

Student Learning Summary Form AY2016-17

Due to your dean by the college deadline

Due from dean to Assessment Office via Blackboard by Sept. 1

Degree Program Name: _____ **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** _____

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 One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this 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 results?</p>	<p>e. (1) Who was responsible for collecting and analyzing the results? (2) How were they shared with the program's faculty?</p>
<p>1. Outcome 1: Articulate a public service perspective to colleagues and the public</p> <p>Graduate ASL Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>(1) Students were evaluated based on their final research paper for PA 697 Research Seminar in Public Administration.</p> <p>(2) PA 697 is the capstone course for the program.</p>	<p>We would expect at least 80% of the students completing the project receive a B or better in regard to this outcome.</p>	<p>Approximately 92% of the 12 students (11/12) evaluated received a B or better for this outcome based on their capstone paper. One student received a score of 80 (B-). Other than that the lowest scores were 84 and 87. The highest score received was a 95 (Received by 3 students) The average score was 91.</p>	<p>(1) Data was collected by the two faculty members mentoring capstone projects, Stan Buchanan and Nathan Myers (also the only two full-time faculty members in the program).</p> <p>(2) Buchanan and Myers collaborated on the drafting of the report and discussed the results.</p>

<p>2. Outcome 4: Master an appropriate literature in public administration</p> <p>Graduate ASL Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>(1) Students were evaluated based on their final research paper for PA 697Research Seminar in Public Administration.</p> <p>(2) PA 697 is the capstone course for the program.</p>	<p>We would expect at least 80% of the students completing the project receive a B or better in regard to this outcome.</p>	<p>Approximately 83% of the 12 students evaluated (10/12) received a B or better for this outcome based on their capstone paper. One student received a score of 80 and other received a score of 82. The highest score received was 95, received by 3 students. The average score was 88.</p>	<p>(1) Data was collected by the two faculty members mentoring capstone projects, Stan Buchanan and Nathan Myers (also the only two full-time faculty members in the program).</p> <p>(2) Buchanan and Myers collaborated on the</p>
				<p>drafting of the report and discussed the results.</p>
<p>(3) Outcome 5: Think and act critically, in ways that bear on solutions to public problems</p> <p>Graduate ASL Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>(1) Students were evaluated based on their final research paper for PA 697Research Seminar in Public Administration.</p> <p>(2) PA 697 is the capstone course for the program.</p>	<p>We would expect at least 80% of the students completing the project receive a B or better in regard to this outcome.</p>	<p>Approximately 67% of the students evaluated (8/12) received a B or better for this outcome based on their capstone paper. The lower scores received included an 80, an 83, and two students receiving a score of 78 for this measure. The highest score received was a 95, which was earned by 3 students. The average score was 87.5</p>	<p>(1) Data was collected by the two faculty members mentoring capstone projects, Stan Buchanan and Nathan Myers (also the only two full-time faculty members in the program).</p> <p>(2) Buchanan and Myers collaborated on the drafting of the report and discussed the results.</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, 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”).
- 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 specific discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student 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.

Please save 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.

Part Two, cont’d.

Outcome 1: Articulating a Public Service Perspective

- (1) In regard to Outcome 1, students performed well when articulating a public service perspective in their papers. This involved expressing the importance of government taking action on an issue or the need for government to play a role in a particular area. Through their introductions and discussions of their results, most of which focused on a policy problem, the vast majority of students reviewed at least articulated why the issue they were investigating was relevant to government actors and how the information in the capstone paper could be relevant to government officials.
- (2) An effort is being made in PA 604 (Research Methods) to require students to explicitly articulate a public service perspective in their projects, and that will be carried into PA 602 in the fall.

Outcome 4: Mastering an Appropriate Literature

- (1) The results for Outcome 4 (mastering an appropriate literature in public administration), while still meeting the stated benchmark, were less satisfactory. There were two issues in regard to this outcome. One was a lack of sufficient use of academic literature generally (whether in public administration or not), while the other was a focus on academic literature outside of public administration (health care literature, for example). On the issue of lack of academic literature, students are required to write literature reviews referencing 10-12 peer-reviewed articles in PA 604 (Research Methods) and PA 602 (Statistical Analysis). In Directed Readings (PA 698), students are required to write longer literature reviews containing approximately 25 peer-reviewed sources (although this is an elective course). Students also are required to read peer-reviewed articles in several other PA courses. Therefore, students are not unfamiliar with peer-reviewed academic literature when they go into their capstone projects. However, from an anecdotal perspective, student still seem to undervalue the importance of past studies to their research and the idea of the literature review in general. They tend to focus on the data and the analysis. On the issue of not engaging with public administration literature specifically, while students are encouraged to pursue research in areas of interest to them and are encouraged to pursue certain healthrelated areas due to the data provided (County Health Rankings) more needs to be done to require students to consult administration and policy journals first.
- (2) An effort was made in PA 604 this past spring to emphasize the importance of the literature review and theory to shaping a research project. This will be carried over into PA 602. In the future, it may be worthwhile to require students to complete their literature reviews in stages (list of articles, outline, full literature review). This is done in PA 698 and might be useful for the other research courses as well. In PA 602, students will also be required to consult public administration and policy journals before any other material.

Outcome 5: Think and Act Critically

- (1) This outcome, which involved the collection, analysis, and interpretation of data, was one in which students did not meet the benchmark. One issue here is the data students choose to employ. Some students choose to pursue very narrow projects, such as just focusing on the county in which they live. This has serious

implications for data availability, which can result in limited and/or unsophisticated analysis. There was at least one student among the 12 evaluated that had a quite robust data set, but chose to employ lower level statistics (descriptive statistics, t-tests) as opposed to OLS regression, which certainly was an option. A couple of students had difficulty providing adequate interpretation of statistical results and one could not adequately articulate from where the data originated. Another project employed qualitative data and, while the data collected and the approach to content analysis were fine, the weakness in the research was that the project did not come together as a coherent whole. In other words it was not clear enough how she got from her initial research question to her results, and therefore it was difficult to evaluate what, if any, valuable information could be derived as a result. This project's issues were more a failure of process than of analysis.

