

Program Outcomes Assessment

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed)

**Created on: 12/08/2009 07:36:00 AM CDT
Last Modified: 11/24/2015 04:20:15 PM CDT**



Table of Contents

General Information	1
Standing Requirements	2
Mission Statement.....	2
Outcomes Library.....	2
Curriculum Map.....	3
Communication of Outcomes.....	3
Archive	5
Archive.....	5
2010-2011 Assessment Cycle	6
Assessment Plan.....	6
Assessment Findings.....	8
2011-2012 Assessment Cycle	12
Assessment Plan.....	12
Assessment Findings.....	22
Action Plan.....	37
Status Report.....	37
2012-2013 Assessment Cycle	39
Assessment Plan.....	39
Assessment Findings.....	45
Action Plan.....	64
Status Report.....	75
2013-2014 Assessment Cycle	85
Assessment Plan.....	85
Assessment Findings.....	91
Action Plan.....	110
Status Report.....	121
2014-2015 Assessment Cycle	128
Assessment Plan.....	128
Assessment Findings.....	135

Action Plan.....	150
Status Report.....	156
2015-2016 Assessment Cycle	163
Assessment Plan.....	163
Assessment Findings.....	170
Action Plan.....	179
Status Report.....	179
2016-2017 Assessment Cycle	180
Assessment Plan.....	180
Assessment Findings.....	180
2017-2018 Assessment Cycle	181
Assessment Plan.....	181
Assessment Findings.....	181
2018-2019 Assessment Cycle	182
Assessment Plan.....	182
Assessment Findings.....	182
2019-2020 Assessment Cycle	183
Assessment Plan.....	183
Assessment Findings.....	183
Appendix	184

General Information (Program Outcomes Assessment)

Standing Requirements

Mission Statement

OUR MISSION: Our singular mission is to prepare today's practicing and promising educator to be tomorrow's complete administrative professional.

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION: The 72 course hour Ph.D. program in Higher Education Leadership is designed to prepare students for positions of leadership in two and four year collegiate institutions. Following a scholar/practitioner philosophy, the program stresses knowledge, skills, and attitudes necessary for leading institutions of higher education in the twenty-first century. It is designed primarily for professionals currently working in higher educational settings who desire a quality educational experience that allows them to continue meeting family and work responsibilities.

Graduates of the program are prepared for administrative leadership positions at public or private, four-year colleges and universities, community colleges, technical schools, and for-profit post-secondary institutions.

Outcomes Library

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome	Mapping
Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge. A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.	No Mapping
Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.	No Mapping
Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.	No Mapping
Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.	No Mapping

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome	Mapping
Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments	No Mapping



The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames No Mapping

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research No Mapping

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research No Mapping

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome	Mapping
---------	---------

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills	No Mapping
--	------------

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.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome	Mapping
---------	---------

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education	No Mapping
--	------------


A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs	No Mapping
--	------------

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Curriculum Map

Active Curriculum Maps

-  **PhD in Higher Education Leadership** (See appendix)
Alignment Set: PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set
Created: 01/03/2012 2:59:46 pm CDT
Last Modified: 01/03/2012 3:21:44 pm CDT

Communication of Outcomes

We plan to present our student outcomes in the following venues: 1) our website, 2) during a summer gathering of stakeholders (to include faculty, alumni, and current students), course syllabi, and 3) to new students each fall through the handbooks we provide for internships. These discussions center on outcomes in line with program Standards where applicable, along with the Unit's Conceptual

Framework.



Archive (This area is to be used for archiving pre-TaskStream assessment data and for current documents.)

 **Archive**

2010-2011 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on

No measures specified

historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

No measures specified

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

No measures specified

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

No measures specified

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

No measures specified

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

No measures specified

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

No measures specified

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

No measures specified

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.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

No measures specified

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

No measures specified

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Measure: Alumni Survey Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Preliminary Exam Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

No measures specified

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

No measures specified

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

No measures specified

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

No measures specified

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

No measures specified

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

No measures specified

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

No measures specified

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

No measures specified

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.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

No measures specified

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

No measures specified

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

2011-2012 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Cohort GPA averages
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: APSY 612 & 712 combined; EDLR 761

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Cohort GPA averages
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: APSY 612 & 712 combined; EDLR 761

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 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.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years
Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing
Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:
Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

Summary of Findings: summative remarks

Recommendations : Add course component

Reflections/Notes :

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Course revision

(Action Plan; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

and organizational structures,
policies, and practices.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey

Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years
Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Cohort GPA averages
Direct - Portfolio

Details/Description: APSY 612 & 712 combined; EDLR 761

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Cohort GPA averages

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:
Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually
Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research

▼ **Measure:** Cohort GPA averages
Direct - Portfolio

paradigms.

