

Degree Program Name: Higher Education Leadership Program _____ **Contact Name(s) and Email(s)** Kandace Hinton
Kandace.hinton@indstate.edu Before you complete the form below, review your outcomes library and curriculum map to ensure that they are accurate and up to date. If not, you may submit a new version along with this summary. Templates are available on the [assessment website](#).

Part One

<p>a. What learning outcomes did you assess this year?</p> <p>If this is a graduate program, indicate 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>1.1 Comprehensive Knowledge knowledge of different theories on leadership and management, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>1.1 Score of 4: 13 (76.47%) Score of 3: 4 (23.53%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a</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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.1 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>1.2 Critical Reflection ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3.5” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>1.2 Score of 4: 13 (76.47%) Score of 3: 4 (23.53%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is where we would expect</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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this final point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.2 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>1.3 Articulate a Philosophy ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</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 “3.5” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>1.3 Score of 4: 11 (64.7%) Score of 3: 6 (35.3%) 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. This is where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a</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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>comparison to summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>1.3 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>1.4 Exercise Leadership ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting, in a manner that evidences reflective leadership proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students recognize and act on professional and ethical challenges that arise in their field or discipline. and Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3.5 to 4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation .</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>1.4 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% 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</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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>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: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>2.1 Construct and Support Interpretations and Arguments ability to apply knowledge, comprehension, and application, in analyzing, synthesizing, and evaluating persuasive information and claims regarding application of research.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions, and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3.5 to 4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>2.1 Score of 4: 14 (82.35%) Score of 3: 3 (17.65%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% 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</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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>summative expectations, at this formative point in their coursework experience.</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>2.1 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>2.2 Employ Multiple Perspectives and Theoretical Frames 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>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students engage in and meaningfully contribute to diverse and complex communities and professional environments.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>2.2 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>Comprehensive Exams</p> <p>2.2 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%)</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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>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>2.3 Critically Read and Review Research 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.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession. and Students achieve mastery of the skills (including using appropriate tools) required in their discipline or profession</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>2.3 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, below the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome. This is where we would expect PhD students to be, in terms of a comparison to summative expectations, at this formative 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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>2.3 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>2.4 An Understanding of Research 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: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions, and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “3.5 to 4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>2.4 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%)</p> <p>100% 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>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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>2.4 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>3.1 Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to function effectively in academic and professional situations, including written and oral communication, listening to and working collegially with diverse groups, and facilitating intra- and inter-group relations, in a manner that evidences communication proficiency.</p> <p>Aligned with Graduate Student Learning Outcome: Students demonstrate professional communication proficiencies.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>3.1 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) 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. 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>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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>3.1 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>4.1 Understanding of K-12 or Higher Education 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>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>4.1 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) 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. 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>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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			<p>4.1 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) 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>4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs 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: Students achieve mastery of the knowledge required in their discipline or profession.</p>	<p>Lessons Learned Project in EDLR 850 – Advanced Leadership</p> <p>Preliminary/Comprehensive Exams at the End of Coursework.</p>	<p>We established a performance expectation that 80% of our students would average at least a “3” (meets expectations) on a four-point scale (1= Needs Improvement, 2= Developing, 3= Meets Expectations, and 4=Exceeds Expectations) in order for achievement of this outcome.</p>	<p><i>Predictions and Reflections on Data:</i></p> <p>Our expectations established for achievement of these outcome was a “4” average across most learning outcomes in the Comprehensive Exams, as they are more a summative snapshot, and a 3 to 3.5 for the Lessons Learned Project, as this was more a cumulative capstone summation.</p> <p>Lessons Learned Project</p> <p>4.2 Score of 4: 15 (88.24%) Score of 3: 2 (11.76%) 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. 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, August 17, 2017.</p>

			4.2 Score of 4: 16 (94.1%) Score of 3: 1 (5.9%) Score of 2: 0 (0%) Score of 1: 0 (0%) 100% of candidates scored a 3 or higher on this assessment, above the threshold amount established for achievement of this outcome.	
<p>Direct measures of program assessment are included in this end-of-year submission for 2016-2017, as we have the developed and implemented them formally. We are particularly pleased the direct 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.

