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1. **Student Learning Outcomes**
   Which of the program’s student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

   **Outcome 1** (Students will apply guided practice in educational administration, aspects of running a school districts, and educational theories to analyze issues related to executive level administration).

2. **Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts**
   Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

   2019 fall finals from Research Topics and District Administration were utilized for review to determine how to align them to outcome 1. These finals were updated to be used for fall 2020 in the format of case studies. The analysis was conducted by professors and discussed with faculty. The pass rate based on the use of the rubric for evidence-based practices and relevant research was 99%.

3. **Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process**
   What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

   Alignment to standards was examined. The faculty discussed how the case study finals represent administrative issues school leaders address in these areas and how they are aligned to current school processes and theories as well as evidence-based practices.

4. **Data/Results**
   What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

   Each final provided by the faculty of the coursework discussed how these align to standards, best practices, and leadership theories. Evaluation by faculty was done in faculty meetings and in small focus groups to determine alignment. The small groups brought information back to the whole group for discussion.

5. **Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions**
   What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

   Utilizing these finals has created a more uniform method of assessing student depth of knowledge, understanding of leadership theories, and evidence-based practices.

6. **Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings**
   A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

   The results were shared during a faculty meeting and discussed. This process of curriculum review will be continued throughout the year and additional changes will be added next year. More course case studies will
be implemented throughout the curriculum mapping process, review of rubric will continue, and evaluation of student success discussion will continue as well as small group review of possible improvements to the case studies.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you’ve initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies
- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan
- Student learning outcomes
- Student artifacts collected
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

The program faculty has begun evaluating each course, approaches to theories, activities, and assessments to create a curriculum map and then look for gaps and overlaps as well as alignment to standards. The faculty has agreed to continue this evaluation process until all coursework has been reviewed.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

7. Closing the Loop: Review of Previous Assessment Findings and Changes
A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

The review of student feedback resulted in the addition of a class (Admin of Special Education), redesign of the arrangement of coursework, and added a rubric to the facility audit. These changes were determined as a need based on course review and student feedback.

B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

They have been assessed through faculty review and discussion and have added clarity of expectations prior to conducting the final exams and clarity to the outcome.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

It was determined using case studies as final exams exemplifies more in-depth knowledge of processes and understanding. This method provides students the opportunity to apply leadership theories as well as research based literature to exemplify their knowledge of best practices in administration.

D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

Continue with course reviews throughout 2021. More course case studies will be implemented throughout the curriculum mapping process, review of rubric will continue, and evaluation of student success discussion will continue as well as small group review of possible improvements to the case studies.

IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.
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