

Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2017-18

Completed reports due from the dean to the Assessment Office via Blackboard by October 15. Deans, assessment coordinators, and/or department chairs set their own internal deadlines for material review and request for refinement if not suitably addressing questions.

Unit/Program Name: Higher Education Leadership Program

Contact Name(s) and Email(s) Kandace Hinton kandace.hinton@indstate.edu

Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part 1a: Summary of Assessment Activities

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</p>	<p>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</p>	<p>d. What were the actual data/results?</p>	<p>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report?</p>
<p>1.1 knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the Knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3=Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project 1.1 Score of 4: 10 (83.33%) Score of 3: 2 (16.67%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative</p>	<p>We gave students more time to complete. In addition, the professor who was one of the writers of the exam offered several review sessions to assist students with preparation.</p>

			<p>point in their coursework experience. Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.1 Score of 4: 12 (100%) Score of 3: 0 (0%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	
<p>2. 1.2 Critical Reflection ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3=Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and reflections on Data:</i> Our expectations established for achievement of this outcome was a “3.5” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>1.2 Score of 4: 11 (91.67%) Score of 3: 1 (.083%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. _ This is where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this final point in their coursework experience. Comprehensive Exams</p>	<p>We provide ample challenge and support through all of the students’ courses to make sure they are critically applying theory to practice. This skill set should be evident on their comprehensive exams.</p>

<p>3. 1.3 Articulate a Philosophy ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p>Predictions and reflections on Data: Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3.5” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation. Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>1.3 Score of 4: 10 (83.3%) Score of 3: 2 (16.6%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience. Comprehensive Exams 1.3 Score of 4: 11 (91.7%) Score of 3: 1 (.083%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	
---	--	---	---	--

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

Notes

- a. Use your outcomes library as a reference.
- b. Each outcome must be assessed by at least one direct measure (project, practica, exam, performance, etc.). If students are required to pass an examination to practice in the field, this exam must be included as one of the measures. At least one of the program’s outcomes must use an indirect measure (exit interview, focus group, survey, etc.). Use your curriculum map to correlate outcomes to courses.

- c. Identify the score or rating required to demonstrate proficiency (e.g., Students must attain a score of “3” to be deemed proficient; at least 80% of students in the program will attain this benchmark.”
- d. Note what the aggregate level of proficiency actually was and the number of students included in the cohort or sample (e.g., “85% of the 25 students whose portfolios were reviewed met the established benchmark”).

Part 1b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?); 2) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year; and 3) how will this information be shared with other stakeholders?

1. We discovered that students learn more by making the connections between theory and practice.
 - a. Students work well collaboratively on consultation projects that link theory to practice. Adversely, as with most groups, finding the best synergistic response to the work at hand for everyone in the group often becomes a point of contention.
 - b. The quality of completed consultation projects are becoming more useful to their clients.
2. Our assessment plan for the coming year will focus on closing the feedback loop between students and faculty to continue curriculum improvement.
3. This information will be shared with the Dean’s office, prospective students, external reviewers, and alumni of the program.

Part 2a: Summary of Student Success Activities

Based on the results of your assessment of student learning outcomes from Part 1 above, reflect on how this data will impact student success within your unit/program.

a. What goals/objectives were established this past year to aid student performance, retention, persistence, and completion?	b. What primary action steps were taken to make progress on each goal and who was responsible?	c. What data informs progress on each goal?	d. What were some accomplishments or achievements for each goal and/or challenges confronted?	e. Please indicate goals that are continuing and any goals that will replace a previous goal. Any additional goals can also be added on a new line.
1. Provide dissertation support to students who have completed coursework.	Offered group-writing sessions with faculty present to give immediate feedback.	Increase in dissertation completion rates.		
2. Provide substantive guidance for preliminary exams.	Offered exam review sessions during class time while in final semester of coursework.	Fewer students needing to rewrite portions of the exam.		
3. Improve online course experience	Upgraded to Collaborate Ultra	Faculty and students’ feedback on old platforms		

Notes

- a. These goals could be program/department wide but may also be focused on specific sub-populations of interest (e.g., service course student performance, transfer students, part-time students, students of a particular class year, students of color, etc.).
- c. Retention and completion data, D/F/drop rates, credit hour productivity (defined as credit hour enrollment at start of term versus credit hours earned at end of term) are common data examples. See [Blue Reports](#) database (access from Linda Ferguson in Institutional Research) or the [Office of Institutional Research](#) for ideas.

