Assurance of Student Learning 2018-2019	
College of Education and Behavioral Science	Educational Administration, Leadership, and Research
Organizational Leadership 545	

Use this page to list learning outcomes, measurements, and summarize results for your program. Detailed information must be completed in the subsequent pages.

Student Learning Outcome 1: Analyze and apply leadership theories, models, approaches, and constructs that create and effective leadership process

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Capstone Project/Research Paper
Instrument 2	Direct: Examination of Pre-Post Program Assessment Survey Results
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.	Met	Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 2: Compare and contrast behaviors of effective leaders

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Capstone Project/Research Paper
Instrument 2	Direct: Examination of Pre-Post Program Assessment Survey Results
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	Met	Not Met

Student Learning Outcome 3: Evaluate or predict ethical leadership perspectives and how they impact the leadership process

Instrument 1	Direct: Analysis of Personal Ethical Analysis Paper
Instrument 2	Direct: Examination of Pre-Post Program Assessment Survey Results
Instrument 3	

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	Met	Not Met

Program Summary (Briefly summarize the action and follow up items from your detailed responses on subsequent pages.)

Overall, the results are mixed in regard to SLOs. The curriculum has needed revision and transformation that was not possible due to limited full-time faculty (two full-time faculty for approximately 150 students). Under new College administrative leadership, the Program was moved to its present Department (EALR) at the end of the Fall 2018 term and has undergone WKU's Comprehensive Academic Program Evaluation (CAPE). The new Department has needed resources to facilitate a revision of the existing curriculum and new faculty were hired (now three full-time faculty). The CAPE results indicated that the program needed transformation. The transformation process will begin during the 2019 fall term. This process will review SLOs to the University mission then assess existing course SLOs to the program SLOs. The present program is more of a collection of courses rather than a program. The revisions to occur are to re-define the core classes by eliminate course options within the core to ensure a set and progressive core for the program.

Electives will consist of a specific cognate through advisor approved courses or inclusion of an undergraduate minor or certificate as electives. The capstone course will continue its focus on preparing students for careers after graduation but will have a more deliberate connection between the program core courses and electives (cognate). A new student learning assessment will replace the present process in the capstone course to provide faculty with better data for assessment. An exit survey on the program is also planned as in indirect measure of SLO achievement. Other program revisions may occur as the transformation process occurs over the next two (2019-2021) academic years.

Student Learning Outcome 1			
Student Learning Outcome	Analyze and apply leadership theories, models, approaches, and constructs that create and effective leadership process		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measures of student learning: Students in the capstone course were given a final, written project/research paper that required them to synthesize their work in the program's core courses. The paper was broken into two parts to evaluate SLOs 1 and 2. To assess SLO 1, students were asked interview three people who were in their proposed professional field that they will pursue upon graduation. Each interview focused on both the profession (to lean more from practitioners) and the leadership theories, models, approaches, and constructs viewed as most effective in that profession. Students then compared interview results to program defined leadership approaches, theories, models, and constructs linking theory and/or concepts to practice.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper "milestone" and lower "capstone" on the Association of American Colleges and Universities (AACU) Critical Thinking + Analysis + Written Communication Rubric (modified to accommodate leadership SLOs). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from "Capstone (4)," "Milestones (3)/(2)," and "Benchmark (1)."		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	40%
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the capstone course project/paper were collected from a random sample of students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). At the time of the evaluation there was only one full-time faculty in the program; this is why 10 random samples were assessed. The rubric used for scoring was the AACU Critical Thinking + Analysis + Written Communication Rubric (modified to accommodate leadership SLO 1).		
Measurement Instrument 2	DIRECT: Students completed a pre-post leadership assessment based on SLOs. The test consisted of 22 questions that required students to select all the correct answers. Four questions were used to assess SLO 1 and 2 as these questions combined leadership theories, models, approaches, constructs and leader behaviors.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program should increase their score on the online assessment for each SLO by at least 10 percent.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	10% increase in scores of correct answers between pre and post-tests by 80% of students	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	70%
Methods	The pre-test was administered during the first core course (LEAD 300) and the post-test was administered during the capstone course (LEAD 400). The test consisted of 22 questions that required students to select all the correct answers. Four questions were used to assess SLOs 1 and 2. The test was online and developed using Qualtrics software. The results of the pre-post tests were collected and compared using the students WKU identification number that was included in the data.		
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			