Details/Description: APSY 612 & 712 combined; EDLR 761

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Cohort GPA averages

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 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.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1:
Understanding of Higher
Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Crafting a Dissertation
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Crafting of a dissertation proposal & defense of final product.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Ongoing

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Crafting a Dissertation

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Cultural Competency Assessment
Direct - Exam

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Cultural Competency Assessment

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Leadership Philosophy Integrative Paper

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Measure:** Alumni Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every three years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Alumni Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Preliminary Exam
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Written and oral

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Comprehensive Preliminary Exam

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Employer Survey
Indirect - Survey

Details/Description:

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Every 3 years

Responsible Individual(s):

Findings for Employer Survey

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Student Exit Interviews
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: Student exit interviews following successful defense of preliminary exams.

Target:

Implementation Plan (timeline): Annually

Responsible Individual(s): Course Instructor

Findings for Student Exit Interviews

No Findings Added

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

Action Plan

Actions

Action Plan

Outcome

Action Plan *No actions specified*

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Course revision

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Alumni Survey

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2011-2012 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: summative remarks

Action Details:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Status Report

Action Statuses

Action Plan

Outcome

Action Plan *No actions specified*

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Action:** Course revision

Action Details:

Implementation Plan (timeline):

Key/Responsible Personnel:

Measures:

Resource Allocations:

Priority:

Status for Course revision

No Status Added

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2012-2013 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply

what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization

problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

◆ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure: Group Consultation Project**
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative

consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

- 📎 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)
- 📎 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year


students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback). This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average “2” or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below


standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of "exceeds" expectations, summatively).


Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: It might be that faculty should allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select

not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 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.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program's duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Communications Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program's duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Communications Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply

what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Consultation Project


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams


Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation
(Action Plan; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.


Results: Target Achievement: Exceeded

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency.

These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: At this point, students are performing at an exceedingly high level. Faculty are reflecting upon whether a lack of variance here gives pause for the consideration of other assessments that will serve to allow for diagnose of growth areas, yet are mindful that incredibly high levels of achievement are demonstrated by these students prior to program enrollment. This area deserves further reflection, as faculty are involved in program teaching and planning.

Substantiating Evidence:

 Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Overall Recommendations

Continue with recently changed format of prelims, and keep the existing format of the group consultation project. Although straightforward in approach without a turn of the dial, this will give the variable of the new comprehensive examination format to settle-in and maintain programmatic treatment as faculty member on sabbatical returns and consideration for adjunct instructors in given in targeted areas.

Overall Reflection

Primarily reflection concerns the fact that students are evaluated as exceeding expectations in all areas -- yes, they most certainly enter the program with credentials deserving merit, but an evaluation measure which results in their exceeding in all areas at all states of the program may need to be refined in order to identify the areas in which they do command growth and improvement. Faculty will consider these issues after results from the coming year to determine if fine-tuning of action planning is needed.

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences

that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students'

philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Our 2nd year students are the most prepared and articulate, as it relates to leadership critical reflection and philosophy. The first year students bring good experience, yet they do not yet have language to connect to these experiences. They have, however, had experiences that have begun the building process for their content knowledge. First-year students' philosophies are being clarified, and they exercise good leadership.

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Action:** Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: All of our courses and course assignments are geared toward students having to demonstrate that they can understand and interpret the course material – lots of applicable theory-into-practice. Ties to current professional responsibilities or demands of the profession are ever-present. Students are prepared for class assignments, and they have demonstrated that a high percent of them are prepared to meet the demands of measurable outcomes 2.1 – 2.4, based on the measures available. Those who turn-in assignments that fall below standards are given the opportunity to demonstrate increased performance, and even mastery, through rewrites in consultation with program faculty (this may have resulted in the preponderance of “exceeds” expectations, summatively).

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 3.1: Communication, Interpersonal and Process Skills

Communication, interpersonal, and process skills necessary to

▼ Action: Communications Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

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.

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program's duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing well with their communication ability, and they get progressively better during the program's duration. This is enhanced by the demand that students present both in writing and orally for each assignment that they are required to complete. The use of analytical skills (data collection, findings, implication, and reporting such) are inherent, which have served as building-block opportunities. Courses are also discussion-based, so multiple opportunities (in-person/discussion board) for student participation are allowed – monitored with feedback from faculty – which serve to allow student voice and reflection. Faculty also have used one-page summaries to recap and extend what students have communicated.

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally well with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon

arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Findings for Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Action Details: Action Details: Over the course of this next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education’s fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2012-2013 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows: Students are doing exceptionally with respect to their understanding of higher education and their abilities to plan and evaluation policies and program. Students bring high-level abilities with them upon enrollment – multiple years of leadership experience upon arrival. Students are, thus, able to grapple with the issues – making them both personal and professional in direct connection with the work they do outside of the classroom. Student effectively articulate both a micro- and macro-perspective in these outcome areas.

