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Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
(Discipline Knowledge) Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.

Connected Document
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Related Measures

M 1: History of Higher Education Final Paper
The History of Higher Education final paper will provide evidence of the students’ ability to understand the depth and breadth of United States higher education; 90 percent of the master’s students in the course will score at 3.0 or higher on a 4.0 scale.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 2: Masters Comprehensive Exam
The Masters Comprehensive Exam results for Fall 2013 will provide data on students’ knowledge of the field; 90 percent of the students will score at 3.0 or higher on a 4.0 scale, and the average score will be 3.20 or higher.

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities
(Skills/Abilities) Students have the ability to identify and help solve current problems facing Higher Education.
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Related Measures

M 3: Student Affairs Paper
The Student Affairs Paper.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

M 4: Conceptual Analysis Paper
The Conceptual Analysis Paper.

Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

SLO 3: Students acquire mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Students acquire mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of Higher Education
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Related Measures

M 5: Differentiated Perspectives
Ability to critically assess and accurately represent Differentiated Perspectives.

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**M 6: Comprehensive Exam**
The Comprehensive Exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
**Target:** 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 4: Students have the ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education**
Students have the ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education
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**Related Measures**

**M 7: Internship Experience**
The Internship Experience
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
**Target:** 80% of students will score a 3 or higher

**M 8: Internship**
The Internship, as assessed by the offices in which students work.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation
**Target:** 80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

**SLO 5: Recognized quality**
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality
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**Related Measures**

**M 9: National conference presentation**
Scholarly work of faculty.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
**Target:** Faculty will average 1 national conference presentation and 2 publications each year

**M 10: 50% of faculty will be requested to be discussants and editorial board members.**
faculty participation on editorial board.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
**Target:** 50% of faculty will be requested to be discussants and editorial board members

**SLO 6: Optimal level**
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion
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**Related Measures**

**M 11: Enroll at least 20 doctoral students across Executive Ed.D**
Doctoral program enrollment.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
**Target:** Doctoral program will continue to enroll at least 20 doctoral students across Executive Ed.D., Gadsden, and traditional main campus sites/modes

**M 12: Average time to degree**
Time taken to complete the degree.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
**Target:** Average time to degree will be below 5.0 years

**SLO 7: Program Value**
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves
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**Related Measures**

**M 13: Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation**
Alumni will value program experiences and preparation
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation

**M 14: Campus outreach**
Program faculty will be active in campus outreach

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Program faculty will be invited to present at least 3 different sessions in campus outreach

### Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

#### Survey of Graduates

- **Established in Cycle:** 2012-2013
- **Implementation Status:** Planned
- **Priority:** High
- **Implementation Description:** Online survey administered by outside agency.
- **Responsible Person/Group:** College of Education Dean's Office.
- **Additional Resources:** None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
(Discipline Knowledge) Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.
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Related Measures

M 1: History of Higher Education Final Paper
The History of Higher Education Final Paper
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All of the master’s students in BEF 653 in 2013-2013 scored at 3.0 or higher on their final paper.

M 2: Masters Comprehensive Exam
The Masters Comprehensive Exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Again as in the previous year, 95% of students had an average score of 3 or higher on their Masters Comprehensive Examination.

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities
(Skills/Abilities) Students have the ability to identify and help solve current problems facing Higher Education.
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Related Measures

M 3: Student Affairs Paper
The Student Affairs Paper.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All of the students enrolled in AHE 521 scored 3 or higher on their Student Affairs paper.

M 4: Conceptual Analysis Paper
The Conceptual Analysis Paper.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All of the students enrolled in AHE 500 scored 3 or higher on their Conceptual Analysis paper.

SLO 3: Students acquire mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Students acquire mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of Higher Education

Connected Document
Related Measures

M 5: Differentiated Perspectives
Ability to critically assess and accurately represent Differentiated Perspectives.
Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Twenty of 35 students (83%) enrolled in AHE 550 scored 3 or higher on their ability to critically assess and accurately represent Differentiated Perspectives.

M 6: Comprehensive Exam
The Comprehensive Exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All students who took the master's comprehensive examination in 2012-2013 passed with a score of 3 or higher.

SLO 4: Students have the ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education
Students have the ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education
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Related Measures

M 7: Internship Experience
The Internship Experience
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
80% of students will score a 3 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
All of the students in AHE 592 scored 3 or higher on their internship experience.

M 8: Internship
The Internship, as assessed by the offices in which students work.
Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation

Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Ninety percent of the students in AHE 591 were assessed as 3 or higher on the internship by their sponsoring offices.

SLO 5: Recognized quality
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality
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Related Measures

M 9: National conference presentation
Scholarly work of faculty.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Faculty will average 1 national conference presentation and 2 publications each year

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012 Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th. At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes. As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans

M 10: 50% of faculty will be requested to be discussants and editorial board members.
Faculty participation on editorial board.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
50% of faculty will be requested to be discussants and editorial board members
Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012 Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th. At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes. As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.

