

**Student Learning Summary Form AY2015-16**

**Due to your dean by June 1**

**Due from dean to assessment office by June 15**

**Degree Program Name:** Ph.D. Higher Educational Leadership **Contact Name and Email** \_ Mary Howard-Hamilton, Program Director, and Ryan Donlan, Assessment Coordinator

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.

**Part One**

<p><b>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</b></p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate the <a href="#">Graduate Student Learning Outcome*</a> each outcome aligns with.</p>	<p><b>b. (1) What method(s) did you use to determine how well your students attained the outcome?</b></p> <p><b>(2) In what course or other required experience did the assessment occur?</b></p>	<p><b>c. What expectations did you establish for achievement of the outcome?</b></p>	<p><b>d. What were the actual results?</b></p>	<p><b>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</b></p>
<p><b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b></p> <p>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>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</b></i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>With respect to our expectations regarding student performance, we enrolled a group of students who had very good depth and breadth of higher educational administration. The bulk had been employed for at least 5 years at a minimum, so it was a matter of putting language to some of the things (theory/skillset) that they had already been doing. The expectation would be that they</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results                  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>could complete the tasks and offer to their client, real solutions to their problems, real advice.</p> <p>In general, Cohort 17 we thought that we would obtain 3's, and some not meeting.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>1.1 Score of 4: 3 (18%) Score of 3: 6 (35%) Score of 2: 8 (47%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>53% 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 point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.1 Score of 4: 8 (47%) Score of 3: 9 (53%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b> 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>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>With respect to our expectations regarding student performance, we felt that classroom pedagogy and instructional delivery would be a key factor, because students would need to demonstrate that they learned new skillsets in doing historical research. We felt that we had good instruction in terms of getting them where they needed to be, to have the outcome they would produce.</p> <p>One particular group had a difficult time moving from the lens that they came in with to a more global lens that we were teaching. Some of the students couldn't move beyond a very</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>rigid “You’re wrong/I’m right” perspective about social justice and diversity. It had to do with not being able to balance the emotional and affective side of diversity issues with the intellectual component. Some students knew racism and oppression was an issue, once they could put a name to what they were seeing, feeling, and hearing, they couldn’t get beyond their anger –We were hoping to put a name to it, allow for the emotions, then to work and do something about it.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>1.2 Score of 4: 3 (18%) Score of 3: 8 (47%) Score of 2: 6 (35%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>65% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is slightly above where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.2 Score of 4: 8 (47%) Score of 3: 9 (53%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

			<p><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b> 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>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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 “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>With respect to our expectations regarding student performance on group consultation projects . . . because they are practitioners and working professionals, their abilities to reflect on ethical moments they had and how they managed an ethical dilemma, and doing this in terms of the consulting project in a group setting, we forecasted that there might be some ethical dilemmas in construction the project. For example, the lavender graduation</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>--- that in and of itself could cause an ethical dilemma in how to do it well, how do we tell our consultees to put together our lavender graduation without offending people. So the work that they did in terms of being practitioners and working professionals, we thought, would transition into how they completed the project.</p> <p>In terms of comprehensive exams, I'd give them a 3 on that. Some could/some couldn't, and I think that the students found a leadership theory model or concept that they could really grab on to, however, the key thing in this is that they weren't able to massage it and make it connect with who they were and their values. They couldn't think outside the box.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>1.3  Score of 4: 3 (18%)  Score of 3: 7 (41%)  Score of 2: 7 (41%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>59% 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.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.3  Score of 4: 10 (59%)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>Score of 3: 7 (41%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b>  ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  <b>Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline.</b>  <b>and</b>  <b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate</b></p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>It was the typical storming, norming, forming, and performing, because they did learn how to collaborate with</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

