

Program-Level Assessment Plan

Program: Organizational Leadership and Technology	Degree Level (e.g., UG or GR certificate, UG major, master’s program, doctoral program): UG Major
Department: NA	College/School: School for Professional Studies
Date (Month/Year): May 2021	Primary Assessment Contact: John Buerck/Katie Devany

Note: Each cell in the table below will expand as needed to accommodate your responses.

#	Student Learning Outcomes	Curriculum Mapping	Assessment Methods		Use of Assessment Data
			Student Artifacts (What)	Evaluation Process (How)	
	<p>What do the program faculty expect all students to know or be able to do as a result of completing this program?</p> <p>Note: These should be measurable and manageable in number (typically 4-6 are sufficient).</p>	<p>In which courses will faculty intentionally work to foster some level of student development toward achievement of the outcome? Please clarify the level (e.g., introduced, developed, reinforced, achieved, etc.) at which student development is expected in each course.</p>	<p>Student Artifacts (What)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Which student artifacts will be used to determine if students have achieved this outcome? In which courses will these artifacts be collected? 	<p>Evaluation Process (How)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> What process will be used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? What tool(s) (e.g., a rubric) will be used in the process? <p>Note: Please include any rubrics as part of the submitted plan documents.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> How and when will analyzed data be used by faculty to make changes in pedagogy, curriculum design, and/or assessment work? How and when will the program evaluate the impact of assessment-informed changes made in previous years?
1	Apply fundamental competencies from business functions.	CIS 2300 (I) ORLD 2000 (I) ORLD 2500 (R) ORLD 2700 (R)	Artifacts such as the organizational assessment final project (ORLD 2000), financial plan assessment (ORLD 2500), and applied organizational analysis (CIS 2300, ORLD 2700) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.	1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum. In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward.

				outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods. 2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.	
2	Analyze a problem and identify the computing requirements appropriate to its solution.	CIS 1600 (I) CIS 2850 (R) CIS 3300 (A)	Artifacts such as are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.	1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods. 2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.	1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum. 2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward.
3	Analyze the local and global impact of computing on individuals, organizations, and society.	CIS 1300 (I) CIS 3150 (R)	Artifacts such as are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.	1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially	1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum. 2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward.

				<p>achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.</p> <p>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.</p>	
4	Describe the role of ethics in decision-making in multicultural, professional organizations	<p>ORLD 1000 (I) ORLD 1800 (I) ORLD 3300 (D) CIS 3150 (R) ORLD 3800 (R) ORLD 4000 (A)</p>	<p>Artifacts such the leadership development plan (ORLD 1000), assessment of case studies (ORLD 1800 and ORLD 4000), applied organizational analysis (ORLD 3300, ORLD 3800), and</p> <p>are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.</p>	<p>1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.</p> <p>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.</p>	<p>1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.</p> <p>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward.</p>
5	Apply leadership principles in multiple contexts.	<p>ORLD 1000 (I) ORLD 3800 (R) ORLD 4000 (A)</p>	<p>Artifacts such the leadership development plan (ORLD 1000), assessment of case studies (ORLD 4000), applied organizational analysis (ORLD 3800) are designed to elicit direct measurement of student development toward this outcome.</p>	<p>1: An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at the end of the course in which this program learning outcome exists. This survey will inquire about: A) Specific artifact(s) used to demonstrate achievement, B) Strengths/weakness in student performance towards this outcome, C) Number of students who</p>	<p>1: Every other year, typically in the spring. The Program Director in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty will analyze assessment data and make changes to pedagogy and/or curriculum.</p> <p>2: In the fall, Program Directors will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements</p>

				<p>achieved/partially achieved/not achieved the outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.</p> <p>2: Assignment rubrics are used to assess the artifacts.</p>	moving forward.
--	--	--	--	--	-----------------

Additional Questions

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the program’s student learning outcomes? (Please note that it is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)

Program Assessment Schedule

The following schedule provides an annual timeline for assessing the program’s student learning outcomes. The assessment schedule will be reviewed annually and modified to address emerging evidence needs for assessment of a particular SLO.

	SLO1	SLO2	SLO3	SLO4	SLO5
AY 2021-22			CIS 1300, CIS 3150	ORLD 1000, ORLD 1800, ORLD 3300, CIS 3150, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000	
AY 2022-23	CIS 2300, ORLD 2000, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700	CIS 1600, CIS 2850, CIS 3300			ORLD 1000, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000
AY 2023-24			CIS 1300, CIS 3150	ORLD 1000, ORLD 1800, ORLD 3300, CIS 3150, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000	

AY 2024-25	CIS 2300, ORLD 2000, ORLD 2500, ORLD 2700	CIS 1600, CIS 2850, CIS 3300			ORLD 1000, ORLD 3800, ORLD 4000
-------------------	--	---------------------------------	--	--	------------------------------------

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.

