

**Student Outcomes Assessment and Success Report AY2018-19** *Consult with your college dean's office regarding due date and how to submit. Deans will submit reports to the Office of Assessment & Accreditation annually by October 15.*

**Unit/Program Name:** Department of Educational Leadership **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Mary F. Howard-Hamilton; [mary.howard-hamilton@indstate.edu](mailto:mary.howard-hamilton@indstate.edu); Kandace Hinton; [Kandace.hinton@indstate.edu](mailto:Kandace.hinton@indstate.edu)

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

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this past year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, identify the Graduate Student Learning Outcome each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What assignments or activities did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome? (2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What were your expectations for student performance?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual data/results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. What changes or improvements were made or will be made in response to these assessment results or feedback from previous year's report? Can expand on this in Part 2.</b></p>
<p>1.1.2 Critical Reflection ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p>	<p>EDLR 755 – Seminar in Education Law Course readings and class discussions included consideration of the roles that sexism and racism play in current higher education legal issues such as sexual assault/harassment and campus hate speech. EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership allowed the students to interview a college president and assess her/his leadership lens. The culminating reflective project was a philosophy of leadership.</p>	<p>Students were expected to demonstrate both understanding of complex social-legal theory, and the ability to consider how the theory might inform higher education policy and their own practice within the constraints of law and policy. Students are expected to clearly articulate their leadership philosophy and understanding of the current higher education environment based upon leadership frames, leadership theories, governance, and current trends in the field.</p>	<p>Students' comments and questions during class discussions showed complex and nuanced reflection about the relationship between social inequities, the law, and higher education. Students were able to demonstrate sufficient knowledge and application of the social-legal concepts taught in class and applied to actual higher education scenarios.</p> <p>Students were able to connect the leadership theories and organizational concepts to the case scenario on the preliminary exam.</p> <p>Doctoral students completing the preliminary exams were successful overall with 98% passing the written and oral components. Students who were directed to resubmit the written exam were successful after the second attempt.</p>	<p>We will continue to infuse critical reflection about socio-political contexts and application.</p> <p>Give students more theory application projects in other courses.</p>

<p>2. 3.1 Leadership skills, professional development, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and higher education administrative environments.</p>	<p>EDLR 891 – Internship Students practice and harness their ability to observe, listen, shadow leaders in higher education administration as well as communicate with a mentor in academic affairs or higher education administration.</p>	<p>Students were expected to complete an EDLR internship experience, shadowing three higher education leaders, writing 10 journal reflections on their experiences and observations as well completing a final product. Students must work with campus professionals and a mentor who is an academic upper level administrative leader</p>	<p>All students were able to complete the internship experience and produce final portfolios reflecting on their leadership skills as well as those who were observed. Their internship mentor evaluations indicated an ability to synthesize their experiences in the journals and apply the Bolman and Deal as well as Kouzes and Posner’s leadership models to their observational experiences.</p> <p>Doctoral students completing the first question on the preliminary exam were successful overall with 98% passing the written and oral components. The first question on the preliminary exam was a case in which they were directed to use specific leadership skills to guide an institutional program. The content from the leadership courses translated to the case (theory to practice) on the exam. Students who were directed to resubmit the written exam were successful after the second attempt.</p>	<p>Final product submitted by the students as well as the mentor’s evaluations provided an analysis of the students’ growth over 16 weeks. Moreover this was an assessment that can be used to gauge professional growth based on a comparison in the first semester and at the end of the academic program.</p>
<p>3. 1.4 Exercise Leadership ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p>	<p>EDLR 752 – Organizational Theory and Leadership</p>	<p>Students completed a consultation project with an academic unit on campus. The students were the experts or leaders and worked with a selected administrative unit on campus to resolve or solve an issue or complete a project.</p>	<p>Students gained experience communicating, deliberating, and collaborating with a consultee or higher education leader as well as that individuals department to address a “problem” and create a solution and outcomes for that area.</p>	<p>We will continue to find projects that will allow the students to enhance their research, consultation, and presentation skills.</p>

			<p>Doctoral students completing the first question on the preliminary exam were successful overall with 98% passing the written and oral components. The first question on the preliminary exam was a case in which they were directed to use specific leadership skills to guide an institutional program. The content from the leadership courses translated to the case (theory to practice) on the exam. Students who were directed to resubmit the written exam were successful after the second attempt.</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.*