Program Success Target for this Measurement		Percent of Program Achieving Target	
Methods			
Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 1.		Met	**Not Met**

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

The program summary best describes the actions to correct program deficiencies for this SLO. Specific actions to improve this SLO will emerge from the ongoing transformation process. Questions driving the transformation process include a) Are SLOs aligned to the University mission? b) What artifacts will provide the most accurate data to assess SLOs? c) Are the learning outcomes measurable? d) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? E) How do we assess program electives in relationship to the core classes?

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

The program summary and actions above best describe follow-up actions. The timeline for these actions is as follows:

   - Fall 2019: develop framework for program transformation and revise/develop program learning outcomes.

   - Spring 2020: align existing courses to new program learning outcomes; identify gaps and overages in existing curriculum; develop and assessment strategy for the transformed program.

   - Summer/Fall 2020: revise core programs; process program and core course revisions through the curriculum approval process.

   - Spring 2021: revise LEAD electives and process revisions through the curriculum approval process; complete revision of capstone course and program assessment.

   - Fall 2021: program revised and implemented.

Student Learning Outcome 2			
Student Learning Outcome	Compare and contrast behaviors of effective leaders		
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT measures of student learning: Students in the capstone course were given a final, written project/research paper that required them to synthesize their work in the program's core courses. The paper was broken into two parts to evaluate SLOs 1 and 2. To assess SLO 2, students were asked interview five people who were in their proposed professional field that they will pursue upon graduation. Each interview focused on both the profession (to lean more from practitioners) and the leader behaviors viewed as most effective in that profession. Students then compared interview results to program defined effective leader behaviors linking theory and/or concepts to practice.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper "milestone" and lower "capstone" on the AACU Critical Thinking + Analysis + Written Communication Rubric (modified to accommodate leadership SLOs). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from "Capstone (4)," "Milestones (3)/(2)," and "Benchmark (1)."		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	80%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	60%
Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the capstone course project/paper were collected from a random sample of students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). At the time of the evaluation there was only one full-time faculty in the program; this is why 10 random samples were assessed. The rubric used for scoring was the AACU Critical Thinking + Analysis + Written Communication Rubric (modified to accommodate leadership SLO 2).		
Measurement Instrument 2	DIRECT: Students completed a pre-post leadership assessment based on SLOs. The test consisted of 22 questions that required students to select all the correct answers. Four questions were used to assess SLO 1 and 2 as these questions combined leadership theories, models, approaches, constructs and leader behaviors.		
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program should increase their score on the online assessment for each SLO by at least 10 percent.		
Program Success Target for this Measurement	10% increase in scores of correct answers between pre and post-tests by 80% of students	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	70%
Methods	The pre-test was administered during the first core course (LEAD 300) and the post-test was administered during the capstone course (LEAD 400). The test consisted of 22 questions that required students to select all the correct answers. Four questions were used to assess SLOs 1 and 2. The test was online and developed using Qualtrics software. The results of the pre-post tests were collected and compared using the students WKU identification number that was included in the data.		
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	
Methods			

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 2.	**Met**	**Not Met**

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

The program summary best describes the actions to correct program deficiencies for this SLO. Specific actions to improve this SLO will emerge from the ongoing transformation process. Questions driving the transformation process include a) Are SLOs aligned to the University mission? b) What artifacts will provide the most accurate data to assess SLOs? c) Are the learning outcomes measurable? d) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? E) How do we assess program electives in relationship to the core classes?

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

The program summary and actions above best describe follow-up actions. The timeline for these actions is as follows:

- Fall 2019: develop framework for program transformation and revise/develop program learning outcomes.