The Program Directors in cooperation with the full-time and adjunct faculty are involved in the development of the courses and their application to each program learning outcome within the plan. These faculties are highly invested in ensuring that course projects and other associated artifacts are created in ways that student performance toward the learning outcome can be distinguished and evidence towards achievement reported.

IMPORTANT: Please remember to submit any rubrics or other assessment tools along with this plan.

Please see rubrics and assessment tools included below.

ORLD 2000 Final Paper Rubric

Final Company Paper

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
<p>This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Readability</p>	<p>10.0 pts Excellent Text is easy to read; the reader can understand sentences clearly when reading at a normal pace and does not have to reread any passages. The reader isn't distracted by any problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation.</p>	<p>7.5 pts Above Average Text is easy to read in most places; reader understands sentences clearly when reading at normal pace; seldom has to reread any passages. Isolated problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract reader in a few places.</p>	<p>5.01 pts Average Text is easy to read in some places; reader can understand some sentences clearly when reading at a normal pace, though may have to reread several passages. Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract the reader in several places.</p>	<p>2.5 pts Below Average The reader has consistent difficulty understanding sentences when reading at a normal pace; the reader consistently has to reread passages. Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation distract the reader repeatedly.</p>	<p>0.0 pts Poor Recurring problems with grammar, spelling, and/or punctuation interfere with the reader's ability to understand the text's lines of reasoning.</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
<p>This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome APA Style and Organization</p>	<p>10.0 pts Excellent Correct use of APA formatting throughout 95% of document and reference pages including appropriate citation of direct and indirect quotes. The paper is structured in a way that sections, and paragraphs within sections, flow easily and naturally; the organization of the paper is clear and logical; paper is clearly structured in a manner consistent with the assignment. Use of headers and subheaders in APA style. Includes an APA well-formatted Cover page.</p>	<p>7.5 pts Above Average Uses correct APA formatting throughout 85% of the document and reference pages including appropriate citation of direct and indirect quotes. The paper is generally structured logically and clearly; paper is generally structured in a manner consistent with assignment requirements; however, some paragraphs within sections may not flow smoothly or naturally, or some ideas may seem out of place in a given section. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is consistent in most part of the the document. Includes a Cover page with most of APA requirement</p>	<p>5.01 pts Average Uses correct APA formatting throughout 75% of the document and reference pages. Mostly correct citation of direct and indirect quotes. There may be greater organization issues; there may be several instances of poor transition from one idea or section to another; use of headings to separate sections may not be easily identifiable; still contains all of the sections required. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is consistent in some parts of the the document. Includes a Cover page</p>	<p>2.5 pts Below Average Contains incorrect APA formatting throughout and reference pages (65% correct). Some errors in citation of direct and indirect quotes. Substantial organizational issues exist; use of headings to separate sections may be non-existent; paper may not be organized according to assignment specifications; major transition problems may be observed. Use of headers and subheaders in APA is inconsistent in most part of the the document. Includes a Cover page with little to no APA's requirements</p>	<p>0.0 pts Poor Contains incorrect APA formatting throughout the majority of the document and reference pages (less than 50% correct). Numerous errors in direct and indirect quotes. Major organizational issues exist; paper may lack several sections required by the assignment; there appears to be little flow among sections; headings typically not used. No use of headers and subheaders or used without APA formatting. Includes a Cover with no APA's formatting or no cover page.</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>
<p>This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Completeness & Depth of SWOT analysis</p>	<p>10.0 pts Excellent Fully answers in sufficient depth all the questions of the SWOT section. Includes a table with four-</p>	<p>7.5 pts Above Average Answers all the questions of the assignment poses, most in sufficient depth for the SWOT section. Includes a</p>	<p>5.01 pts Average Answers all the questions the assignment poses, some in sufficient depth, for</p>	<p>2.5 pts Below Average Does not respond coherently to some of the questions of the SWOT analysis. Does</p>	<p>0.0 pts Poor Does not respond coherently to most of the questions the assignment poses for</p>	<p>10.0 pts</p>

