

Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

Program(s): Student Personnel Administration Master's Program

Department: Higher Education Administration

College/School: School of Education

Date: 11/18/17

Primary Assessment Contact: Karen Myers (SOE HEA); Joseph Nichols (SOE),

1. Which program student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

LO 1: Graduates will use student development, organizational, and environmental theories to analyze issues related to students and higher education student personnel administration practice.

LO 2: Graduates will interpret and apply research to higher education student personnel administration practice.

LO 3 Graduates will apply leadership, communication, organizational, financial, assessment, and management practices to professional work in higher education student personnel administration functional areas.

2. What data/artifacts of student learning were collected for each assessed outcome? Were Madrid student artifacts included?

LO1

EDH 5350 S17 SUM17

Self-analysis paper in course

EDH 5360 S17

Self-analysis paper in course

EDH 5640 F16

Final project/paper in course

Assessments at end of program

Comprehensive written exam F16, S17 SUM17

Exit interviews (Handwritten Notes; No Rubrics)

LO2

EDH 5350 F16, SUM17

Self-analysis paper in course

EDH 5360 S17

Self-analysis paper in course

EDH 5600 F16

Simulation university project in course

EDH 5470 S17

Final project/paper in course

EDH 6050 F16, SUM17

Final project in course

Assessments at end of program

Comprehensive written exam

F16, S17 SUM17

Exit interview (Handwritten Notes; No Rubrics)

LO 3

EDH 5600 F16

Simulation university project in course.

EDH 5470 S17

Final project/paper in course

EDH 6050 F16, SUM17

Final project in course

EDH 5915 F16, S17 SUM17

Self-assessment in internship

EDH 5916 F16, S17 SUM17

Self-assessment in internship

Assessments at end of program

Comprehensive written exam F16, S17 SUM17

Exit interviews (Handwritten Notes; No Rubrics)

3. How did you analyze the assessment data? What was the process? Who was involved?

NOTE: If you used rubrics as part of your analysis, please include them in an appendix.

Rubrics developed by course instructors were used for course assessment data analysis (rubrics in Google Drive folder).

Rubric developed by program directors were used for comprehensive exam data analysis (rubrics in Google Drive folder).

4. What did you learn from the data? Summarize the major findings of your analysis for each assessed outcome.

NOTE: If necessary, include any tables, charts, or graphs in an appendix.

LO 1: Graduates will use student development, organizational, and environmental theories to analyze issues related to students and higher education administration practices.

All courses listed in plan measured this learning outcome through assignments. All instructors used self-designed rubrics. Following faculty evaluation of this learning outcome, the HEA faculty revised the learning outcome for clarity; revised the “signature” assignment in each course, some using a case study approach; and discussed adopting a generic rubric, which each instructor potentially will use.

LO 2: Graduates will interpret and apply research to higher education administration practices.

Some courses listed in plan measured this learning outcome through assignments and some did not. Some instructors did not use rubrics and/or did not have assessment data due to returning original assignments to students with hand-written feedback and not making copies. Following faculty evaluation of this learning outcome, the HEA faculty revised the learning outcome for clarity; omitted some courses and subsequent assessment methods for this learning outcome; revised the “signature” assignment in each course, some using a case study approach; and discussed adopting a generic rubric, which each instructor potentially will use.

LO 3: Graduates will apply leadership, communication, organizational, financial, assessment, and management practices to professional work in higher education administration.

All courses listed in plan measured this learning outcome through assignments. All instructors used self-designed rubrics. Following faculty evaluation of this learning outcome, the HEA faculty revised the learning outcome for clarity; revised the “signature” assignment in each course, some using a case study approach; and discussed adopting a generic rubric, which each instructor potentially will use.

5. How did your analysis inform meaningful change? How did you *use the analyzed data to make or implement recommendations for change* in pedagogy, curriculum design, or your assessment plan?

Following faculty evaluation of the assessment data and learning outcomes, the HEA faculty revised the learning outcome for clarity, specifically incorporating the terms “guided practice” and “discipline-based literature (i.e., interpret and apply discipline-related literature to higher education student affairs practice); revised the “signature” assignment in each course, some planning to use a case study approach; and discussed adopting a generic/uniform rubric, which may be tailored for each “signature” assignment.

6. Did you follow up (“close the loop”) on past assessment work? If so, what did you learn? (*For example, has that curriculum change you made two years ago manifested in improved student learning today, as evidenced in your recent assessment data and analysis?*)

This is the first year collecting assessment data. Based on the collected data, the HEA faculty **revised** the Student Personnel Administration Master's Program **Assessment Plan** on October 13, 2017, determined "signature" assignments in each course, and are considering adopting a generic/uniform rubric. We will follow up with each of these modifications in the next two years to evaluate their impact on student learning.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any revised/updated assessment plans to the University Assessment Coordinator along with this report.