment**
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment**

No Findings Added

**Measure: Employer Survey**
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every 3 years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Employer Survey**

No Findings Added
Measure: Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target: 
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews
No Findings Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Measure: Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description: 
Target: 
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
Responsible Individual(s): 

Findings for Alumni Survey
No Findings Added

Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral
Target: 
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
No Findings Added

Measure: Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.
Target: 
Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing
Responsible Individual(s): 

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Cultural Competency Assessment</th>
<th>Details/Description:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> for Cultural Competency Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Employer Survey</td>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect - Survey</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Individual(s):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> for Employer Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper</td>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure: Student Exit Interviews</td>
<td>Details/Description:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct - Student Artifact</td>
<td>Target:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.</td>
<td>Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Findings</strong> for Student Exit Interviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No Findings Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every three years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Alumni Survey**

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Written and oral

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor

**Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam**

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

**Details/Description:**

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Every 3 years

**Responsible Individual(s):**

**Findings for Employer Survey**

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

**Target:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Annually

**Responsible Individual(s):** Course Instructor
PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Action:** Course revision

This Action is associated with the following Findings

**Findings for Alumni Survey**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** summative remarks

**Action Details:**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):**

**Key/Responsible Personnel:**

**Measures:**

**Resource Allocations:**

**Priority:**

---

**Status Report**

**Action Statuses**
### Action Plan

**Outcome**

| Action Plan | No actions specified |

### PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.</th>
<th>Action: Course revision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.</td>
<td>Action Details:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Implementation Plan (timeline): |
| Key/Responsible Personnel: |
| Measures: |
| Resource Allocations: |
| Priority: |

**Status** for Course revision

*No Status Added*

### Status Summary

*No text specified*

### Summary of Next Steps

*No text specified*
效益评估计划

效益和衡量标准

PHD在教育管理（领导力高等教育）结果集

OBJ1：反思型领导能力

Outcome 1.1: 全面知识
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Measure: 全面考试
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: 批判性反思
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Measure: 全面考试
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply...
what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average *2* or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average *2* or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average *2* or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency
Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Measure: Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization
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Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Assessment Findings**

**Finding per Measure**

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

© Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations: Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded
**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:**
Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title:** Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

*(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)*

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative
Consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Findings for Group Consultation Project

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan (Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

### Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Findings** for Comprehensive Exams

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnosis of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**
- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)
- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

(Instruction Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings** for Group Consultation Project

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year
students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan (Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.
Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 - 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:
- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:
Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact
Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (Timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence: Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.
Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project
**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnosis of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)**

---

**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below...
standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

(See Appendix)

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material - lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select...
Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnosis of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program’s duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:
Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Communications Action Plan  
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program’s duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Communications Action Plan  
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)
**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

**Outcome 4.1:**
**Understanding of Higher Education**
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

**Reflections/Notes:** At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Action Item Title:** Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation
**(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)**

**Measure:** Consultation Project
**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply
what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Exceeded

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

**Substantiating Evidence:**

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

---

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Action Item Title:** Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation  
(2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams - Direct Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under objective to coalesce under outcome. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

- Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation
(2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project
Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency.

These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence: 

Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Overall Recommendations

Continue with recently changed format of prelims, and keep the existing format of the group consultation project. Although straightforward in approach without a turn of the dial, this will give the variable of the new comprehensive examination format to settle-in and maintain programmatic treatment as faculty member on sabbatical returns and consideration for adjunct instructors in given in targeted areas.

Overall Reflection

Primarily reflection concerns the fact that students are evaluated as exceeding expectations in all areas -- yes, they most certainly enter the program with credentials deserving merit, but an evaluation measure which results in their exceeding in all areas at all states of the program may need to be refined in order to identify the areas in which they do command growth and improvement. Faculty will consider these issues after results from the coming year to determine if fine-tuning of action planning is needed.

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrship Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency
Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**
[Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML))](#) (See appendix)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences...
that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**  
Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)
philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**
- Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

---

### Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students’ philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.
**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**  
Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

## OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection</th>
<th>Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice. | **This Action is associated with the following Findings**  
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action. |
| **Action Details:** NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place. | **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year. |
| **Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan | **Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program. |
| **Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time. | **Priority:** High |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy</th>
<th>Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership. | **This Action is associated with the following Findings**  
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action. |
| **Action Details:** NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place. | **Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year. |
| **Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan | **Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program. |
| **Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time. | **Priority:** High |
**Outcome 2.1:** Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**  
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:
Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research
The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
( Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project
( Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:
Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)
Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:
 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)
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.