SLO 6: Optimal level
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion
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Related Measures

M 11: Enroll at least 20 doctoral students across Executive Ed.D
Doctoral program enrollment.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Doctoral program will continue to enroll at least 20 doctoral students across Executive Ed.D., Gadsden, and traditional main campus sites/modes

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012 Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th. At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes. As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans

M 12: Average time to degree
Time taken to complete the degree.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Average time to degree will be below 5.0 years

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
The average time to completion of the master's degree in Higher Education is 1.5 years.

SLO 7: Program Value
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves
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Related Measures

M 13: Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation
Alumni will value program experiences and preparation

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Not Reported This Cycle
We are awaiting the results of an alumni and alumnae survey to be administered in December 2013.

Related Action Plans (by Established cycle, then alpha):
For full information, see the Details of Action Plans section of this report.

Survey of Graduates
Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

M 14: Campus outreach
Program faculty will be active in campus outreach

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Program faculty will be invited to present at least 3 different sessions in campus outreach

Finding (2012-2013) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012 Subject:
Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports

The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th. At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes. As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a "time out" on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.

Details of Action Plans for This Cycle (by Established cycle, then alpha)

Survey of Graduates

The College of Education will survey its graduates in December 2013.

Established in Cycle: 2012-2013
Implementation Status: Planned
Priority: High

Relationships (Measure | Outcome/Objective):
- Measure: Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation
- Outcome/Objective: Program Value

Implementation Description: Online survey administered by outside agency.
Responsible Person/Group: College of Education Dean's Office.
Additional Resources: None
Mission / Purpose

The mission of the Department of Educational Leadership, Policy and Technology Studies is to prepare ethical and reflective practitioners, researchers, and scholars for work in K-12, higher education, and other educational settings. Through teaching and outreach, the Department strives to promote the values, knowledge, and skills needed to improve education in the state and across the region; and through the scholarly activities of its faculty and students, contribute to national research. Leadership, in all areas, requires an understanding of curricular, instructional, supervisory, and administrative processes—as well as an awareness of the ever-changing social, philosophical, historical, political, cultural, legal, moral, and economic contexts of education. Programs offered through the Department meet this challenge by focusing on knowledge construction, learning, and pedagogy, and the development of professional practice that respects diversity, honors difference, and promotes social justice. The Department also maintains an on-going, open dialogue about school improvement through its association with various federal, state, and local educational agencies and professional organizations.

Student Learning Outcomes, with Any Associations and Related Measures, Targets, Findings, and Action Plans

SLO 1: Discipline Knowledge
(Discipline Knowledge) Knowledge of key theoretical positions within the field.
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Related Measures

M 1: History of Higher Education Final Paper
The History of Higher Education Final Paper
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
19 of 21 (90%) students in BEF 553 scored 3 or higher on the History of Higher Education Final Paper.

M 2: Masters Comprehensive Exam
The Masters Comprehensive Exam.
Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
95% of students had an average score of 3 or higher on their Masters Comprehensive Exam.

SLO 2: Skills/Abilities
(Skills/Abilities) Students have the ability to identify and help solve current problems facing Higher Education.
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Related Measures

M 3: Student Affairs Paper
The Student Affairs Paper.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
27 of 29 (93%) students enrolled in AHE 521 scored 3 or higher on their Student Affairs Paper.

M 4: Conceptual Analysis Paper
The Conceptual Analysis Paper.
Source of Evidence: Written assignment(s), usually scored by a rubric
Target:
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher
Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
14 of 15 students (93%) enrolled in AHE 500 scored 3 or higher on their Conceptual Analysis Paper.

SLO 3: Students acquire mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge
(An Improvement Outcome Derived From their 2010-11 Assessment Findings) Students acquire mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge in the field of Higher Education
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**Related Measures**

**M 5: Differentiated Perspectives**  
Ability to critically assess and accurately represent Differentiated Perspectives.  

Source of Evidence: Academic direct measure of learning - other  

**Target:**  
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher  

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
37 of 45 students (82%) who enrolled in AHE 550 scored 3 or higher on their ability to critically assess and accurately represent Differentiated Perspectives  

**M 6: Comprehensive Exam**  
The Comprehensive Exam.  

Source of Evidence: Comprehensive/end-of-program subject matter exam  

**Target:**  
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher  

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
All students (100%) who took Comprehensive Exams in 2011-2012 passed with an average grade of 3 or higher  

**SLO 4: Students have the ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education**  
Students have the ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education  
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**Related Measures**

**M 7: Internship Experience**  
The Internship Experience  

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  

**Target:**  
80% of students will score a 3 or higher  

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
11 of 12 students (92%) who completed AHE 592 scored 3 or higher on Internship Experience  

**M 8: Internship**  
The Internship, as assessed by the offices in which students work.  

Source of Evidence: Field work, internship, or teaching evaluation  

**Target:**  
80% or more of students will score 3 or higher  

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
11 of 12 students (92%) were assessed as 3 or higher on the Internship by the office in which they worked  

**SLO 5: Recognized quality**  
The program will improve and sustain a high level of recognized quality  
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**Related Measures**

**M 9: National conference presentation**  
Scholarly work of faculty.  

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other  

**Target:**  
Faculty will average 1 national conference presentation and 2 publications each year  

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**  
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012  

Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports  

The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th.  