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: Engagement and Improvement

In no more than one page, summarize 1) the discoveries assessment has enabled you to make about student learning (a. What specifically do students know and do well—and less well? b. What evidence can you provide that learning is improving?) 2) the changes you have made or will make in response to these discoveries and/or the coordinator’s feedback; and 3) what your assessment plan will focus on in the coming year.

Please provide this report to your dean 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.

(1) How has this year’s assessment and assessment processes told us about student learning? Assessment results revealed to us that as times, that we now have a sense of where students are in terms of their learning, and there is a better assessment of their growth near the end of their coursework transitioning into the preliminary written and oral exams. After grading candidates the first year of coursework in the spring, fall, and in their internships, assessment has shown us that they have learned to apply some traditional theories. The students in the final semester of coursework have grown immeasurably. We have seen that with Lessons Learned project, applying theory to practice, with the writing of their leadership philosophies and multiple theories to demonstrate what they value. The doctoral students had an opportunity to interview a college president as well as delve into the leadership theories in the final semester. Our higher education program has a sound curriculum which is one of the three propositions for doctoral programs to prepare university leadership, specifically (1) theory to practice (2) consistency and flexibility and (3) assessment and accountability of student learning (Freeman, Hagedorn, Goodchild, & Wright, 2014). Certainly, they did an exceptional job dissecting cases, applying theory, and gleaning information from germinal academic leaders in the field. The Lessons Learned exercise prepared them for the written and oral preliminary exams. Overall, our higher education curriculum is “synergistic, working in tandem with practical applications in higher education doctoral curricula” (Freeman & Kochan, 2014, p. 152) and with our national standards (i.e. The Council for the Advancement of Standards in Higher Education) as well as the national propositions (Freeman, Hagedorn, Goodchild, & Wright, 2014) to get students ready and settled emotionally for preliminary exams, write the dissertation, and be prepared to move into upper levels of academic administrative leadership positions in various college and university settings. 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. Academic year 2016-2017 we have offered a qualitative research course for the first time. Students who were interested in writing qualitative dissertation enrolled in this course and we have seen improved methodology chapters from these students. Other students have the option of enrolling in a 2nd level statistics course which strengthens their methodology chapter for the dissertation. To date, none of the students have completed their final dissertations but several have defended proposals. This AY 2017-18, we anticipate completion of several dissertations using qualitative research methods learned from the course. We also rearranged the sequencing of two core courses, EDLR 763, College Student Development and EDLR 760, Resource Management. Students shared, and we agreed, that the 763 course would be a good follow up to the EDLR 806 course they completed during the summer term and the 760 course was a great companion course for EDLR 850, Advanced Leadership in Higher Education, which is offered the final semester of course work.

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. Therefore, because the majority of faculty in the SAHE and HEL Programs are adjunct, we are working on constant and consistent evaluation and feedback so that student learning will not diminish. However, we are finding that because of the lack of continuity within the ranks of adjunct faculty many gaps are discovered in student learning and satisfaction.

What about our Assessment Plan, itself? Our assessment plan is working, as proven by the higher outcome scores in the assessment rubric for 2016-2017. Our ability to be nimble in adjusting core courses based on student feedback and the changing higher education environment.

(2) Changes – As noted previously, we have changed the sequencing of our courses so that there is a seamless theory to practice and research transition. The students have stated that we should emphasize the social justice framework of our program and there is new material that shares our philosophy with interested applicants. We are changing the website to articulate our ongoing vision for the social justice curriculum that has been in place for several years. Additionally, we have used the Hoosier First grant to meet prospective applicants at key institutions like Ivy Tech, Vincennes University, IUPUI, and IPFW to share the overview of our program, present our teaching approach, describe the content taught in class, and highlight the alumni career accomplishments. The past two years we have created an optional study abroad component to visit higher education institutions in South Africa which overlaps with the social justice philosophy (e.g. apartheid institutions, Mandela’s leadership philosophy, and post-apartheid systems development in higher education). It is our hope that we can continue this 2-3 week summer experiential travel component and eventually build it into the course structure. Moreover, according to Wright and Freeman (2014, p. 249) “Global competition is an issue. To remain globally competitive, higher education administration preparation programs will need to demonstrate outcomes that illustrate high levels of capability on the part of their graduates, who should be able to successfully anticipate, plan, and implement change.”