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program’s duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program’s duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:
Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Action: Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon
Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Findings for Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Action Details: Action Details: Over the course of the next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:
Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Action: Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Action Details: Action Details: Over the course of the next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and
continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**

- Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

---

### Status Report

#### Action Statuses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.</strong> A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action:</strong> Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Attachments:</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Status** for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement
### Plan

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly “in progress.”

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Continued mindful effort.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key/Responsible Personnel:</strong> Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Measures:</strong> Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocations:</strong> Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Priority:</strong> High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supporting Attachments:</strong> Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Details:</strong> Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year’s assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress
Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.
Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

[Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML))](#) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.
**Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames**

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**

Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

---

**Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly “in progress.”

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Ongoing mindful effort.

---

**Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research**

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.
**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

**Action Details:** Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**

Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

---

**Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly “in progress.”

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Ongoing mindful effort.

---

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**
Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

**Action:** Communications Action Plan

**Action Details:** Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocation:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**

Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

**Status for Communications Action Plan**

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly “in progress.”

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Ongoing mindful effort.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

**Action:** Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

**Action Details:** Over the course of this next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format -- allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.
**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Action: Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation**

**Action Details:** Action Details: Over the course of this next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Supporting Attachments:**

- Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

---

**Status for Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation**

**Current Status:** In Progress

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly “in progress.”

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Ongoing mindful effort.
Status Summary

Program faculty are working hard to continually reflect and re-evaluate their curriculum, instruction, and field experiences on behalf of program quality and student learning.

Summary of Next Steps

Continued mindful efforts.
2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.
### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

**The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Exams</th>
<th>Direct - Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Dr. Ryan Donlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Group Consultation Project</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> Dr. Ryan Donlan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply
what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**
**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**

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.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams  
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

**Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams  
Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Measure:** Consultation Project  
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan
problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

#### Measure: Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

#### Measure: Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

#### Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

#### Measure: Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

---

### Assessment Findings

**Finding per Measure**

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

---

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**
Details/Description: A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.1: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

Substantiating Evidence:

PhD Higher Ed Data 2013-2014 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:
Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 80%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

**Reflections/Notes:** It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:
Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.2: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 90%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.
Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Onion Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Onion Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)
**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

*Direct - Student Artifact*

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

*Measure Two: Group Consultation Project*  
*Measure Two 1.3: Exceeds 30%; Meets 70%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%*

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**  
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

*Direct - Exam*

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**
(2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as
follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.4: Exceeds 10%; Meets 80%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.1: Exceeds 30%; Meets 50%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.
Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 70%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 30%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**


**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact
Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 60%; Developing 40%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

enguishments Action Plan

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research
The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met
Recommendations: Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:
Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then
synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 20%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met
Recommendations: Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.
Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:
Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the
faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

In order to help with 2.4, a research question was added to prelims, which has helped students to better articulate this knowledge.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

**Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**
(2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

**Findings** for Group Consultation Project

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.4: Exceeds 0%; Meets 0%; Developing 100%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year’s professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.
**Reflections/Notes**: Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – no need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1:** Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 3.1: Exceeds 80%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Keep infusing diversity throughout the curriculum and also to make sure that we have diverse faculty and to model what we want our students to be like in the classroom – modeling the type of person we would like to see them become.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: Written and oral communication – They were a group that were very much performing at the A level – a “B” was an unusual circumstances.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

Communications Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)
### Measure: Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** Dr. Ryan Donlan

---

### Findings for Group Consultation Project

**Summary of Findings:** Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

**Measure Two: Group Consultation Project**

**Measure Two 3.1:** Exceeds 10%; Meets 70%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: Keep infusing diversity throughout the curriculum and also to make sure that we have diverse faculty and to model what we want our students to be like in the classroom – modeling the type of person we would like to see them become.

**Reflections/Notes:** Written and oral communication – They were a group that were very much performing at the A level – a “B” was an unusual circumstances.