- Spring 2020: align existing courses to new program learning outcomes; identify gaps and overages in existing curriculum; develop and assessment strategy for the transformed program.

- Summer/Fall 2020: revise core programs; process program and core course revisions through the curriculum approval process.

- Spring 2021: revise LEAD electives and process revisions through the curriculum approval process; complete revision of capstone course and program assessment.

- Fall 2021: program revised and implemented.

Student Learning Outcome 3	
Student Learning Outcome	Evaluate or predict ethical leadership perspectives and how they impact the leadership process
Measurement Instrument 1	DIRECT: Students in the required leadership ethics course were given a written assignment to create a personal ethical leadership statement that required them to synthesize their ethical perspective in relationship to their leadership approach. To assess SLO 3, students had to define their ethical perspective based on ethical models, theories, and constructs discussed in the course. Students then compared their ethical perspective to effective leader behaviors linking theory and/or concepts to practice.
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program score between upper "milestone" and lower "capstone" on the AACU Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric (modified to accommodate the ethical leadership SLO). Scores on the rubric item for this SLO ranged from "Capstone (4)," "Milestones (3)/(2)," and "Benchmark (1)."

Program Success Target for this Measurement	80%	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	80%

Methods	Direct: Artifacts from the required leadership ethics course ethical leadership statement paper were collected from a random sample of students in the course ($N = 10$) and all identifiers removed (student name, course numbers, faculty name). At the time of the evaluation there was only one full-time faculty in the program; this is why 10 random samples were assessed. The rubric used for scoring was the AACU Ethical Reasoning Value Rubric (modified to accommodate leadership SLO 3).
Measurement Instrument 2	DIRECT: Students completed a pre-post leadership assessment based on SLOs. The test consisted of 22 questions that required students to select all the correct answers. Three questions were used to assess SLO 3.
Criteria for Student Success	Students should at the end of the program should increase their score on the online assessment for SLO 3 by at least 10 percent.

Program Success Target for this Measurement	10% increase in scores of correct answers between pre and post-tests by 80% of students	**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	40%
Methods	The pre-test was administered during the first core course (LEAD 300) and the post-test was administered during the capstone course (LEAD 400). The test consisted of 22 questions that required students to select all the correct answers. Three questions were used to assess SLO 3. The test was online and developed using Qualtrics software. The results of the pre-post tests were collected and compared using the students WKU identification number that was included in the data.		
Measurement Instrument 3			
Criteria for Student Success			
Program Success Target for this Measurement		**Percent of Program Achieving Target**	
Methods			

Based on your results, circle or highlight whether the program met the goal Student Learning Outcome 3.	Met	Not Met

Actions (Describe the decision-making process and actions planned for program improvement. The actions should include a timeline.)

The program summary best describes the actions to correct program deficiencies for this SLO. Although the second direct measure indicates students did not meet expectations the first direct method did and is viewed as more significant that the second direct measure. Specific actions to improve this SLO will emerge from the ongoing transformation process. Questions driving the transformation process include a) Are SLOs aligned to the University mission? b) What artifacts will provide the most accurate data to assess SLOs? c) Are the learning outcomes measurable? d) Are the learning outcomes of core courses appropriately designed to address program outcomes? E) How do we assess program electives in relationship to the core classes?

Follow-Up (Provide your timeline for follow-up. If follow-up has occurred, describe how the actions above have resulted in program improvement.)

The program summary and actions above best describe follow-up actions. The timeline for these actions is as follows:
   - Fall 2019: develop framework for program transformation and revise/develop program learning outcomes.
   - Spring 2020: align existing courses to new program learning outcomes; identify gaps and overages in existing curriculum; develop and assessment strategy for the transformed program.
   - Summer/Fall 2020: revise core programs; process program and core course revisions through the curriculum approval process.
   - Spring 2021: revise LEAD electives and process revisions through the curriculum approval process; complete revision of capstone course and program assessment.
   - Fall 2021: program revised and implemented.