- (2) This may be the most difficult area in which to remediate students' performance because of many students seemingly ingrained aversion to research methods/statistics. However, some to the curriculum have been made. In recent semesters, students have been provided with secondary data to use for class projects, thus allowing them to focus on the appropriate research process and conducting an appropriate analysis/interpretation, instead of collecting data. Also PA 604 was designed this past spring to make the final project more limited in scale, allowing for the class to spend more time on basic concepts and allow for a, hopefully, more gentle introduction to a research project. A couple of ideas planned for PA 602 in the fall include incorporating more information about the relationship between research methods and grant writing (in hopes of encouraging students to take the course more seriously) and getting students in the earlier research courses involved in other students' capstone research to allow for some degree of constructive feedback and collaboration which could benefit capstone students and those in other research courses.

Future Evaluation Plans

- (3) Next year we plan to evaluate Outcome 4 (Mastering an Appropriate Literature) and Outcome 5 (Thinking and Acting Critically) again to see if there has been any notable improvement. It would also be productive to evaluate Outcome 2 (Communicate in a Diverse Environment) if, in fact, we do institute mechanisms to allow students to provide feedback on the on-going research of other students in hopes of constructive collaboration and shared learning.

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

Degree Program: Master Of Public Admin Date: 01.19.18

	Level 0 – Undeveloped	Level 1 – Developing	Level 2 – Mature	Level 3 – Exemplary
1. Student Learning Outcomes	<input type="checkbox"/> No outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input type="checkbox"/> Some of the outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> A Curriculum Map was provided.	<input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are specific, measurable, student-centered, program-level outcomes. <input type="checkbox"/> Outcomes at least indirectly support Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes are important, specific, measurable, student-centered program-level outcomes that span multiple learning domains. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes directly integrate with Foundational Studies Learning Outcomes or the Graduate Learning Goals. <input 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 type="checkbox"/> The Curriculum Map identifies where/to what extent each outcome is

				<p>addressed and offers evidence that students have sufficient opportunity to master the associated learning outcomes.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Two or more outcomes were assessed in this cycle.</p>
<p>2. Measures & Performance Goals</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No measures are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> No goals for student performance are identified.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are provided, but some are vague and/or do not clearly assess the associated outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures are primarily indirect.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Performance goals are identified, but they are unclear or inappropriate.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, but there is no evidence that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is provided to suggest that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, and general information is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were provided.</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Detailed information is provided to show that measures are appropriate to the outcomes being assessed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Measures assess some high impact practices (internships, capstone course projects, undergraduate research, etc.)</p> <p><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.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some measures allow performance to be gauged over time, not just in a single course.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess</p>

				<p>more than one outcome, a clear explanation is offered to substantiate that this is appropriate.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Clear and appropriate standards for performance are identified and justified.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Mechanisms used to assess student performance (rubrics, checklists, exam keys, etc.) were summarized as well as provided to demonstrate that the measure provides specific evidence of what students know/can do.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> If performance goals are based on course and/or assignment grades, specific evidence is provided to demonstrate that grades are calibrated to the outcomes.</p>
<p>3. Results</p>	<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 and 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 type="checkbox"/> Students are achieving some of the performance</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Data are being collected and analyzed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Results are provided.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Some information is offered to demonstrate that data collection, analysis, and interpretation processes are valid and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Clear, specific, and complete details about data collection, analysis, and interpretation of results are provided to demonstrate the validity and usefulness of the assessment process.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Students generally are achieving the performance standards expected of them and demonstrate continuous</p>

		standards expected of them.	standards expected of them.	improvement on standards they have yet to achieve/achieve less well. <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.
4. Engagement & Improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> No one is assigned responsibility for assessing individual measures. <input type="checkbox"/> Assessment primarily is the responsibility of the program chair. <input type="checkbox"/> No improvements (planned or actual) are identified. <input type="checkbox"/> No reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input type="checkbox"/> The same faculty member is responsible for collecting and analyzing most/all assessment results. <input type="checkbox"/> It is not clear that results are shared with the faculty as a whole on a regular basis. <input type="checkbox"/> Plans for improvement are provided, but they are not specific and/or do not clearly connect to the results. <input type="checkbox"/> Little reflection is offered about previous results or plans.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. ?? <input type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input type="checkbox"/> Improvements in student learning have occurred as the result of assessment.	<input type="checkbox"/> All program faculty members are engaged in collecting and analyzing results. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Faculty regularly and specifically reflect on students' recent achievement of performance goals and implement plans to adjust activities, expectations, outcomes, etc. according to established timelines. <input checked="" 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.
Overall Rating	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 0 – Undeveloped	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 1 - Developing	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

Outcomes are clear, measurable and important. A single measure (the final research paper) is used to assess all three outcomes, and details are provided to indicate that this is appropriate. Performance expectations are high, but they still are based on grades. And thus I continue to encourage you to provide evidence that grading and assessment processes are linked, as via a rubric that identifies the specific kinds and levels of knowledge and skill you expect students to demonstrate. Two faculty members collect and analyze the results, though it is not clear that they are shared with the faculty as a whole. Yet Part Two shows that in-depth conversations about student learning are occurring and result in pertinent changes (e.g., requiring students to explicitly articulate a public service perspective, providing them with secondary data, etc.) and plans for improvement (e.g., requiring students to complete the literature review in stages).

Thank you!