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Communications Action Plan**

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

### OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1:** Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

---

### Measure: Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).
Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 4.1: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including “finance.” These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be “governance,” very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to they key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases
( Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan
Findings for Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 4.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 10%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including “finance.” These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be “governance,” very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to the key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite
number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 4.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including “finance.” These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be “governance,” very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes: Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to the key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 4.2: Exceeds 10%; Meets 20%; Developing 70%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher
education, including “finance.” These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be “governance,” very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

**Reflections/Notes:** Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to they key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

**These Findings are associated with the following Actions:**

**Practical Application Cases**

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

---

**Overall Recommendations**

Continue striving for diversity in the program and maintain responsiveness in meeting the needs of students. Maintain a balance of quantitative and qualitative approaches to programmatic review, and further examine the effects of the cohort experience on the perspectives of both students and faculty. Connect with stakeholders to gauge perceptions of our programmatic quality, yet keep the focus on measurable student achievement.

**Overall Reflection**

Faculty formative and summative discussions on programmatic quality, services to students, and what the data are telling us have been found very valuable under the framework set-up this past year. Continue the conversations and mindfulness in looking at ourselves. Diversity has been a key component in our services and success.

**Action Plan**

**Actions**

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.1: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 80%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.2: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 90%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.3: Exceeds 30%; Meets 70%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

**Action Details:** Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Action**

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.4: Exceeds 10%; Meets 80%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.
**Action Details:** Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Action:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.1: Exceeds 30%; Meets 50%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings:** Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 70%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.
Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 30%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 60%; Developing 40%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.
Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 20%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies
throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High
OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills
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.

Action: Communications Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 3.1: Exceeds 80%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

Findings for Group Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 3.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 70%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

Action Details: Action Details: Infusion of diversity in the classroom and faculty modeling.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Resource Allocations: No financial allocation needed at this time.
Priority: High

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Action: Practical Application Cases

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 4.1: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Findings for Consultation Project
(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 4.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 10%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Action Details: Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.
**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Action**: Practical Application Cases

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**
(2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings**: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 4.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**
(2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

**Summary of Findings**: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 4.2: Exceeds 10%; Meets 20%; Developing 70%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

**Action Details**: Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.
Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

---

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures: Measures:** Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

---

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.
**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

---

**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

---

**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**

**Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

---
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Action Details:** Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan**

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

---

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Action:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Action:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

**Action:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

Program Outcomes Assessment
PHD in Educat Adm (LdrsHP Higher Ed)

benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.
**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

---

**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

**Action:** Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**Status for Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

---

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**

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.

**Action:** Communications Action Plan

**Action Details:** Action Details: Infusion of diversity in the classroom and faculty modeling.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.
**Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Communications Action Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocation(s) Status:</strong> As Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps/Additional Information:</strong> Program faculty are satisfied that they have infused diversity in the classroom via faculty modeling; in fact, we believe that we serve as a model for the University in this regard. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

**Action:** Practical Application Cases

**Action Details:** Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Practical Application Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current Status:</strong> Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource Allocation(s) Status:</strong> As Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Steps/Additional Information:</strong> Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully provided more opportunities for students to apply the law in various contexts through their coursework and practicum experiences.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Action:** Practical Application Cases

**Action Details:** Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.
Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** Medium

---

**Status** for Practical Application Cases

**Current Status:** Completed

**Resource Allocation(s) Status:** As Planned

**Next Steps/Additional Information:** Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully provided more opportunities for students to apply the law in various contexts through their coursework and practicum experiences.

---

**Status Summary**

Successful in completing action plans in all areas.

---

**Summary of Next Steps**

Continued reflection and assessment with the help and assistance of Dr. Ryan Donlan
# Assessment Plan

## Outcomes and Measures

### PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

#### OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.</th>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Exams</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.</td>
<td>Direct - Exam</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive exams (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

| Measure: Group Consultation Project |
| Direct - Student Artifact |

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

| Measure: Comprehensive Exams |
| Direct - Exam |

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

### Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

### Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

### Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).
**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
*Direct - Exam*

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
*Direct - Exam*

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members
**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames**

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

---

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research**

The ability to critically read and...
review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.
include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1:** Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

**Outcome 4.1:** Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues,

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.
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organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available
for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Assessment Findings