Action Details: Action Details: Over the course of this next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and

continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement

Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Action:** Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Continued mindful effort.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: NOTE: COMPUTER HAS PLACED THIS UNDER OBJECTIVE TWO. THIS ACTION HAS BEEN DETAILED UNDER OBJECTIVE ONE. IT CAN BE DELETED FROM THIS SECTION BY THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR. Action Details: Faculty plan to coordinate program-wide improvements based on this year's assessment results (as per reflection above). Based on the exit assessments after completion of coursework and comprehensive exams – Faculty believe the program is meeting the needs of students (assessment plus candidate feedback) and students are exceeding in their tasks. This is true as well, with respect to the Internship, but further discussion of how this aspect of the program can be enhanced will take place.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Action Item Title: Reflective Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Action:** Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly “in progress.”

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty plan, over the course of the next academic year, to allow students to select their own groups for group projects. At this point, faculty have made the decision to create resource and product interdependence, themselves, yet they believe that student could not only exercise the autonomy to create groups, but also to send out an rfp to select not only the project, but also the client – of course, with approval of program faculty.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Action: Communications Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Faculty will allow more democratic opportunities for student autonomy in both the selection of assignments, as well as the presentation medium of each assignment. They feel that this autonomy will allow students to capitalize on their strengths of communication efficacy, thus building their growth areas as their capabilities allow.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Communications Action Plan

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Action: Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

Action Details: Action Details: Over the course of this next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Action:** Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

Action Details: Action Details: Over the course of this next academic year, faculty will continue with the recent changes in prelim format – allowing for a take-home examination and continuation of the two-part process (part related to a research question – which includes building a research project/aligned to their dissertation if desired). Both qualitative and quantitative methodologies are inherent in this assessment. Faculty also will continue their expectation of candidates to articulate to political or governmental figures the financial implications, as well as higher education's fiduciary responsibility and maintenance of the societal good. If students cannot demonstrate this adequately, they must rewrite those portions of the assessment until they can demonstrate proficiency. These modifications and enhancements of prelims will continue over the next academic year. No modifications of the Group Consultation Project are needed at this time.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.


Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Supporting Attachments:

 Meeting Minutes (Word Document (Open XML)) (See appendix)

Status for Action Item Title: Field Content Proficiency Examination Continuation

Current Status: In Progress

Resource Allocation(s) Status: Continued discussion is taking place among faculty, with student and graduate assistant input, regarding the Ph.D. program, including internal faculty reflection regarding curricular quality, teaching practices, and the Internship. This status report is certainly "in progress."

Next Steps/Additional Information: Ongoing mindful effort.

Status Summary

Program faculty are working hard to continually reflect and re-evaluate their curriculum, instruction, and field experiences on behalf of program quality and student learning.

Summary of Next Steps

Continued mindful efforts.

2013-2014 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply

what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization

problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

◆ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 1.1: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%


This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

Substantiating Evidence:

 PhD Higher Ed Data 2013-2014 (Excel Workbook (Open XML)) (See appendix)

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 1.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 80%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.2: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 90%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.3: Exceeds 30%; Meets 70%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 1.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as

follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.4: Exceeds 10%; Meets 80%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continuation of the deeper sense of "What is a cohort" will be reinforced by faculty over the course of the next year.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: It might be a good idea to continue with more cohort gatherings, such as dinners, opportunities for collaboration earlier in the semester, phone calls and campus visits with them beyond the first year, and similar activities. The synthesized assessment is notably more positive than individual student numbers indicate through analytical measurement. Could this reflect the power of the cohort in making the sum of the experience even greater than what the individual persons bring to it?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.1: Exceeds 30%; Meets 50%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 2.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 70%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort

model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 30%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 60%; Developing 40%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 - No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 2.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then

synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 20%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the

faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

In order to help with 2.4, a research question was added to prelims, which has helped students to better articulate this knowledge.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the "sum" of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.4: Exceeds 0%; Meets 0%; Developing 100%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Continue with the approach brought by this past year's professor. Consider a 15-week qualitative research.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: We now have a nice balance of quantitative and qualitative dissertations, borne of the attentiveness and balanced instructional focus of the instruction. All of the students passed 612 and 712 – No need for retakes. Interesting that the “sum” of the synthesized observational perspective seems greater than the assessed parts (students per outcome), taken analytically. Could this be a result of the power of the cohort model?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

**Outcome 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.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 3.1: Exceeds 80%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Keep infusing diversity throughout the curriculum and also to make sure that we have diverse faculty and to model what we want our students to be like in the classroom – modeling the type of person we would like to see them become.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: Written and oral communication – They were a group that were very much performing at the A level – a “B” was an unusual circumstances.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Communications Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 3.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 70%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: Keep infusing diversity throughout the curriculum and also to make sure that we have diverse faculty and to model what we want our students to be like in the classroom – modeling the type of person we would like to see them become.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: Written and oral communication – They were a group that were very much performing at the A level – a "B" was an unusual circumstances.