<p>tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>			<p>people who had different techniques and methods of gathering data and actually time management skills to come up with a project. There are some people who didn't do as much, and others are task-masters – different leadership styles. That's what we wanted to happen, as that happens on most group consultation projects. They operated in Bolman and Deal's frames, and Kouses &amp; Posner's leadership style.</p> <p>On comprehensive exams, 80% we felt would do well in leadership. There are a couple candidates who we didn't think will do well, because some don't even have jobs. They didn't do well with their cohort. If you can't communicate with the cohort, you have got to wonder how they would communicate with colleagues in the field.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>1.4  Score of 4: 5 (30%)  Score of 3: 8 (47%)  Score of 2: 4 (23%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>77% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is above where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

			<p>1.4  Score of 4: 6 (35%)  Score of 3: 11 (65%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b>  ability to apply knowledge, comprehension, and application, in analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating persuasive information and claims regarding application of research.</p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions, and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>We thought they would have done a good job, and they did a good job interpreting the data</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

<p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  <b>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</b></p>			<p>from focus groups and from their individual interviews in the group consultation project. Some of the information wasn't favorable to anyone – to the institution, to the organization, it didn't show segments of the university and community in a positive way. However, during their presentation, they were able to package this information appropriately so as to teach the recipient regarding the issue they were trying to address.</p> <p>On comprehensive exams, some did very well, and very compassionate, strong listeners, willing to work with people where they are in their development and to challenge them to think outside the box. Some students knew exactly how to manage conversations in a way that wouldn't interrupt into something volatile.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>2.1  Score of 4: 4 (23%)  Score of 3: 8 (47%)  Score of 2: 5 (30%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>70% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is above where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

			<p>2.1  Score of 4: 7 (41%)  Score of 3: 10 (59%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson’s responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b> facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>In terms of how we thought they might do here, they came from different backgrounds, leadership styles, and personalities – and</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

<p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  <b>Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</b></p>			<p>were using Bolman &amp; Deal, Kouses &amp; Posner, etc. and had to actually put these into action in internships as well. They understood the four frames and recognized folks who were more political etc., symbolic, and in some ways they challenged the system in a way politically, there needed to be a new policy or practice created in order to effectively move their recommendations forward.</p> <p>On the comprehensive exams, they applied a number of different theories. However, some have a heavy reliance on one perspective. They may love Bolman and Deal, for example, and they did not move beyond that model. We tried to encourage them to be very adept and conversant and understand at least three to four different models. Most of them latched onto one concept and just rolled with that.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>2.2  Score of 4: 5 (30%)  Score of 3: 6 (35%)  Score of 2: 6 (35%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>65% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is slightly above where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p>	
---	--	--	---	--

			<p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>2.2</p> <p>Score of 4: 5 (29%)  Score of 3: 12 (71%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson’s responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b>  ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic</p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

<p>inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  <b>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</b>  and  <b>Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</b></p>			<p>On the consultation project – They had to provide the consultee with an annotated bibliography of literature that deals with the particular issue they were working on. It allowed them to go into our higher education journal and find best practice.</p> <p>On the comprehensive examinations, we didn’t know what to forecast in terms of performance in this outcome, as they called Mark Frederick and imploded at the beginning of writing it. A gaggle of three or four struggled, but in the end, we found that they produced well.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>2.3  Score of 4: 3 (18%)  Score of 3: 6 (35%)  Score of 2: 8 (47%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>53% 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 point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>2.3  Score of 4: 4 (24%)  Score of 3: 13 (76%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson’s responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>2.4 An Understanding of Research</b>  understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome:  <b>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</b></p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions, and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>We did not feel that this group had a grasp of research during the Group Consultation Project – They did a full-out historical research paper. The first semester, we get their feet wet. They read the literature on research in the field, and they are just starting how to read a data</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>set. In the 752 class, they went out and captured data from National Center for Educational Statistics and they had to learn HOW to read a large dataset. Then, they had to mine that data set.</p> <p>Time would tell the story, as we thought performance would increase on the comprehensive exams.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>2.4 Score of 4: 3 (18%) Score of 3: 4 (24%) Score of 2: 10 (58%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>42% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is about where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>2.4 Score of 4: 5 (29%) Score of 3: 12 (71%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson’s responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b> 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, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</b></p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>This particular group did pretty well in terms of cross-cultural communication. About 1/3 of our group was racially diverse – 50/50 split in gender. They have done very well in communicating across gender, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation – a very good job very respectful toward each other.</p> <p>We forecasted on the comprehensive exams that 80% would do well in leadership. There were a couple that we didn’t think would do well, because some didn’t even have jobs. They didn’t do well with</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>their cohort. If you can't communicate with the cohort, you have got to wonder how they would communicate with colleagues in the field.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>3.1 Score of 4: 4 (24%) Score of 3: 10 (58%) Score of 2: 3 (18%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>82% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is above where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>3.1 Score of 4: 7 (41%) Score of 3: 10 (59%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			<p>individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p><b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education</b> theoretical understanding of K-12 education or higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>In terms of our estimated of performance, we kept in mind that they were learning. The theoretical application process had not yet begun. That would begin to happen the semester following.</p> <p>In a summative sense, we felt they were good. They loved the field. They love higher education and higher educational administration – well, 80% of them anyway. They were very understanding of the structure and the policies and politics of higher ed. They are more comfortable after leaving this program – leading a unit, given they have the vocabulary and skillset to sit down and be a good administrator.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results  Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>4.1 Score of 4: 8 (47%) Score of 3: 7 (41%) Score of 2: 2 (12%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>88% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is above where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>4.1 Score of 4: 9 (53%) Score of 3: 8 (47%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