#### Finding per Measure

**PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set**

**OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency**

**Outcome 1.1:** Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure One 1.1: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did not do as well in prelims is in year’s past. About 1/3 of the cohort really struggled with our comprehensive exam. The good news is that having an oral prelims in addition to the written really helped, in that those who struggled in one venue or the other were allowed to play to their strengths, particularly when it came to successful prompting from faculty in the room. We had several students who had to rewrite sections of the prelims or an entire question. What that did for program faculty – It said that perhaps we need to look at our classroom feedback and teaching strategies, because when you have an entire cohort that’s struggling, you ask “What happened during the course of the two years in which they were matriculating?” not “What is wrong with the students.” Student success on the Group Consultation Project was better than on the Comprehensive Exams.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That’s for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We’re starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master’s area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that’s why we’re retooling
**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 1.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 52%; Developing 48%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did not do as well in prelims is in year’s past. About 1/3 of the cohort really struggled with our comprehensive exam. The good news is that having an oral prelims in addition to the written really helped, in that those who struggled in one venue or the other were allowed to play to their strengths, particularly when it came to successful prompting from faculty in the room. We had several students who had to rewrite sections of the prelims or an entire question. What that did for program faculty – It said that perhaps we need to look at our classroom feedback and teaching strategies, because when you have an entire cohort that’s struggling, you ask “What happened during the course of the two years in which they were matriculating?” not “What is wrong with the students.” Student success on the Group Consultation Project was better than on the Comprehensive Exams.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That’s for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research course, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We’re starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master’s area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that’s why we’re retooling
for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Findings for Comprehensive Exams

**Summary of Findings:** Measure One 1.2: Exceeds 18%; Meets 58%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

With respect to Critical Reflection, it was developing and moving into the “Meets Expectations” phase – this was occurring all the way into the 2nd year. Some students still lacked the ability to have an understanding and to respect institutional differences, in terms of how some students would address a situation one way versus the other, and how to evaluate situations and institutions using multiple frames of leadership, and applying them appropriately.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That’s for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We’re starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master’s area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that’s why we’re retooling.

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Findings for Group Consultation Project

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 1.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 41%; Developing 59%; Does Not Meet 0%

With respect to Critical Reflection, it was developing and moving into the “Meets Expectations” phase – this was occurring all the way into the 2nd year. Some students still lacked the ability to have an understanding and to respect institutional differences, in terms of how some students would address a situation one way versus the other, and how to evaluate situations and institutions using multiple frames of leadership, and applying them appropriately.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That’s for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research
course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming into our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling.

### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

### Measure: Comprehensive Exams

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

### Findings for Comprehensive Exams

**Summary of Findings:** Measure One 1.3: Exceeds 18%; Meets 47%; Developing 35%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did well in Articulating a Philosophy; they met our expectations in this area. This was demonstrated particularly well in our Advanced Leadership course, in their last semester of coursework. They integrated the theories from our textbooks in the field, and they all talked about the attributes that they felt more confident and comfortable embracing when they are in certain leadership situations. One example would be “speaking out on social justice issues,” and another would be “becoming a savvy political negotiator.”

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That’s for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We’re starting to see this generation coming into our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master’s area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that’s why we’re retooling.

### Measure: Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.
**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure One 1.4: Exceeds 24%; Meets 52%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

In exercising leadership, half of the group/cohort really exceeded expectations in this category, and the other half – those skills were developing or they met those expectations by the end of coursework. Several students in this cohort ended up leaving their current posts at their institutions, and the other half seemed to enjoy promotions – their leadership requirements were expanded. It's like 50/50, and it could be that the half that just didn't do well, they figured out that they weren't really showing who they really were, so they gave
themselves the opportunity to re-tool.  

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We’re starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master’s area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that’s why we’re retooling

** Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 1.4: Exceeds 1%; Meets 52%; Developing 47%; Does Not Meet 0%

In exercising leadership, half of the group/cohort really exceeded expectations in this category, and the other half – those skills were developing or they met those expectations by the end of coursework. Several students in this cohort ended-up leaving their current posts at their institutions, and the other half seemed to enjoy promotions – their leadership requirements were expanded. It’s like 50/50, and it could be that the half that just didn’t do well, they figured out that they weren’t really showing who they really were, so they gave themselves the opportunity to re-tool.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That’s for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We’re starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master’s area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that’s why we’re retooling

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**
Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 2.1: Exceeds 24%; Meets 52%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

