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☐ HLC Approval Date (if applicable)
4.0 STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES AND ASSESSMENT PLAN

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.
# Program Assessment Plan

**Program:** Master of Professional Studies  
**Department:** N/A  
**College/School:** School for Professional Studies  
**Date:** October, 2019  
**Primary Assessment Contact:** John Buerck

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assessment Mapping</th>
<th>Assessment Methods</th>
<th>Use of Assessment Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|    |                            | From what specific courses (or other educational/professional experiences) will artifacts of student learning be analyzed to demonstrate achievement of the outcome? Include courses taught at the Madrid campus and/or online as applicable. | What specific artifacts of student learning will be analyzed? How, and by whom, will they be analyzed?  
   - Note: the majority should provide direct, rather than indirect, evidence of achievement.  
   Please note if a rubric is used and, if so, include it as an appendix to this plan. | 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  | The primary concentration’s discipline-specific learning outcome. (Each graduate certificate has at least one learning outcome associated with the discipline). | Varies | 1. An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at end of 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 | 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.  
Program Director will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible |
| 2 | The secondary concentration's discipline-specific learning outcome. (Each graduate certificate has at least one learning outcome associated with the discipline). | Varies | The outcome, D) Suggestions on potential changes to the curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.  
2. Exit survey completed by students at end of degree.  
3. Masters applied research projects completed in MRP 5963 will be evaluated by the Program Director at the end of the research project using a three-point rubric. Comments and recommendations will be recorded. | refines or enhancements moving forward.  
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. Program Director will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. |
| 3 | Utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context | Varies | 1. An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at end of 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. Exit survey completed by students at end of degree.  
3. Masters applied research projects completed in MRP 5963 will be evaluated by the Program Director at the end of the research project using a three-point rubric. Comments and recommendations will be recorded.  
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. Program Director will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. |
| 4 | Apply program-specific knowledge across disciplines to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework. | Varies | 1. An assessment survey will be completed by each instructor at end of 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.  
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. Program Director will follow up on action items from the previous year to determine impact and possible refinements or enhancements moving forward. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>curriculum/pedagogies/artifacts/assessment methods.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Exit survey completed by students at end of degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Masters applied research projects completed in MRP 5963 will be evaluated by the Program Director at the end of the research project using a three-point rubric. Comments and recommendations will be recorded.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Questions**

1. On what schedule/cycle will faculty assess each of the above-noted program learning outcomes? (It is not recommended to try to assess every outcome every year.)
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major or Minor Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>AA 5221</th>
<th>ORLD 5050</th>
<th>Primary Concentration (4 courses)</th>
<th>Secondary Concentration (4 courses)</th>
<th>MRP 1, 2, &amp; 3 (Capstone)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Example: Outcome #1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The primary concentration’s discipline-specific learning outcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The secondary concentration’s discipline-specific learning outcome.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>1, 2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply program-specific knowledge across disciplines to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Describe how, and the extent to which, program faculty contributed to the development of this plan.
   The Program Director 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 outcomes can be distinguished and evidence towards achievement reported.

3. On what schedule/cycle will faculty review and, if needed, modify this assessment plan?
   This plan will be reviewed annually to ensure it continues to meet the program’s needs. If a given learning outcome indicated areas in need of focused assessment, especially as it relates to one or more courses within the program or a foundational competency, then the schedule may be altered as needed. As SPS programs continually evolve to meet changing market needs, this assessment plan is dynamic and subject to change as the program evolves and new programs are offered.