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Communications Action Plan
(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1:
Understanding of Higher
Education**

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 4.1: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to they key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ Measure: Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 4.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 10%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to their key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite

number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 4.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to they key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 3 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = meets expectations; 3 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): Dr. Ryan Donlan

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 4.2: Exceeds 10%; Meets 20%; Developing 70%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher

education, including “finance.” These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be “governance,” very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Recommendations: For the coming year – With respect to 4.2 Plan and Evaluate Policies and Program – We would need to have more cases prepared for them, particularly in the last semester, in which they can apply more theory to practice. Law is one of those classes in which they do not yet have enough opportunities to take the law and apply it to higher education policies as much as faculty would like them to do so.

Reflections/Notes : Reflections/Notes: Students know enough bullet points so that they are not dangerous; rather they are very helpful. Our preliminary examination gives students the opportunity to put, succinctly, every course into a case. They need to go to they key sources – precise and to-the-point in 20 pages. Why is law important? Why is history important? Why is governance important?

These Findings are associated with the following Actions:

Practical Application Cases

(Action Plan; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Overall Recommendations

Continue striving for diversity in the program and maintain responsiveness in meeting the needs of students. Maintain a balance of quantitative and qualitative approaches to programmatic review, and further examine the effects of the cohort experience on the perspectives of both students and faculty. Connect with stakeholders to gauge perceptions of our programmatic quality, yet keep the focus on measurable student achievement.

Overall Reflection

Faculty formative and summative discussions on programmatic quality, services to students, and what the data are telling us have been found very valuable under the framework set-up this past year. Continue the conversations and mindfulness in looking at ourselves. Diversity has been a key component in our services and success.

Action Plan

Actions

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 1.1: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 1.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 80%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 1.2: Exceeds 60%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 1.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 90%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 1.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 1.3: Exceeds 30%; Meets 70%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 1.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 10%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 1.4: Exceeds 10%; Meets 80%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular preliminary examination group was outstanding. They absorbed just about everything we presented to them. This particular cohort was comprised of 10 students. Eight of the ten successfully completed the oral and written prelims. Students were exceptional in terms of every single aspect of higher education, from statistics to law and philosophy. We may see 10 out of 10 completing the dissertation in a timely fashion.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 2.1: Exceeds 30%; Meets 50%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 2.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 70%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams
Measure One 2.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 30%; Developing 30%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project
Measure Two 2.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 60%; Developing 40%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 2.3: Exceeds 20%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 20%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies

throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 2.4: Exceeds 20%; Meets 60%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 20%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

In order to help with 2.4, a research question was added to prelims, which has helped students to better articulate this knowledge.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 2.4: Exceeds 0%; Meets 0%; Developing 100%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students display superior abilities to construct and support interpretations and arguments. Over this past year, the professor teaching the course made the greatest difference in the world. The professor for this particular cohort had them so well prepared that all of them had a dissertation topic, a rough draft of their three chapters, and each cohort weekend, the faculty of higher education was invited in to listen to their dissertation plans and offered feedback. That made a world of difference, as this bolstered their confidence in speaking with authority about their topic and presenting their ideas in front of a group.

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Action: Communications Action Plan

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 3.1: Exceeds 80%; Meets 20%; Developing 0%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 3.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 70%; Developing 20%; Does Not Meet 0%

Superior. We believe that the small cohort, uniquely diverse, has an impact on this outcome. This was a cohort rich with diversity that has allowed the white male to gain a deepened appreciation of his privilege. In and out of class, they communicate well and agree to disagree. They mentioned to faculty that this has helped them on campus when they needed to handle political situations.

Action Details: Action Details: Infusion of diversity in the classroom and faculty modeling.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Action: Practical Application Cases

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 4.1: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Findings for Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 4.1: Exceeds 10%; Meets 10%; Developing 80%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Action Details: Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Action: Practical Application Cases

This Action is associated with the following Findings

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure One: Comprehensive Exams

Measure One 4.2: Exceeds 40%; Meets 50%; Developing 10%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Findings for Group Consultation Project

(Assessment Plan and Assessment Findings; 2013-2014 Assessment Cycle)

Summary of Findings: Summary of Findings: Faculty summarized the following findings through an analytical approach that first considered each measure separately, then synthesized under outcome to coalesce under objective. This process resulted in a finite number of tangible action steps from which to move the program forward. Findings are as follows:

Measure Two: Group Consultation Project

Measure Two 4.2: Exceeds 10%; Meets 20%; Developing 70%; Does Not Meet 0%

This particular group definitely has an elevator speech prepared for every area of higher education, including "finance." These students can articulate the importance of the dollar amounts for higher education in America within 60 to 90 seconds. They are really articulate in their understanding of key issues, as they are on the firing line (life in a fishbowl), in which we need to be clear and articulate on why we love this profession and why we need support from all of our constituents. The other elevator speech that they would really be able to be clear about – with their own colleagues – would be "governance," very clearly. As higher education administrators, they are able to take a very clear stance on why there should be shared governance, the importance of tenure – articulating why we need adjuncts, yet not a whole lot of adjuncts.

