

Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: **Ph.D. Higher Education Administration**

Department: Higher Education

Degree or Certificate Level: Ph.D.

College/School: School of Education

Date (Month/Year): **September 2021**

Primary Assessment Contact: Molly Schaller, Program
Director

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? Fall 2020, Spring 2021, Summer 2021 (2020 – 2021)

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? 2020

1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

Student Learning Outcome 2

Graduates will demonstrate critical reflection as they use discipline-based literature to inform ethical decisions in higher education leadership.

2. Assessment Methods: Artifacts of Student Learning

Which artifacts of student learning were used to determine if students achieved the outcome(s)? 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.

The artifacts directly measuring student learning of demonstrating critical reflection as they use discipline-based literature to inform ethical decisions in higher education leadership are:

1) Case Studies

- a) Assessed by instructor of record using rubric (see attached)
- b) Collected in EDH 6150 Organization and Administration of Higher Education (Spring 2021)
- c) Collected in EDH 6580 Disability in Higher Education (Fall 2020)

2) Final Projects

- a) Assessed by instructor of record using rubric (see attached)
- b) Collected in EDH 6580 Financial Administration in Higher Education (Spring 2021)
- c) Collected in EDH 5250 History of Higher Education (Fall 2020)

3) Comprehensive Exam (Fall 2020 & Spring 2021)

- a) Assessed using rubric (see attached)
- b) *End of Program Exam*, representative of students' most advanced work

All courses are taught in-person on Frost Campus. Highlighted courses are hybrid or fully online due to COVID-19 global pandemic.

3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the artifacts of student learning, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Given SLO 2 listed above, what evaluation process will we use? (What Steps, Who, When)

Comprehensive Exams – evaluated by 2 faculty members, with a third evaluator in the case of disagreement of “passing”

EDH 6150 – Organization and Administration of Higher Education – faculty member became ill, so no results reported

EDH 6580 – Disability in Higher Education – case studies evaluated by instructor of record

EDH 6580 – Financial Administration in Higher Education – artifact evaluated by instructor of record

EDH 5250 – History of Higher Education – artifact evaluated by instructor of record.

How might we describe the relationship between our tool, the artifact, and SLO 2?

We developed a learning outcome rubric to examine students’ progress on this specific learning outcome. The development of the rubric started with professional rubrics from two professional organizations, ACPA and NASPA. Of particular note is that the learning outcome and rubric were developed

4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcome(s)? 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)?

Comprehensive Exams – the comprehensive exam rubric specifically addresses critical reflection and the use of discipline based literature. In the Fall 2020 we implemented a new approach to comprehensive exams. Because of the challenges our students and faculty faced during the pandemic, comprehensive exams were moved, permanently, to a take home case study with research response for all students. During the Fall 2020, six doctoral students took comprehensive exams. Five students passed comprehensive exams and one did not pass. In the Spring 2021 8 students took and all passed comprehensive exams. Results were read without identifying information by two faculty, with a third asked to review responses if there was disagreement in the results. Results showed that there is not strong interrater reliability on the exams. Out of the 14 exams read, there was at least a 4 point difference (out of a possible 24) on seven of the exams. Results did show that there is significant concern over the writing functions and synthesis of the final essays.

EDH 6150 – Organization and Administration of Higher Education – no data

EDH 6580 – Disability in Higher Education – There were four doctoral students in EDH 6050 Disability in Higher Education and Society in fall semester 2020. One received an incomplete, thus this student’s production was not considered in the assessment of the learning objective associated with the course. Given the range on the rubric scale, the remaining doctoral students fell within the intermediate range. This suggests these students demonstrated a knowledge of systemic and organizational leadership skills, reflected the ethical standards of the profession, and created an insightful document moderately synthesized the concepts in the course.

EDH 6580 – Financial Administration in Higher Education – the final product of a paper and presentation for 8 doctoral students were evaluated in the Spring 2021. The course took place both face to face and via Zoom in the Spring term, as the class made weekly decisions about their health and well-being. Final presentations took place in person. Utilizing the rubric, 7 of the 8 students exhibited advanced levels of critical reflection in the use of discipline-based literature. One student showed no inclusion of ethical decision making or theoretical understanding of the role of ethics in financial administration.

EDH 5250 – History of Higher Education - In examining final papers from doctoral students in the class, it is clear the learning outcome was achieved in most papers. Everyone learned in the same way – synchronously on zoom every Monday evening during the fall 2020 semester so the teaching modality was the same for all students. The degree to which this learning outcome was achieved was in part connected to paper topics. Everyone used discipline based literature for their final papers, so regardless of how much they examined ethical decision making, they became familiar with discipline based literature connected to their topic. One of the stated goals for the final paper, as seen in the syllabus and my verbal instruction and

a different assignment, was to become familiar with the literature connected to their final paper in preparation for writing a dissertation.