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
	quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Components are well developed in content by providing an in-depth analysis . Components meet all requirements of the checklist.	table with four-quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Analysis and content are developed but have room for improvement. Components meet most of requirements of the checklist.	the SWOT section. Includes a table with four-quadrants, one for each of the SWOT components. Components meet at least half of the requirements of the checklist.	not include a table with four-quadrants or SWOT components are missing. SWOT components meet at least one fourth of the requirements of the checklist.	the SWOT section, does not include a table or quadrants are missing. The checklist with requirements was not followed.	
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Completeness & Depth of Conclusion	10.0 pts Excellent Fully answers in sufficient depth all the questions of the Conclusion section. Conclusion is well developed in content by providing an in-depth analysis. Conclusion meets all requirements of the checklist.	7.5 pts Above Average Answers all the questions the assignment poses, most in sufficient depth for the conclusion section. Analysis and content are developed but have room for improvement. Conclusion meets most of requirements of the checklist.	5.01 pts Average Answers all the questions the assignment poses, some in sufficient depth for the Conclusion section. Conclusion meets at least half of the requirements of the checklist.	2.5 pts Below Average Does not respond coherently to some of the questions of the Conclusion. Conclusion meets at least one fourth of the requirements of the checklist.	0.0 pts Poor Does not respond coherently to most of the questions the assignment poses for the Conclusion section. The checklist with requirements for the conclusion was not followed.	10.0 pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome Incorporation of Feedback into Final Paper	10.0 pts Excellent Paper incorporates all feedback from instructor that is provided on company assignments.	7.5 pts Above Average Paper incorporates at least about 90% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	5.01 pts Average Paper incorporates at least about 75% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	2.5 pts Below Average Paper incorporates at least about 50% of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	0.0 pts Poor Paper has little to none incorporation of feedback from instructor on previous company assignments.	10.0 pts
This criterion is linked to a Learning Outcome References	10.0 pts Excellent Student referenced between 12 to 14 sources, with a minimum of	7.5 pts Above Average Student referenced at least 10 sources, with a minimum of 4 non-	5.01 pts Average Student referenced at least 9 sources, with a minimum of 4 non-	2.5 pts Below Average Student referenced at least 5 sources, with a minimum of 2 non-	0.0 pts Poor Student referenced less than 3 sources or reference page is	10.0 pts

Criteria	Ratings					Pts
	5 non-website sources.	website sources.	website sources.	website sources.	missing.	
Total Points: 70.0						

ORLD 3800 Final Presentation Rubric

Presentation Content: Strategy and/or Strategic Planning Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided strategy and/or strategic planning recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Strategy and strategic planning recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide strategic and/or strategic planning recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Content: Structure & Design Elements Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided structure and design recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Structure and design recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide structure and design recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Content: People Strategy Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided people strategy recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

People strategy recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide people strategy recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Content: Culture/ethics/values Recommendations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Provided culture/ethics/values recommendations based on the prior organizational analysis; and clearly and accurately applied the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Culture/ethics/values recommendations are not fully developed or supported by organizational analysis; and/or failure to clearly or accurately apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Does not provide culture/ethics/values recommendations; or not based on the prior organizational analysis; or does not apply the course readings, materials and/or lectures

Presentation Quality--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Presentation recording was good quality in a format easy to use by the viewer; presentation was well-rehearsed and flows well; the pace and tone of the presenter were appropriate; length of presentation was 6-8 minutes

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation recording was poor quality; and/or format was not easy to use by the viewer; and/or presentation was not well-rehearsed and did not flow well; and/or the pace and tone of the presenter were not appropriate; and/or length of presentation was not within 6-8 minutes

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation recording was poor quality; and/or format was not easy to use by the viewer; and presentation was not well-rehearsed and did not flow well; and the pace and tone of the presenter were not appropriate; and/or length of presentation was not within 6-8 minutes

Slide Quality--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Presentation slides were visually attractive, creative and interesting; slides contained the appropriate amount of text using a readable font size; tables and figures were clearly visible

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides were not visually attractive, creative and/or interesting; and/or slides did not contain the appropriate amount of text or font size; and/or tables and figures were blurry

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides were not visually attractive, creative and/or interesting; and slides did not contain the appropriate amount of text or font size; and tables and figures were blurry

Organization and Readability--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Presentation slides were well-organized and free of formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and included title slide, objectives, and a reference slide

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides were not well-organized and/or had some formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and/or one of the following was missing: title, objective or reference slide

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides were not well-organized and/or had numerous formatting, typographical, grammatical errors; and/or two of the following were missing: title, objective or reference slide

Support, Analysis, & Critical Thinking--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 4 (13.33%) points

Critically analyzed and applied the course readings, lectures and interview with at least 5 direct/indirect citations

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Failed to critically analyze and/or apply the course readings; and/or relied heavily on personal examples or poorly supported evidence; and/or made 3-4 direct/indirect citations

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Failed to critically analyze and/or apply the course readings; and relied heavily on personal examples or poorly supported evidence; and made 0-2 direct/indirect citations

APA Style and Citations--

Levels of Achievement:

Exceptional 3 (10%) points

Presentation slides were free of APA errors; accurately used citations (direct and indirect quotes)

Meets Expectations 2 (6.67%) points

Presentation slides had some APA errors; and/or did not accurately use citations (direct and indirect quotes)

Needs Improvement 0 (0%) points

Presentation slides had numerous APA errors; and did not accurately use citations (direct and indirect quotes)

**Saint Louis University School for Professional Studies
Program Assessment Model**

The School for Professional Studies has adopted the model described in this document for programmatic assessment. Starting with new programs, the model will be phased in for all SPS programs.

The model is designed to illustrate alignment among School, program and course student learning outcomes as well as an ongoing, cyclical assessment process.