Action Details: Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

📄 Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

▼ **Action:** Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

Action Details: Action Details: A concerted effort to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the next year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Leadership Proficiency Improvement Plan to maximize collaborative opportunities over the course of the academic year. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned

benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan**

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Action: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Deepened immersion of students into formulation of dissertation topics, ongoing involvement of faculty, and critical feedback.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully completed their work in the Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies Action Plan for a deepened immersion of students in terms of dissertation topics, with critical feedback and close involvement of faculty. Program is successful in meeting planned benchmarks of success. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Action: Communications Action Plan

Action Details: Action Details: Infusion of diversity in the classroom and faculty modeling.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2014 – 2015 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Communications Action Plan

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have infused diversity in the classroom via faculty modeling; in fact, we believe that we serve as a model for the University in this regard. We look forward to continued review of data and fashioning of plans for the next academic year.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ **Action:** Practical Application Cases

Action Details: Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Practical Application Cases

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully provided more opportunities for students to apply the law in various contexts through their coursework and practicum experiences.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Action:** Practical Application Cases

Action Details: Action Details: More opportunities to apply the law in myriad contexts for the coming year.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2013 – 2014 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education

Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: Medium

Status for Practical Application Cases

Current Status: Completed

Resource Allocation(s) Status: As Planned

Next Steps/Additional Information: Program faculty are satisfied that they have successfully provided more opportunities for students to apply the law in various contexts through their coursework and practicum experiences.

Status Summary

Successful in completing action plans in all areas.

Summary of Next Steps

Continued reflection and assessment with the help and assistance of Dr. Ryan Donlan

2014-2015 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The faculty to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will

include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues,

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available

for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 1.1: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did not do as well in prelims as in year's past. About 1/3 of the cohort really struggled with our comprehensive exam. The good news is that having an oral prelims in addition to the written really helped, in that those who struggled in one venue or the other were allowed to play to their strengths, particularly when it came to successful prompting from faculty in the room. We had several students who had to rewrite sections of the prelims or an entire question. What that did for program faculty – It said that perhaps we need to look at our classroom feedback and teaching strategies, because when you have an entire cohort that's struggling, you ask "What happened during the course of the two years in which they were matriculating?" not "What is wrong with the students." Student success on the Group Consultation Project was better than on the Comprehensive Exams.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

▼ **Measure: Group Consultation Project**
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 1.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 52%; Developing 48%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did not do as well in prelims as in year's past. About 1/3 of the cohort really struggled with our comprehensive exam. The good news is that having an oral prelims in addition to the written really helped, in that those who struggled in one venue or the other were allowed to play to their strengths, particularly when it came to successful prompting from faculty in the room. We had several students who had to rewrite sections of the prelims or an entire question. What that did for program faculty – It said that perhaps we need to look at our classroom feedback and teaching strategies, because when you have an entire cohort that's struggling, you ask "What happened during the course of the two years in which they were matriculating?" not "What is wrong with the students." Student success on the Group Consultation Project was better than on the Comprehensive Exams.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Measure: Comprehensive Exams**
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available

for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 1.2: Exceeds 18%; Meets 58%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

With respect to Critical Reflection, it was developing and moving into the "Meets Expectations" phase – this was occurring all the way into the 2nd year. Some students still lacked the ability to have an understanding and to respect institutional differences, in terms of how some students would address a situation one way versus the other, and how to evaluate situations and institutions using multiple frames of leadership, and applying them appropriately.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 1.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 41%; Developing 59%; Does Not Meet 0%

With respect to Critical Reflection, it was developing and moving into the "Meets Expectations" phase – this was occurring all the way into the 2nd year. Some students still lacked the ability to have an understanding and to respect institutional differences, in terms of how some students would address a situation one way versus the other, and how to evaluate situations and institutions using multiple frames of leadership, and applying them appropriately.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research

course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 1.3: Exceeds 18%; Meets 47%; Developing 35%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did well in Articulating a Philosophy; they met our expectations in this area. This was demonstrated particularly well in our Advanced Leadership course, in their last semester of coursework. They integrated the theories from our textbooks in the field, and they all talked about the attributes that they felt more confident and comfortable embracing when they are in certain leadership situations. One example would be "speaking out on social justice issues," and another would be "becoming a savvy political negotiator."