			need of growth and reinforcement.	
<p><b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b> ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: <b>Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</b></p>	<p>Group Consultation Project in EDLR 752 – Organization and Governance</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><b><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></b></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 2.5 to 3 for the Group Consultation Project, as this was more a formative snapshot.</p> <p>We thought they would do a good job this year, because this was the 2<sup>nd</sup> semester internship, in which they did a deeper consultation and did a program evaluation and a recommendation.</p> <p>They’re not going to be exceptional, but they are going to be ok.</p> <p>Group Consultation Project</p> <p>4.2 Score of 4: 2 (12%) Score of 3: 7 (41%) Score of 2: 8 (47%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>53% 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.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p>	<p>Collecting Results: Mary Howard-Hamilton and Kandace Hinton – Tabulating the Results Ryan Donlan – Analyzing the Results, Mary Howard-Hamilton, Kandace Hinton, and Ryan Donlan. The results were shared with faculty in a Program Meeting, May 11, 2016.</p>

			<p>4.2  Score of 4: 4 (24%)  Score of 3: 13 (76%)  Score of 2: 0 (0%)  Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.</p> <p><b><i>Interpretations and Further Thoughts</i></b></p> <p>For students, the expectation is that they would score a 3 across all Standard Elements measured, which by its very nature would allow for some performance to be below that standard on this individual outcome if it were above the expectation on others. Given these results, please understand that it is the Dissertation Chairperson's responsibility to assume the ownership of building candidate skills (post-prelims) that are in need of growth and reinforcement.</p>	
<p>Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).</p>				

\* See <https://www2.indstate.edu/graduate/forms/review.pdf>.

*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, practice, 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 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).
- e. This may be a specific individual, a position (e.g., assessment coordinator), or a group such as the department assessment committee. Minutes should reflect that results are shared with members of the department at least annually.

## Part Two

**In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about your students’ learning, the curriculum, departmental processes, and/or the assessment plan itself; 2) the changes and improvements you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback on the previous summary; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.**

*If you would like to reference any supporting materials (departmental meeting minutes, detailed assessment results, etc.), please provide the URL at which they can be found.*

*Narrative in the following section, in answer to the questions above, is gleaned from department review of assessment results, which include informal, indirect feedback from candidates in our program and stakeholders in the field, as well as faculty program meeting reflections and conversations:*

(1) How has this year’s assessment and assessment processes told us about student learning? Assessment results revealed to us that as times, it is hard to get a sense of where students are in terms of their learning, but it behooves us to study the details closely. After grading candidates this past spring, fall, and in their internships, assessment has shown us that they have learned to apply some traditional theories. The students who are getting ready to graduate, we see that they have grown immeasurably. We have seen that with their interview projects, applying theory to practice, with the writing of their leadership philosophies and multiple theories to demonstrate what they value. They were much more creative than those in previous years. Certainly, they did a great job dissecting cases and getting ready for prelim exams. Overall, we are beginning to find a rhythm to get students ready and settled emotionally for preliminary exams. They don’t seem to be as nervous as the group the year prior. Students were not as anxious to get questions about prelims answered this year, as they had in years past. Students’ interpersonal characteristics, at times, served as barriers to their learning. This group was prepared.