5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

The results suggest to us two key findings: First, our current coursework does not include specific and explicit ethical theory or exploration of the ways that our ethics influence decision making. Second, our doctoral students still need support in synthesizing their learning. We will need to continue to model this level of synthesis in all courses.

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?

Faculty shared results of their evaluations either in departmental meetings or during the sub-committee work to evaluate the program. The results were shared with all faculty.

B. How specifically have you decided to use these 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
- Artifacts of student learning
- 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 these findings.

For all courses – we will need to explicitly include more content regarding ethics in foundational courses and then utilize the rubric to specifically evaluate ethical decision making.

Ethical Theory and Practice will be added as a sub-topic to the Organization and Administration in Higher Education course.

For EDH 6580 – Instructor plans to incorporate more writing assignments where critical reflection and synthesis of content is the main focus.

Comprehensive Exams – Because our reviews show such low interrater reliability, the program faculty should engage in a more thorough discussion of expectations, the use of the rubric, and what constitutes a passing exam. While only 1 out of 14 students failed their exam, the high degree of disagreement among faculty suggests that we need additional conversations about writing expectations. Inclusion of a specific ethics component to the question should take place once students have had such content in their coursework.

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?

We have 1) developed a dissertation outline and shared that with all students in the dissertation phase, 2) developed APA and research management workshops for students and presented those to all willing doctoral students, and 3) increased the level of student writing in EDH 5250 and EDH 5350 to assist students in moving along in their preparation of a literature review for the dissertation.

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

We have not yet engaged in an assessment of these changes.

C. What were the findings of the assessment?

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

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

Ph.D. Higher Education Administration Learning Outcome Rubrics

Program Learning Outcomes with Course Source for Artifacts

1. Graduates will demonstrate critical reflection as they use discipline-based literature to inform ethical decisions in higher education leadership. EDH 6150, EDH 6580, EDH 6050, EDH 5250) - Fall 2021			
Competencies ¹	Scale Levels		
	Advanced	Intermediate	Foundational
Leadership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Seek out and develop new and emerging constructs of “leader” and “leadership.” • Facilitate reflective learning and relationship building across campus, community, and the profession. • Promote a shared vision that drives unit, divisional, and institutional short- term and long-term planning and the ongoing organizing of work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and understand systemic and organizational constructs of “leader” and “leadership.” • Use reflection to develop and incorporate one’s authentic self into one’s identity as a leader. • Seek entrepreneurial and innovative perspectives when planning for change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and understand individual- level constructs of “leader” and “leadership.” • Explain the advantages and disadvantages of different types of decision-making processes. • Identify institutional traditions, mores, and organizational structures and how they influence others to act in the organization. • Think critically, creatively, and imagine possibilities for solutions.
Personal and Ethical Foundations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Model adherence to ethical guidelines and mediate disparities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Explain alignment of practice, personal ethics, and ethical statements. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Shows ability to understand and apply ethical theories to the problem at hand

¹ ACAP/NASPA Professional Competencies Rubrics. (2016). Available from https://www.myacpa.org/sites/default/files/ACPA%20NASPA%20Professional%20Competency%20Rubrics%20Full.pdf?utm_source=ACPA+Communications+List&utm_campaign=ae55f4837d-EMAIL_CAMPAIGN_2016_10_27&utm_medium=email&utm_term=0_e83904aedd-ae55f4837d-83827993

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and support an ethical workplace culture. 	<p>Model adherence to ethical guidelines and mediate disparities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop and support an ethical workplace culture. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Articulates personal code of ethics informed by ethical codes. • Explain how one's behavior reflects ethics of profession
Content Depth & Breadth Indicated	The answer contains a depth and breadth of knowledge of the subject which is distributed throughout in a meaningful manner and answers the question completely.	The answer contains adequate knowledge of the subject with appropriate application and adequately answers the question.	The answer demonstrates a minimum or surface level application of the knowledge base and/or does not answer portions of the question.
Content Accuracy	All supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.	Most supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.	Few supportive facts and statistics are reported accurately.
Synthesis of Concepts	The breadth of content is presented seamlessly showing evidence of capacity to synthesize concepts.	Concepts appear to be related, but are not fully synthesized	Concepts presented but not as related to one another.