SAINT LOUIS UNIVERSITY.

## Program Assessment: *Annual Report*

**Program(s): Higher Education Administration PhD Program**

**Department: Higher Education Administration**

**College/School: School of Education**

**Date: 11/17/17**

**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 administration practices.
>
> **LO 2**: Graduates will interpret and apply research to higher education administration practices.
>
> **LO 3**: Graduates will apply leadership, communication, organizational, financial, assessment, and management practices to professional work in higher education administration.

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

> **LO1**
>
> EDH 5350 FL16, SUM 17
> Self-analysis paper in course
>
> EDH 6150 S17
> Project/paper in course
>
> Assessments at end of program
> Comprehensive written exam
> FL16, S17
>
> **LO2**
>
> EDH 5250 F16
> Final project/paper in course
>
> EDH 5350 F16, SUM 17
> Self-analysis paper in course

EDH 5400 F16
Final project/paper in course

EDH 6150 S17
Project/paper in course

EDH 5910 F16, S17 SUM17
Self-assessment in internship

Assessments at end of program
Comprehensive written exam F16, S17


**LO 3**
EDH 5400 F16
Final project/paper in course

EDH 6150 S17
Final project/paper in course

EDH 6580 F16
Final project/paper in course

Assessments at end of program
Comprehensive written exam
F16, S17

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? <u>Summarize</u> 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 assessment 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 assessment 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; 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 assessment 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; developed and added a fourth learning outcome addressing proposing and conducting research related to higher education administration practices; 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 for this program. Based on the collected data, the HEA faculty **revised** the Higher Education Administration PhD Program **Assessment Plan** on October 13, 2017, including adding a learning outcome; 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.*