At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes.  

As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.  

**M 10: 50% of faculty will be requested to be discussants and editorial board members.**  
faculty participation on editorial board.  

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other
Target:
50% of faculty will be requested to be discussants and editorial board members

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012

Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports

The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th.

At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes.

As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.

SLO 6: Optimal level
The program will build and sustain an optimal level of annual program enrollments and degree completion

Related Measures

M 11: Enroll at least 20 doctoral students across Executive Ed.D
Doctoral program enrollment.
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Doctoral program will continue to enroll at least 20 doctoral students across Executive Ed.D., Gadsden, and traditional main campus sites/modes

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012

Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports

The purpose of this email is to ask you to reduce the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th.

At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes.

As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.

M 12: Average time to degree
Time taken to complete the degree.

Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Average time to degree will be below 5.0 years

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Analysis of graduating class demonstrates an average time to completion of degree as 1.45 years for 9 students
One student took longer than two years.

SLO 7: Program Value
The program will be highly valued by its program graduates and other key constituencies it serves

Related Measures

M 13: Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation
Alumni will value program experiences and preparation
Source of Evidence: Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

Target:
Alumni will indicate a level of 4.0 or higher on satisfaction with program experiences and preparation

Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012

Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports

The purpose of this email is to ask you to **reduce** the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th.

At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes.

As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.

**M 14: Campus outreach**
Program faculty will be active in campus outreach

**Source of Evidence:** Academic indirect indicator of learning - other

**Target:**
Program faculty will be invited to present at least 3 different sessions in campus outreach

**Finding (2011-2012) - Target: Met**
Waiting to complete, as instructed by the following email from Bob Smallwood dated 5/14/2012

Subject: Modification of Requirements for the July 15th Annual Assessment Reports

The purpose of this email is to ask you to **reduce** the amount of assessment documentation you are planning to provide in your 2011-12 Annual Assessment Reports that are due July 15th.

At the beginning of this academic year, you submitted an assessment plan for each of the undergraduate and graduate degree programs offered within your department. Those assessment plans included a mission statement, three common program outcomes, four or more student learning outcomes, and two or more assessment measures to be employed in monitoring achievement of each of your stated outcomes.

As much as we are reluctant to make any changes in annual report requirements at this late date, wisdom would suggest we take a “time out” on asking you to provide supporting documentation for the three common outcomes you included last September for each degree program within your annual assessment plans.
### Curriculum Maps #1 (In which courses or in what activities or assignments are Student Learning Outcomes Addressed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>AHE 500</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>AHE 521</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>AHE 550</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>AHE 553</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>AHE 540</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 6</td>
<td>AHE 592</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Curriculum Map II (What assessment measures will be employed in which courses/activities/assignments for each Student learning Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course 1</th>
<th>AHE 500</th>
<th>Knowledge of key scholars and their contribution to the field of Higher Education</th>
<th>Course Embedded Assignment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course 2</td>
<td>AHE 521</td>
<td>Identify current problems facing Higher Education</td>
<td>Conceptual Analysis Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 3</td>
<td>AHE 550</td>
<td>Mastery of breadth and depth of knowledge</td>
<td>Course Embedded Assignment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 4</td>
<td>BEF 553</td>
<td>Ability to perform professional duties in Higher Education</td>
<td>History Paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course 5</td>
<td>AHE 592</td>
<td>Intern checklist</td>
<td>Supervisor Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Internship</td>
<td>Written Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Comprehensive Exams</td>
<td>Written Responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Program Rubric

Faculty evaluate candidates based on four criteria:
(1) organization, accuracy and comprehensiveness,
(2) consistency with the concepts and ideas found in the current literature,
(3) the production of a logical, valid, and persuasive argument, and
(4) the demonstration of scholarly writing.

The point scale used to evaluate student responses on these four categories:

5 = Excellent answer, all points of the question are answered fully with comprehensive documentation. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear and concise.

4 = Good answer, well above average, all points of the question are answered with documentation that generally supports the answer. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear and concise. Errors in minor details of answers are tolerated.

3 = Answer is adequate, all points of the question are treated but at a minimal level and with sketchy documentation. Information is valid and pertinent. Organization is logical and language is clear. Minor errors are tolerated.

2 = Answer is inadequate, fewer than half of the points called for by the question are answered and documentation is either lacking or is erroneous. Portions of the information are invalid and not pertinent. Organization lacks a logical flow and language is vague. Major points made in the answer are in error.

1 = Answer is less than would be expected from a competent graduate student. Documentation is absent and most of the information is incorrect. The answer does not address the question, lacks logical flow and indicates a deficiency in verbal skills.

0 = N/A The answer is inadequate, does not address the question and is incorrect.