What has assessment and assessment processes allowed us to learn about curriculum? In the higher education Ph.D., based on the feedback we get from students and our assessment results over this past year, everything is sequenced just right. We always ask the question, “Is something missing?” We have adjusted recently. This is the first year we have offered qualitative research or a 2<sup>nd</sup> level statistics course quantitatively. We will see the results of this, this coming year, as some students begin to write their dissertation.

What have we learned about departmental processes through assessment and the assessment processes? With faculty stretched thin between the Higher Ed PhD and Student Affairs Program (SAHE), in losing two tenure/tenure track positions in the last year, we have felt that this has adversely

impacted the time and attention that we would like to give to classroom planning, curriculum work, and assessment. That said, we are mindful that student learning cannot occur without a continued focus on departmental processes and systems that support them, so we make effort to put a keen eye on everything that we are doing. Using all resources available to put faculty in the SAHE program is what needs to be prioritized at this point, so that we can pay more attention to the process that support student learning – including of course assessment, in the PhD in higher education program.

What about our Assessment Plan, itself? It has been a solid plan over the last three years, and we find it meaningful and helpful. It has a solid formative component and a solid summative component, and shares learning outcomes with the K-12 PhD program, which is helpful in department-wide discussions of PhD success.

(2) Changes – We have toyed around with a possibility of offering a course on community colleges. We do not know where we would put it or what we would take out. We have adjusted most of our classes, to have a social justice context to them. Candidate feedback shows our students asking us why we do not promote the fact that we have a social justice higher education program, as this is the paradigm through which we teach our courses. One of the things we would like to try to implement is as follows: We would like to have students at the end of each academic year sit down and write – for first-year and second-year doctoral students and for first and second-year master’s students – “What were your key learning take-away’s from this past year? What was significant in your learning processes for this past year?” Then, we would have those papers and data available at the end of each year. The same with faculty during the retreat at the end of the year – writing about the key teaching take away’s. Hopefully, we are experimenting with new things and doing new things – starting this fall.

(3) We believe that our Assessment System is a good one, and for the coming year, we plan on keeping the same system in place, yet we may study whether or not the formative assessment is appropriately assigned, as it is at present. Indirect measures of program assessment will be included in the end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the need to develop and implement them formally. We are particularly pleased that indirect measures will be a focus in the future (and that we are allowed this time and space to formalize them).

## APPENDIX 2

### PhD Master Assessment Rubric

Student's Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Please evaluate and score your student's ability on each of the following outcomes, as they pertain to Doctoral Prelims:

	<b>Exceeds Expectations (4), Meets Expectations (3), Developing (2), and Does Not Meet Expectations (1)</b>
<b>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
<b>1.2 Critical Reflection</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays 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.
<b>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
<b>1.4 Exercise Leadership</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.
<b>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and research proficiencies.
<b>2.4 An</b>	Displays understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, in a manner that evidences analytic inquiry and

<b>Understanding of Research</b>  <b>Score:</b>	research proficiencies.
<b>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays 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, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.
<b>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays theoretical understanding of K-12 education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice.
<b>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs</b>  <b>Score:</b>	Displays ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within K-12 education, in a manner that evidences field content area proficiency.

**Student Learning Summary Report Rubric :: Office of Assessment & Accreditation :: Indiana State University**

Degree Program: PhD Educational Administration/Higher Education Leadership    Date: 7.20.2016

	<b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<b>Level 1 – Developing</b>	<b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>
<b>1. Student Learning Outcomes</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes are identified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> An Outcomes Library was provided.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific and measurable.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are student-centered.  <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, and student-centered.  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed.  <input type="checkbox"/> At least one outcome was assessed in this cycle.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes listed in the Outcomes Library are specific, measurable, student-centered, and span multiple learning domains.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes reflect the most important results of program completion (as established by an accreditor or other professional organization).  <input type="checkbox"/> Learning outcomes are consistent across different modes of delivery (face-to-face and online.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are regularly reviewed (and revised, if necessary) by the faculty and other stakeholders.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.