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 1.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 35%; Developing 65%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students did well in Articulating a Philosophy; they met our expectations in this area. This was demonstrated particularly well in our Advanced Leadership course, in their last semester of coursework. They integrated the theories from our textbooks in the field, and they all talked about the attributes that they felt more confident and comfortable embracing when they are in certain leadership situations. One example would be "speaking out on social justice issues," and another would be "becoming a savvy political negotiator."

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 1.4: Exceeds 24%; Meets 52%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

In exercising leadership, half of the group/cohort really exceeded expectations in this category, and the other half – those skills were developing or they met those expectations by the end of coursework. Several students in this cohort ended-up leaving their current posts at their institutions, and the other half seemed to enjoy promotions – their leadership requirements were expanded. It's like 50/50, and it could be that the half that just didn't do well, they figured out that they weren't really showing who they really were, so they gave

themselves the opportunity to re-tool.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 1.4: Exceeds 1%; Meets 52%; Developing 47%; Does Not Meet 0%

In exercising leadership, half of the group/cohort really exceeded expectations in this category, and the other half – those skills were developing or they met those expectations by the end of coursework. Several students in this cohort ended-up leaving their current posts at their institutions, and the other half seemed to enjoy promotions – their leadership requirements were expanded. It's like 50/50, and it could be that the half that just didn't do well, they figured out that they weren't really showing who they really were, so they gave themselves the opportunity to re-tool.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : A redesign of syllabus and assignments to allow students better to put theory into practice. That's for every single one of our classes. The other recommendation that we are implementing – We allow students are able to select a statistics course that would best fit their research process, adding a qualitative research course, expanding our research course options.

Reflections/Notes : We're beginning to admit a generation of students who have been comfortable not reading. We're starting to see this generation coming in to our Ph.D. in Higher Education program. For a number of years, this has been occurring in our Master's area, and we are surprised to see this moving into our doctoral program – that's why we're retooling

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 2.1: Exceeds 24%; Meets 52%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

Constructing, supporting, and interpreting arguments – Students have developed the appropriate thought processes by the 2nd year, and students have met our expectations on this. Most of them can give you a pretty good elevator speech about higher education and the importance of higher education – the importance of colleges and universities and why we are structured and organized the way the public sees us. They can support and argue the appropriateness of the fiscal challenges and the fiscal requests that we make, and they can support and argue the role of the faculties within institutions – their roles and what we do for students, as well as communities and stakeholders (the benefits of having higher education in their backyards, and educated people to train the next generation).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 2.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 35%; Developing 65%; Does Not Meet 0%

Constructing, supporting, and interpreting arguments – Students have developed the appropriate thought processes by the 2nd year, and students have met our expectations on this. Most of them can give you a pretty good elevator speech about higher education and the importance of higher education – the importance of colleges and universities and why we are structured and organized the way the public sees us. They can support and argue the appropriateness of the fiscal challenges and the fiscal requests that we make, and they can support and argue the role of the faculties within institutions – their roles and what we do for students, as well as communities and stakeholders (the benefits of having higher education in their backyards, and educated people to train the next generation).

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 2.2: Exceeds 24%; Meets 41%; Developing 35%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students meet the expectations of employing multiple frames – through organizational theory, higher educational theories, etc. according to the different types of institutions that they would walk into. They can walk in and out of those environments and know that those specific institutions are unique in their own way – a niche for everyone – in terms of who are students and who are employed.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading

that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 2.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 41%; Developing 59%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students meet the expectations of employing multiple frames – through organizational theory, higher educational theories, etc. according to the different types of institutions that they would walk into. They can walk in and out of those environments and know that those specific institutions are unique in their own way – a niche for everyone – in terms of who are students and who are employed.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 29%; Developing 71%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 2.3: Exceeds 0%; Meets 29%; Developing 71%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 2.4: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 2.4: Exceeds 0%; Meets 24%; Developing 76%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students and developing in their critical reading and review of research. For example, they did not do well on the methodology questions on the preliminary exam. What we are going to do to try to resolve this issue is to engage them in more reading and short papers, as well as exposure to top-tier journal articles. In one class, the faculty have tripled the number of research articles they are reading and critiquing. This would go hand in hand with their understanding of research – it is developing.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Again, the shift in the syllabi, where we are going to be requiring more readings, as well as the increase in the use of case studies, are recommended. The research methods classes will use more research articles, and the students will have more conversations within the classrooms with respect to methodology, and how it applied, day-to-day, to their work activities.

Reflections/Notes : We're finding that the students don't tend to engage in much reading that will help with these areas of focus and concern. Students seem to take longer in completing the dissertations – they don't seem to have gotten into the reading rhythm.