(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 2017-2018, 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).

References

Freeman, S., Hagedorn, L.S., Goodchild, L.F., & Wright, D.A., (2014). *Advancing higher education as a field of study: In quest of doctoral degree guidelines, commemorating 120 years of excellence*. Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Freeman, S., & Kochan, F., (2014). Toward a theoretical framework for the doctorate in higher education administration. In S. Freeman, L.S. Hagedorn, L.F. Goodchild, & D.A. Wright (Eds.), *Advancing higher education as a field of study: In quest of doctoral degree guidelines, commemorating 120 years of excellence* (pp. 145-168). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

Wright, D.A., & Freeman, S. (2014). The future of higher education administration preparation program guidelines and their implementation. In S. Freeman, L.S. Hagedorn, L.F. Goodchild, & D.A. Wright (Eds.), *Advancing higher education as a field of study: In quest of doctoral degree guidelines, commemorating 120 years of excellence* (pp. 145-168). Sterling, VA: Stylus.

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

Degree Program: Higher Education Leadership Program Date: 10.27.2017

	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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Outcomes were identified. <input checked="" 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 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 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 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

				<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 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 type="checkbox"/> At least one direct measure was provided for each outcome.</p> <p><input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Multiple measures were employed, and most are direct. <i>No Indirect.</i></p> <p><input 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 type="checkbox"/> If a measure is used to assess more than one outcome, a clear explanation</p>

				<p>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 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 and meaningful.</p> <p><input checked="" 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 and usefulness 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</p>

		standards expected of them.		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. <i>Could be all?</i> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results regularly are shared with the faculty. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> The faculty regularly engages in meaningful discussions about the results of assessment. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> These discussions lead to the development of specific, relevant plans for improvement. <input checked="" 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 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level 1 – Developing <i>Right on the cusp of mature!</i>	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 2 – Mature	<input type="checkbox"/> Level 3 – Exemplary

COMMENTS

The rubric preceding these comments identifies the specific criteria I used to assess your report, but I will make a few observations about it. I still would like to see your outcomes written as traditional outcomes statements that use specific verbs to clarify what learning domain you are assessing (e.g., Students will explain the difference between key leadership and management theories; articulate an integrated philosophy; relate theory to practice; and so on). Outcomes like 2.1 and 3.1 combine several activities, which must make it difficult for you to design assessment measures that get at the heart of what you expect students to know and do (and a single rubric that can assess all of these skills). This year’s plan relied on three assessment measures (the Lessons Learned project and two exams), and students met performance goals set for all eleven outcomes. But no information is provided about the Lessons Learned project to demonstrate that it is aligned with the outcomes it is intended to assess. What does this project entail?

It appears to me that students met the standards set for each outcome/measure, though in the “predictions and reflections” section of outcome 2.3, you indicate that students did not meet the threshold established for the Lessons Learned project (100% earned a 3 or 4) ?? Also, I noted that you award scores on a four-point scale even to exams. Does that mean you key the questions to the outcomes? If so, good for you!

Your discussion in Part Two should be tied to your program’s outcomes. Thus, when you note that by their final semester, students have grown, you should link this to a particular outcomes(s), as well as offering some evidence to prove it. (Perhaps the positive impact of the new qualitative research course on students’ methodology chapters is an illustration of this growth?) You go on to identify some of students’ particular strengths (dissecting cases, applying theory, gleaning information from leaders in the field), which I really appreciate. On the other hand, what are their specific weaknesses? You mention “gaps” in student learning and satisfaction. What are these, and how will you address them in the future? You also identify several positive changes that you have made, from re-sequencing courses to creating a summer study abroad experience that supports the social justice component of the program. Given the staffing constraints you are facing, this is particularly impressive!

As you know, we are gearing up for the Higher Learning Commission reaffirmation process. Thus, it is particularly important for us to be able to provide evidence that we are systematically assessing our curricular and co-curricular programs; using the information we derive from that process to develop actionable plans for improvement in student learning; and documenting the improvements that result. Thank you for completing your Student Learning Summary Report!