Constructing, supporting, and interpreting arguments – Students have developed the appropriate thought processes by the 2nd year, and students have met our expectations on this. Most of them can give you a pretty good elevator speech about higher education and the importance of higher education – the importance of colleges and universities and why we are structured and organized the way the public sees us. They can support and argue the appropriateness of the fiscal challenges and the fiscal requests that we make, and they can support and argue the role of the faculties within institutions – their roles and what we do for students, as well as communities and stakeholders (the benefits of having higher education in their backyards, and educated people to train the next generation).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes: We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members
Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 2.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 35%; Developing 65%; Does Not Meet 0%

Constructing, supporting, and interpreting arguments – Students have developed the appropriate thought processes by the 2nd year, and students have met our expectations on this. Most of them can give you a pretty good elevator speech about higher education and the importance of higher education – the importance of colleges and universities and why we are structured and organized the way the public sees us. They can support and argue the appropriateness of the fiscal challenges and the fiscal requests that we make, and they can support and argue the role of the faculties within institutions – their roles and what we do for students, as well as communities and stakeholders (the benefits of having higher education in their backyards, and educated people to train the next generation).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes: We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 2.2: Exceeds 24%; Meets 41%; Developing 35%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students meet the expectations of employing multiple frames – through organizational theory, higher educational theories, etc. according to the different types of institutions that they would walk into. They can walk in and out of those environments and know that those specific institutions are unique in their own way – a niche for everyone – in terms of who are students and who are employed.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes: We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading
that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project
**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 2.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 41%; Developing 59%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students meet the expectations of employing multiple frames – through organizational theory, higher educational theories, etc. according to the different types of institutions that they would walk into. They can walk in and out of those environments and know that those specific institutions are unique in their own way – a niche for everyone – in terms of who are students and who are employed.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 29%; Developing 71%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 29%; Developing 71%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.
Reflections/Notes: We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam
Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 2.4: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes: We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact
Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 2.4: Exceeds 0%; Meets 24%; Developing 76%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

**Reflections/Notes:** We’re finding that the students don’t tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don’t seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

---

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1:** Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure One 3.1: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Overall, students met expectations in this area and grew from the beginning of the program to the end of the program. They can communicate well with diverse groups, and the group really mastered Bolman & Deals frames in terms of communicating effectively with people in organizations. They’re on point with it; students know what to do here, as they have the right tools.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** One of the things we would like to see is to have our students more involved with conferences and presentations, and the ability to meet with other doctoral students and scholars in the field. The intent would be to allow them to see how much more
they need to learn, and how much more they are able to grow with interaction with others, in lifelong learning situations. They will become better scholars if they keep up with professional development.

**Reflections/Notes**: None at this time, except to say that students need to continue practicing. After two years, we don’t want students to slip into their old ways again (ways of thinking and comfort). It could be that maybe we need to think of a way we have a professional development program that brings them back. That could be a creative way of keeping them engaged – bring them back every two or three years, and have a professional development seminar.

**Measure**: Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description**: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target**: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s)**: All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings**: Measure Two 3.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 41%; Developing 59%; Does Not Meet 0%

Overall, students met expectations in this area and grew from the beginning of the program to the end of the program. They can communicate well with diverse groups, and the group really mastered Bolman & Deals frames in terms of communicating effectively with people in organizations. They’re on point with it; students know what to do here, as they have the right tools.

**Results**: Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations**: One of the things we would like to see is to have our students more involved with conferences and presentations, and the ability to meet with other doctoral students and scholars in the field. The intent would be to allow them to see how much more they need to learn, and how much more they are able to grow with interaction with others, in lifelong learning situations. They will become better scholars if they keep up with professional development.

**Reflections/Notes**: None at this time, except to say that students need to continue practicing. After two years, we don’t want students to slip into their old ways again (ways of thinking and comfort). It could be that maybe we need to think of a way we have a professional development program that brings them back. That could be a creative way of keeping them engaged – bring them back every two or three years, and have a professional development seminar.