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 3.1: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Overall, students met expectations in this area and grew from the beginning of the program to the end of the program. They can communicate well with diverse groups, and the group really mastered Bolman & Deals frames in terms of communicating effectively with people in organizations. They're on point with it; students know what to do here, as they have the right tools.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : One of the things we would like to see is to have our students more involved with conferences and presentations, and the ability to meet with other doctoral students and scholars in the field. The intent would be to allow them to see how much more

they need to learn, and how much more they are able to grow with interaction with others, in lifelong learning situations. They will become better scholars if they keep up with professional development.

Reflections/Notes : None at this time, except to say that students need to continue practicing. After two years, we don't want students to slip into their old ways again (ways of thinking and comfort). It could be that maybe we need to think of a way we have a professional development program that brings them back. That could be a creative way of keeping them engaged – bring them back every two or three years, and have a professional development seminar.

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 3.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 41%; Developing 59%; Does Not Meet 0%

Overall, students met expectations in this area and grew from the beginning of the program to the end of the program. They can communicate well with diverse groups, and the group really mastered Bolman & Deals frames in terms of communicating effectively with people in organizations. They're on point with it; students know what to do here, as they have the right tools.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : One of the things we would like to see is to have our students more involved with conferences and presentations, and the ability to meet with other doctoral students and scholars in the field. The intent would be to allow them to see how much more they need to learn, and how much more they are able to grow with interaction with others, in lifelong learning situations. They will become better scholars if they keep up with professional development.

Reflections/Notes : None at this time, except to say that students need to continue practicing. After two years, we don't want students to slip into their old ways again (ways of thinking and comfort). It could be that maybe we need to think of a way we have a professional development program that brings them back. That could be a creative way of keeping them engaged – bring them back every two or three years, and have a professional development seminar.

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

**Outcome 4.1:
Understanding of Higher
Education**

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 4.1: Exceeds 29%; Meets 47%; Developing 24%; Does Not Meet 0%

Students meet-to-exceed our expectations in understanding higher education. They came into our program with a blank slate, and didn't really know the details of how our profession and institutions come together and perform their functions. By the time they get ready to leave, this knowledge is common knowledge to them.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we're doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

Reflections/Notes : Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

▼ Measure: Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 4.1: Exceeds 0%; Meets 24%; Developing 76%; Does

Not Meet 0%

Students meet-to-exceed our expectations in understanding higher education. They came into our program with a blank slate, and didn't really know the details of how our profession and institutions come together and perform their functions. By the time they get ready to leave, this knowledge is common knowledge to them.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we're doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

Reflections/Notes : Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

Summary of Findings: Measure One 4.2: Exceeds 24%; Meets 47%; Developing 29%; Does Not Meet 0%

Whether or not they can use this in program evaluation, we think that they can. We have several opportunities for students to audit their organization and evaluate their systems. They have an opportunity to do this for their institutions in their first year, and then again through a multicultural audit for diversity in their final year of the program. They meet our expectations and are able to perform organizational, cultural, or leadership gap analyses in order to serve effectively in that capacity.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we're doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

Reflections/Notes : Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

Summary of Findings: Measure Two 4.2: Exceeds 0%; Meets 29%; Developing 71%; Does Not Meet 0%

Whether or not they can use this in program evaluation, we think that they can. We have several opportunities for students to audit their organization and evaluate their systems. They have an opportunity to do this for their institutions in their first year, and then again through a multicultural audit for diversity in their final year of the program. They meet our expectations and are able to perform organizational, cultural, or leadership gap analyses in order to serve effectively in that capacity.

Results: Target Achievement: Met

Recommendations : Maybe we can design a project for their last semester that allows them an opportunity to integrate two years of coursework into some type of consultation project or a final product of some sort. This may be difficult to implement with all else we're doing this past semester, but with re-tooling our syllabi, this may be a possibility this next spring. We may not currently be giving them enough time for capstone integration.

Reflections/Notes : Students know they have more to learn, but by the time students finish the program, they are exhausted, and their goal is to get the dissertation written. What will be helpful, again, will be some type of gathering every two years or so to bring everyone together and offer some type of professional development seminar. This would give us the opportunity to conduct a post-program assessment for a follow-up analysis of what we are doing and how we are doing it.

Overall Recommendations

Syllabi revisions, as well as further development of experiential learning in students for presentations and integration of coursework.

Overall Reflection

Great opportunities and reflection and conversation, based on this year's assessment data. Good for program evaluation and coursework refinement.

 **Action Plan**

Actions

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum



The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain

classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

This Action is associated with the following Findings

No supporting Findings have been linked to this Action.

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

◆ Status Report

Action Statuses

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Action:** Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ Action: Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

Action Details: We are going to evaluate other higher education programs to see if certain classes need to be rethought or merged. One in particular the Philosophy in Higher Ed, and the other is Seminar in Educational Thought. We may also rearrange the sequence of classes.

Since we are also coming up on our 20th Anniversary, we are going to have a Strategic Planning Meeting in the Summer of 2016, to talk about the next 20 years, in 5-year chunks.