				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.
<b>2. Measures &amp; Performance Goals</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.  <input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are not specific.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to indicate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.	<input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were provided, and a majority are direct.  <input type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures include course and/or assignment grades, and specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.  <input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.  <input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, this was included as a measure.  <input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some <a href="#">high impact practices</a> (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)  <input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.  <input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms (rubrics, checklists, criterion-referenced exams, etc.) were provided to demonstrate that the measure provides clear evidence of what

				<p>students know/can do. <b>The rubric does not identify the specific traits assessed.</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate how this is effective.</p>
<b>3. Results</b>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No information is provided about the data collection process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students are meeting few of the performance standards set for them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being collected.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some data are being analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Insufficient information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If students are required to pass a certification or licensure exam to practice in the field, the pass rate meets the established benchmark.</p>
<b>4. Engagement &amp; Improvement</b>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they do not clearly connect to the results or are too</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance standards and implement plans to adjust activities, performance goals, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines.</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	vague to implement.  <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	development of specific, relevant plans for improvement.  <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> Faculty and other important stakeholders reflect on the history and impact of previous plans, actions, and results, and participate in the development of recommendations for improvement.  <input type="checkbox"/> Continuous improvement in student learning occurs as the result of assessment.  <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes and results are easily accessible to stakeholders on/from the program website.  <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Assessment is integrated with teaching and learning.
<b>Overall Rating</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 0 – Undeveloped</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 1 – Developing (right on the border of Mature)</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 2 – Mature</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Level 3 – Exemplary</b>

## COMMENTS

### Strengths, Concerns, Recommendations for Improvement

In future reports, I would appreciate your including only the information needed to address the criteria in the Student Learning Summary Report form or its rubric. Provide links instead of attachments or direct me to necessary supplemental information in a Blackboard site.

#### 1. Learning Outcomes

Several of the outcomes are not written as outcomes (1.1. 3.1. 4.1.) but they easily could be; 2.4 uses the verb “understand,” which does not clearly describe how you expect them to demonstrate the related ability. Please revise for next year’s report. Your curriculum map shows that most outcomes are sufficiently addressed. Given the results of the group project, can identify any gaps in the coverage of outcomes most pertinent to it?

#### 2. Measures & Performance Goals

Two performance measures are used to assess all eleven outcomes, and no information is provided about the Group Consultation Project to establish that it is aligned with these outcomes. The same performance expectations and rubric (?) are listed for both activities. I am curious about whether the expectations really are appropriate for the group project, given that students generally do not meet them. (I appreciate aspirational goals, truly, but have you considered setting an appropriate goal for students at this point in their education?) Also, while the rubric is aligned with the outcomes, it does not identify the specific traits you expect to see at each level. Consequently, I wonder if you are gathering specific enough information about what students know/can do and don’t know/can’t do that can be used to improve their learning and/or those of a future cohort, as well as justifying the scores awarded.

#### 3. Results

The results on the comprehensive exam exceed the standard set, but those for the group project meet it on only two of eleven outcomes. I am confused by comments that suggest this level of performance is appropriate? I find your detailed reflection pertinent and interesting (and honest), but I would appreciate your eliminating the duplication in subsequent reports. Are this year’s results comparable to previous years’? What changes are you seeing?

#### 4. Engagement & Improvement

The report indicates that there is broad faculty involvement in collecting, analyzing, and reflecting on assessment data and practices. But I do not see evidence that learning is improving or that there are specific plans to address weaknesses, particularly as they pertain to the group project. You note that the dissertation chairperson is responsible for building candidate’s skills. Have you developed an action item related to this?

Thanks for sharing this information about your assessment program. I look forward to learning more next year!