**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

**Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education**

**Measure**: Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**
A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Findings for Comprehensive Exams

**Summary of Findings:** Measure One 4.1: Exceeds 29%; Meets 47%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students meet-to-exceed our expectations in understanding higher education. They came into our program with a blank slate, and didn’t really know the details of how our profession and institutions come together and perform their functions. By the time they get ready to leave, this knowledge is common knowledge to them.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we’re doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

**Reflections/Notes:** Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

---

**Measure:** Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

### Findings for Consultation Project

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 4.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 24%; Developing 76%; Does
Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 4.2: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Whether or not they can use this in program evaluation, we think that they can. We have several opportunities for students to audit their organization and evaluate their systems. They have an opportunity to do this for their institutions in their first year, and then again through a multicultural audit for diversity in their final year of the program. They meet our expectations and are able to perform organizational, cultural, or leadership gap analyses in order to serve effectively in that capacity.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations: Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we’re doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

Reflections/Notes: Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.
**Measure:** Group Consultation Project  
**Direct - Student Artifact**  

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

**Summary of Findings:** Measure Two 4.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 29%; Developing 71%; Does Not Meet 0%

Whether or not they can use this in program evaluation, we think that they can. We have several opportunities for students to audit their organization and evaluate their systems. They have an opportunity to do this for their institutions in their first year, and then again through a multicultural audit for diversity in their final year of the program. They meet our expectations and are able to perform organizational, cultural, or leadership gap analyses in order to serve effectively in that capacity.

**Results:** Target Achievement: Met

**Recommendations:** Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we’re doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

**Reflections/Notes:** Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

---

**Overall Recommendations**

Syllabi revisions, as well as further development of experiential learning in students for presentations and integration of coursework.

**Overall Reflection**

Great opportunities and reflection and conversation, based on this year’s assessment data. Good for program evaluation and coursework refinement.

---

**Action Plan**

**Actions**
PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrship Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

**Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.**
A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.
**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Action**: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel**: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures**: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations**: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority**: High

---

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Action**: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline)**: Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel**: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures**: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations**: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority**: High
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research
The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain
classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

### OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**

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.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

### OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**This Action is associated with the following Findings**

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.
Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings
No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.
**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular is the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**No Status Added**

---

**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular is the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

---

**No Status Added**
**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**
The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes. Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**

*No Status Added*

---

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection**
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes. Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**

*No Status Added*
Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**
*No Status Added*

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

**Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**
*No Status Added*

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments
The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum**
*No Status Added*
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames
The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

---

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research
The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton … for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan


Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

---

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.
Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**

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.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

---

**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

**Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.
administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Status Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs**
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

**Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

**Action Details:** We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Implementation Plan: Implement these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

**Key/Responsible Personnel:** Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

**Measures:** Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

**Resource Allocations:** Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

**Priority:** High

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Status Added</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Status Summary**

No text specified

**Summary of Next Steps**

No text specified
## PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

### OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

| Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge. | **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams  
Direct - Exam |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| **Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.  
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).  
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.  
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members |

| Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection | **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams  
Direct - Exam |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------------------|
| **Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.  
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).  
**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.  
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members |
**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Group Consultation Project</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> All faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy**

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Comprehensive Exams</th>
<th>Direct - Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation Plan (timeline):</strong> Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Responsible Individual(s):</strong> All faculty members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure: Group Consultation Project</th>
<th>Direct - Student Artifact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Details/Description:</strong> The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Target:</strong> The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average &quot;2&quot; or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments**

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies**

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members
**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames**

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research**

The ability to critically read and

**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members
Review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research
An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will
OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

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.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Measure: Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members
Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs
The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members
Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added
### Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection
The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

*No Findings Added*

### Measure: Group Consultation Project
**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

*No Findings Added*

### Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy
The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.
**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

No Findings Added

**Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership**

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

No Findings Added

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply...
what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

*No Findings Added*

---

### OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

#### Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

*No Findings Added*

---

**Measure:** Group Consultation Project

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.
Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of

**Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

No Findings Added
research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

---

**Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research**

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members
**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

*No Findings Added*

**Measure: Group Consultation Project**

Direct - Student Artifact

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Group Consultation Project**

*No Findings Added*

**OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency**

**Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills**

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.

**Measure: Comprehensive Exams**

Direct - Exam

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

*No Findings Added*
**OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency**

### Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

#### Measure: Comprehensive Exams

**Direct - Exam**

**Details/Description:** Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

**Findings for Comprehensive Exams**

No Findings Added

#### Measure: Consultation Project

**Direct - Student Artifact**

**Details/Description:** The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

**Target:** The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

**Implementation Plan (timeline):** Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

**Responsible Individual(s):** All faculty members

No Findings Added
Findings for Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added
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