Helpful Hints for Completing this Table

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

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

Use [Blue Reports](#) to generate the following information (as well as any other information helpful to you):

- 1) Cohort Sizes - 85
- 2) 2) Year-to-Year Retention – 84.62%
- 3) 3) 5-Year Graduation Rate

**What worked well in supporting student success this year?**

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

The hiring of Dr. Jon Iftikar was critical because we needed a law scholar to teach in the summer. Additionally, as he becomes more comfortable with the curriculum we will invite him to teach another content course in the doctoral area. He will begin working with dissertations as a committee member next year.

We will continue to provide a thorough orientation program in the summer with the incoming cohort. This allows them to meet each other, bond as a cohort, meet the faculty, and become familiarized with the distance teaching platform.

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

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

### **Part 1c: Summary of Career Readiness Activities (OPTIONAL FOR GRADUATE PROGRAMS)**

Please submit your Career Readiness Competencies curriculum map along with this report as a separate attachment. The template was sent to you with this form via email.

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

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

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

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

The Higher Education Leadership Program underwent an internal and external review process. The faculty is in the process of creating and implementing a certificate in higher education leadership. Additionally, the students shared with the reviewers that there needs to be more social justice material in the classes. We are reviewing textbooks now to determine the best fit for this body of literature.

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

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

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

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

The information about the assessment process and the outcomes will be shared: (1) in an annual report at the end of each academic year (2) in the Educational Leadership Department newsletter that is sent to all alumni and current students and (3) with the Advisory Board that will be created in 2019-2020.

**Please prepare this report as a Word document.** Do not include any attachments. Instead, provide links to important supporting materials

*(e.g., detailed—but not student-specific--assessment results; rubrics; minutes; etc.), or upload them to the college's assessment site in Blackboard.*

Dear Mary and Kandace,

Thank you so much for sharing your assessment process and findings for AY 2018-19 with the Assessment Council. You will find feedback and ratings on the rubric below. It is understood that some of the feedback might encompass practices that you already engage in but were not documented in this report. As the purpose of this evaluation is focused on recognizing great work and helping faculty improve assessment practice, it is not necessary to retroactively add documentation. Please feel free to let me know if you have any questions or if there is any way I can assist you in further developing assessment 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)

<b>Program: Educational Leadership – Higher Education</b>	<b>Overall Rating: Mature (2.25/3.00)</b>
<b>Strengths</b>	<b>Recommendations</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Learning outcomes are clear, specific, and measureable.</li><li>• Courses during which assessments take place are clearly noted, and assignments are described.</li><li>• Concepts and skills students are expected to master are clearly described.</li><li>• Performance findings related to specific sections aligned with learning outcomes on preliminary exams are reported.</li><li>• Good information about expanding opportunities throughout the curriculum to support learning outcomes achievement.</li><li>• Excellent discussion of findings and improvements to the preliminary exam process.</li><li>• Great information provided about improving the assessment plan for future use and the extensive incorporation of faculty into the assessment process.</li><li>• Clear information provided about sharing findings.</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Provide information on alignment between program learning outcomes and related Graduate Student Learning Outcomes.</li><li>• The primary student performance data is related to the corresponding sections of the preliminary exam, which is great, but is missing detailed expectations of performance and actual performance on the assignments listed for assessment. The discussion of concepts and skills is excellent – additional information about specific expectations and how students are evaluated would add more clarity to the process (e.g., on the EDLR 850 philosophy of leadership assignment, 90% of students will achieve a 3 out of 4 on the rubric, indicating mastery of incorporation of relevant leadership concepts. 93% scored 3 or higher; or 20% scored 3 and 80% scored 4).</li><li>• Information about evaluation of student performance is helpful – if rubrics, checklists, etc. were used that can be noted, or they can be attached.</li></ul>

Evaluation Criteria	Exemplary	Mature	Developing	Undeveloped
<p><b>Student Learning Outcomes</b></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><b>Performance Goals &amp; Measures</b></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>

<b>Analysis &amp; Results</b>	<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.</p>
<b>Sharing &amp; Use of Results for Continuous Improvement</b>	<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>
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Exemplary	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Developing	<input type="checkbox"/> Undeveloped