Part 2b: Continuous Quality Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries that attention to student performance, retention, persistence, and completion has enabled you to make about program/department systems, processes, and norms as it effects students; and 2) how this will positively impact student success, including with regard to the readiness of students for graduate study or a career?

1. We have found that the additional preparation work through review of materials for students' preliminary exams has proffered better and more complete exams. Furthermore, fewer students have to remediate the exam or portions of it once orals are completed.
2. Successfully completing the preliminary exam moves students closer to completing their dissertations and ultimately the Ph.D.

Dear Kandace,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2017-18 with the Assessment and Student Success Councils. You will find a comprehensive synthesis of the feedback compiled by both groups below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but that are not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment in your program.

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

Sincerely,

Kelley (x7975)

Program: PhD Higher Education Leadership	
Assessment Practice Overall Rating: Mature (2.00/3.00)	
Student Success Practice Overall Rating (notes below in blue): Undeveloped (0.75/3.00)	
Strengths	Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Clear learning outcomes paired with the appropriate CGPS outcomes.• Specific measures applied at specific times during the curriculum with clear expectations for student performance.• Good choice and explanation of major, summative projects for understanding student learning toward the end of the program.• Clear and comprehensive information on sharing results.• Clear and comprehensive information on sharing results.• Good, actionable strategies.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In your findings – it looks like the comprehensive exam scores are missing for the second outcome assessed, and for some of the scores you refer to them as being “below” the established threshold where I think it is meant to say “above.”• It may just be the outcomes that were assessed this cycle, but when possible consider varying the courses and/or assignments used to take data points for student learning to ensure that their progress is understood at various points throughout the curriculum.• It would be helpful to add a note or attach a copy of the rubrics used to score the Lessons Learned project and the comprehensive exams, along with a description of how the rubrics were tested or validated if more than one rater was used.• It seems that both measures (Lessons Learned and Comps) were used to measure three different outcomes. If the rubrics used for evaluation were analytical in design by outcome, you could report student scores on just the sections corresponding to each outcome to have a clearer picture of performance by outcome. This could be more helpful with your goal of closing the loop by helping to identify specific areas for follow-up, especially when your students are already performing at a high level.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• In describing what was learned from findings and what action to take be clear how you came to those conclusions. Was the consultation project mentioned part of Lessons Learned? Was teaching adjusted to include more theory to practice that led to these strong performances by students?• It's understandable that this plan is undeveloped at this time, as no data collection has taken place at this point. A few areas for improvement with the plan as is:• Where you have listed goals, it would be helpful to indicate the overall goal in mind. These are written as strategies for an underlying goal, such as closing the ABD-to-graduation gap, pass rates and ensuing persistence related to the preliminary exam, and learning and/or persistence related to distance learning.• Note which faculty are responsible for the action steps listed (just the program chair, or affiliated or administrative faculty as well?).
--	--

Assessment Scoring Rubric is included below. Student Success Scoring Rubric is included on the last page for reference only. Score was calculated on a 0 (undeveloped), 1 (developing), 2 (mature), 3 (exemplary) scale.