Implementation Plan (timeline): Implementation Plan: Implement of these strategies throughout the duration of the 2015 – 2016 school year.

Key/Responsible Personnel: Key Responsible Persons: For Implementation -- Dr. Hinton, Dr. Howard-Hamilton ... for Data Collection – Dr. Donlan

Measures: Measures: Current Outcomes and Measures for EDLR PhD Higher Education Program.

Resource Allocations: Resource Allocation: No financial allocation needed at this time.

Priority: High

Status for Reevaluate the Ph.D. in Higher Ed Curriculum

No Status Added

Status Summary

No text specified

Summary of Next Steps

No text specified

2015-2016 Assessment Cycle

Assessment Plan

Outcomes and Measures

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3 = meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams

Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

review various forms of research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will

include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues,

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available

for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

◆ Assessment Findings

Finding per Measure

PHD in Educat Adm (Ldrshp Higher Ed) Outcome Set

OBJ 1: Reflective Leadership Proficiency

Outcome 1.1: Comprehensive Knowledge.

A comprehensive knowledge of different theories on leadership and management.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.2: Critical Reflection

The ability to reflect critically on historical and contemporary issues within education and to relate them to leadership and practice.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.3: Articulate a Philosophy

The ability to articulate an integrated philosophy of education and leadership.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 1.4: Exercise Leadership

The ability to exercise leadership within an educational setting.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply

what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

OBJ 2: Analytic Inquiry and Research Proficiencies

Outcome 2.1: Construct and Support Interpretations/Arguments

The ability to construct and support reasonable interpretations and arguments.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.2: Employ Multiple Perspectives/Theoretical Frames

The facility to employ multiple perspectives and theoretical frames to assess educational and organizational structures, policies, and practices.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.3: Critically Read and Review Research

The ability to critically read and review various forms of

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam



research and to use it to resolve administrative challenges in educational situations.

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ Measure: Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 2.4: An Understanding of Research

An understanding of qualitative and quantitative research paradigms.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

OBJ 3: Communication Proficiency

Outcome 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.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization

problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

OBJ 4: Field Content Area Proficiency

Outcome 4.1: Understanding of Higher Education

A thorough theoretical understanding of higher education and its administration and the ability to relate theory to practice in the areas of academic and student affairs, policy and legal issues, organization and governance, finance, and social foundations of education.

▼ Measure: Comprehensive Exams Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ Measure: Consultation Project Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Outcome 4.2: Plan and Evaluate Policies and Programs

The ability to plan and evaluate policies and programs within higher education.

▼ **Measure:** Comprehensive Exams
Direct - Exam

Details/Description: Upon completion of coursework, students take comprehensive examinations (prelims) integrating what they have learned in class and internships. The written portion of the exam takes place during the designated 72-hour course completion timeline. Several weeks following the written exam, students defend their content on that examination in a meeting on campus.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Comprehensive Exams

No Findings Added

▼ **Measure:** Group Consultation Project
Direct - Student Artifact

Details/Description: The penultimate assignment for EDLR 752 is the collaborative consultation project that provides students with an opportunity to work in small groups to apply what they have learned to real governance or to a higher-educational organization problem/issue facing an Indiana college or university. Students will define a problem and develop responses for it. They just delve deep to analyze the crux of the problem, seek-out relevant research, consult with experts, and devise a proposed course of action. Products will include The Consultation Executive Summary, Class Group Project Presentation, and Final Paper.

Target: The target threshold that indicates the minimal acceptable level of achievement of the outcome is that students average "2" or higher on this assessment on a scaled score of 1 - 4 (1 = does not meet expectations; 2 = developing; 3= meets expectations; 4 = exceeds expectations).

Implementation Plan (timeline): Data are analyzed in May and June of each year, available for programmatic decisions after that time on an annual basis.

Responsible Individual(s): All faculty members

Findings for Group Consultation Project

No Findings Added

Overall Recommendations

No text specified

Overall Reflection

No text specified

 **Action Plan**

 **Status Report**

2016-2017 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

2017-2018 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

2018-2019 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

2019-2020 Assessment Cycle

 **Assessment Plan**

 **Assessment Findings**

Appendix

-
- A. **PhD in Higher Education Leadership** (Curriculum Map)
 - B. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - C. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - D. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - E. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - F. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - G. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - H. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - I. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - J. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - K. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - L. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - M. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - N. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - O. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - P. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - Q. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))

- R. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - S. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - T. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - U. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - V. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - W. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - X. **Aggregated Data Spreadsheet 2012-2013** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
 - Y. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - Z. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AA. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AB. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AC. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AD. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AE. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AF. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AG. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AH. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AI. **Meeting Minutes** (Word Document (Open XML))
 - AJ. **PhD Higher Ed Data 2013-2014** (Excel Workbook (Open XML))
-