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p>Student Learning Outcomes</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) directly link to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcome(s) is specific, measurable, and student-centered.</p> <p>Rationale for assessment of this outcome(s) is made clear (ex: it is part of a standing assessment cycle, a need was identified, etc.)</p>	<p>At least one learning outcome that is aligned with program coursework is assessed this cycle.</p> <p>Learning outcomes(s) is measurable.</p>	<p>No learning outcomes are identified for assessment or the outcomes that are identified are not linked to program outcomes aligned with program coursework (e.g. – curriculum map) or are not measurable.</p>
<p>Performance Goals & Measures</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools used to measure student performance are described and were reviewed for validity or trustworthiness prior to use (note this in the report; attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal identified for each learning outcome is clear and reasonable (ex: based on previous performance data, professional standards, etc.).</p> <p>Identified measures are designed to accurately reflect student learning, including at least one direct measure.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are described (attach tools if applicable – ex: rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.).</p>	<p>Performance goal(s) is identified for each learning outcome.</p> <p>Identified measures (ex: assignments, projects, tests, etc.) are poorly suited to performance goals or are solely indirect measures.</p> <p>Tools or processes for evaluating student performance on measures are not described.</p>	<p>No goals for student performance of learning outcomes is identified, and/or no measures are provided.</p>

Analysis & Results	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of quality analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p> <p>Results are discussed in relation to college, institutional, and/or accreditor goals/standards.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with clear description of analysis (e.g., analysis follows accepted statistical or qualitative procedures).</p> <p>Results are shared in relation to performance goals.</p>	<p>Data is collected using the measures and tools identified.</p> <p>Results are reported with little description of analysis.</p>	<p>No data is being collected.</p> <p>No results are provided. (in terms of what is missing from the table)</p>
Sharing & Use of Results for Continuous Improvement	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>A plan for adjusting performance, goals, assessment, and/or program components based on results is outlined.</p>	<p>Clear information is provided about sharing and using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Discussion of what was learned from results is provided and connected to plans for sharing and using results to inform practice.</p>	<p>Limited information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>Some discussion of what was learned from results is provided.</p>	<p>No information is provided about sharing or using results to inform practice.</p> <p>No evidence of reflection on results is provided (ex: discussion, conclusions drawn)</p>
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped

Student Success Activities Report Rubric (Part 2 of Student Outcomes Assessment Report)

Office of Student Success/Office of Assessment & Accreditation Evaluation Date:

Evaluation Criteria	0 Undeveloped	1 Developing	2 Mature	3 Exemplary
Goals/ Objectives	No goals/objectives are identified.	Goals/objectives are poorly suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives may also be modest at best such that little effort is required.	Goals/objectives are generally clear and reasonably well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also generally at least moderately aggressive such that appropriate effort is required.	Goals/objectives are all clear and well suited to addressing student performance, retention, persistence, and/or completion. Goals/objectives are also at least moderately aggressive in all cases such that appropriate effort is required.
Action Steps	No action steps are identified.	Action steps are weak, underdeveloped, and/or poorly suited to making progress on goals/objectives. No person(s) or group(s) indicated who will be responsible for the actions.	Action steps are generally clear and reasonably well suited to making progress on goals/objectives. Person(s) or group(s) responsible for the actions are indicated in most cases.	Action steps are all clear and well suited to making progress on goals/objectives Person(s) or group(s) responsible for each action are indicated, ideally with a timeline.
Data that Informs Progress on Each Goal/Objective	No data, quantitative or qualitative, is identified.	Data to inform progress are poorly suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are generally well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.	Data to inform progress are all well suited to measure progress on goals/objectives.
Assessment of Outcomes and Continuous Improvement	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, no reflection provided on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. No reflection on outcome assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, modest at best reflection provided (and/or is vague or of questionable connection to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Modest at best reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, generally appropriate reflection provided (and is reasonably well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Reasonable reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.	For goals/objectives in place the prior year, strong reflection is provided in all cases (and is well connected to results) on achievements/challenges, sharing results, and/or plans for improvement or change based on results. Well-developed reflection on assessment plan for continuous improvement provided for new goals/objectives.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary