Please attach a narrative (not to exceed 4 pages, excluding appendices) addressing the following:

- What are the student learning outcomes? Please provide a numbered list.
- Which learning outcomes were assessed?
- How were they assessed? (Programs must use at least one direct assessment of student learning.)
- Undergraduate programs should assess at least one University Undergraduate Learning Outcome (UULO) each year, which may or may not overlap with a program learning outcome.
- Graduate programs should assess at least one outcome related to one of the following graduate level requirements each year:
  - student engagement in research, scholarship, creative expression and/or appropriate high-level professional practice.
  - activities requiring originality, critical analysis and expertise.
  - the development of extensive knowledge in the field under study.

- What was learned from the assessment results?
- How did the program respond to what was learned?

Please limit the narrative portion of your report to no more than four pages. You may attach appendices with data, tables, charts, or other materials as needed. Please explain the relevant conclusions from any appendices in your narrative. Please contact the Office of Academic Assessment if you have questions or need assistance.
YEAR 3
Assessment of Learning Outcome 7
This phase will be undertaken as part of the 2017 assessment report update

7. Research Methods- Quantitative: Students will (a) describe, select and use advanced statistical research methods (including computer technology for the analysis of data); (b) describe the role of the scientific method; and (c) identify the threats to inference posed by various research designs and methods. Research Methods- Qualitative: Students will describe (a) qualitative approaches to exploring phenomena related to educational and other social contexts; (b) the theoretical and practical considerations of collecting and interpreting observation and interview data for presentation in a qualitative manuscript, and (c) criteria for establishing trustworthiness of qualitative studies.

The selection of learning outcome 7 for Year 3 of the Assessment plan was based on the need to address the remaining required methods courses for the Ph.D. The original plan was to have full-time faculty who teach EPY methods courses to confirm that the learning outcomes are an appropriate representation of the course content. However, the EPY faculty have been engaged in revising their courses and curriculum. Similarly, the higher education faculty are currently reviewing the PhD program due to the integration of new faculty members. Due to these substantial changes, a new plan will be devised for the next assessment to adequately evaluate learning outcome seven on a future report. Please see appendix A for the rubric depicting evaluation of doctoral level comprehensive exams. As mentioned previously, learning outcome 7 is evaluated directly through these exams.
Add Assessment of Learning Outcome 2, 3, & 6
*This phase completed as the 2016 assessment report update

2. Legal Issues: Understand the legal setting as it impacts post-secondary education leaders through text assignments, group project, case studies, in-depth research, essay, and project preparation; Develop knowledge of the nature and scope of legal resources; Expand & update knowledge of substantive aspects of higher education law; Practice and identify problems and legal case precedent on postsecondary educational leadership and administration. This course was taught by a new instructor Fall 2017. The faculty member has updated the course and syllabus using a new textbook, and aligning the syllabus with the learning outcomes identified in this report. Given that courses often change after the instructor teaches it the first time, the learning objectives will be reviewed on a future report, once consistency is established for the course assignments.

3. Designing & Critiquing Research: Match appropriate methodologies to particular research questions; Design and differentiate among a variety of methodologies (qualitative and quantitative) to answer particular research questions; Critique existing research and critically review research literature; Begin the process of defining a research problem, relate it to relevant literature; derive an appropriate method to study. This course was fully revamped for delivery in Fall 2017. The course now serves doctoral students in Higher Education as well as Educational Psychology. Given that courses often change after the instructor teaches it the first time, the learning objectives will be reviewed on a future report, once consistency is established for the course assignments.

6. Public Policy: Contextualize education policy analysis with regard to the public good; understand different conceptual theories associated with policy development, implementation, and outcomes; Apply theoretical knowledge to particular higher education problems.

The selection of learning outcomes 2, 3, & 6 for year 2 of the Assessment plan was based on the need to address the remaining required core courses for the Ph.D. degree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Assigned Readings / Peer review</th>
<th>Policy Forum Papers (3)</th>
<th>Ignite Policy presentations (3)</th>
<th>Comprehensive Final Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EDH 738 Public Policy in Higher Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contextualize education policy analysis with regard to the public good</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand different conceptual theories associated with policy development, implementation, and outcomes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the types of institutions, their governance structure and policy;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apply theoretical knowledge to particular higher education problems</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the role the Federal Government has played in the</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With new faculty members hired in spring 2017 and beginning in fall of 2017, the goal was to have all core PhD courses taught by tenure track program faculty. These courses should be taught every other academic year, therefore higher education faculty members were designated to teach and re-develop the course with appropriate learning outcomes and assessments beginning in Fall 2018. Due to this current change in faculty, the outcomes noted here reflect only EDH 738 Public Policy in Higher Education course. The faculty member teaching this course works jointly with the Educational Psychology program as a qualitative methodologist and also within the Higher Education program. She provided the syllabi currently being used in the course.

In addition to course specific elements that address Learning Outcomes 1-7, these outcomes will also be assessed through relevant comprehensive exam scores, the dissertation proposal, and the dissertation over a three-year period from all committee members.

**Comprehensive Exams**

The two-part comprehensive exams require students to situate their research interests/question within the context and constructs of higher education, and is particularly relevant to both year 1 and year 2 outcomes. Students’ advisors will be responsible for collecting the appropriate documentation, summarizing committee members’ comments, and submitting those data to the Ph.D. program coordinator.

To be eligible to take Part I of the comprehensive examination students must have completed the following courses: History of American Higher Education (EDH 703); Finance & Budgeting (EDH 710); Theory of Educational Organizations (EDH 715); Public Policy in Higher Education (EDH 738); and Higher Education Law (EDH 705). Part I of the doctoral comprehensive examination assesses student competence in the H.E. substantive core content coursework. To be eligible to take Part II of the comprehensive examination students must have completed the following courses: Designing and Critiquing Research (EDH 707); Evaluation Research Methods (EPY 716), Qualitative Research Methodology (EPY 718); and Inferential Statistics & Experimental Design (EPY 722). Part II of the doctoral comprehensive examination assesses student competence in the Research core and methods coursework.

The learning outcomes will be measured using an evaluation rubric shared with students prior to the examination (See Appendix A for a complete grading rubric). Program faculty members utilizing the attached rubric will evaluate both Part I & Part II of the examination. A score of 4 and above on a 6 point scale must be attained on the exams to pass. Passing grades awarded by a majority of the faculty evaluators are required for a pass to be awarded. The faculty expects students will score above four on each part of the examination.
YEAR 1
Assess Learning Outcomes 1, 4, & 5
*This phase was completed in the 2015 Assessment report

As noted earlier, Learning Outcome 1 was selected to coordinate with the planned first year assessment of learning outcomes for the master’s program since students in the PhD program may be enrolled in EDH 703 (History of American H. E.), depending on their background. EDH 710 (Finance & Budgeting) and EDH 715 (Organization Theory) constitute the remaining core courses for Learning Outcomes 4 & 5.

These three required core courses (EDH 703, EDH 710, and EDH 715) contribute heavily to the outcomes that were assessed during Year 1. The content for each of the three required courses was further defined as indicated in the accompanying charts produced by the faculty for assessing each element are indicated. Any part-time faculty who may teach these courses will be required to participate in any assessments identified for these courses. The course instructors will assemble and analyze the data and provide information to the PhD program coordinator for these learning outcomes.

Assessment of Learning Outcome 1: Higher Education History

The connection paper and presentation assignment is to apply the course readings to a set of historical topics and issues in American higher education during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The oral history project requires students to interview someone (a senior acquaintance, colleague, or family member) from a different generation (before 1975) who attended college. Bring the results of your project to class for an informal presentation and discussion, as well as a 5-7 page summary of what you learned from the interview. A comprehensive seminar paper/final examination will be given in order to assess core historical competencies. Broad themes, pivotal figures, and watershed moments will be covered, and all content will be thoroughly explicated in class and throughout the assigned readings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes H. E. History EDH 703</th>
<th>Connection Paper &amp; Presentation</th>
<th>Oral History Paper and presentation</th>
<th>Comprehensive Seminar Paper/Final Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand and critically analyze the changing historical trends, issues, ideas and events in the development of American higher education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe the changes in student access, student life; and the relationship between students and colleges</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify the types of institutions, their governance structure and financing;</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand tenure and academic freedom; changes in the curriculum</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the role the Federal Government has played in the development of higher education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) Higher Education History Learning Outcomes:
This course is a historical overview of American higher education from the Colonial period to the present. The first half of the course concentrated on early colonial colleges and their curricula and the later proliferation of colleges that occurred in the nineteenth century. Attention was given to the movement from “elite” education of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries to “mass” education in the mid nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. These later time periods resulted in the growth of state universities and the founding of institutions for “special” populations of students. The second half of the course discussed the rise and growth of the research university and its relationship to federal and private funding and the impact this funding has had on higher education and “universal” access in the twentieth century. Throughout the course, attention was given to the history of the undergraduate curriculum for various types of institutions, the changing purposes of higher education, and the growth in hierarchical categorization of higher education as college attendance became more accessible to larger numbers of students.

1. Debate/Discussion Connection Paper:

Using the scholarly/academic literature and citations this debate/discussion connection paper guided students to learn and comprehend the historical significance and change overtime of American higher education in the terms of its diversity of institutional types, its curricular offerings, and its costs and economic outcomes. Through this assignment, their readings, and robust class debates and discussions students clearly captured an understanding of the various institutional types from the elitist liberal arts colleges (only few could attend), to the development of the teaching or normal schools (state or regional schools), to the creation of the German research universities, and finally to the American innovation of the community colleges. The students also learned that within these institutional types there were numerous curriculum changes (liberal arts or classical, career and practical, and professional, and elective) degrees (e.g., AA, BA, MA, PH.D), governance and financing issues between public and private institutions, student access, tenure and academic freedom, and the role the Federal governments played in the development of higher education that occurred overtime.

2. Oral History Project:

This project allowed students to personally experience history through a historical interview process with a senior acquaintance, colleague, or family member from a different generation who attended college. Once the interview was completed they connected the individual’s experiences with the historical literature. Students also shared these lived connections and experiences with students in the class, and they summarized what they learned from the interview and literature connections. In this experience they could see the changing historical trends, issues, ideas and events in the development of American higher education for a generation they interviewed. They also identified the diversity of institutional types, their governance structure and financing (private or public), changes in curriculum, and understood, when applicable, tenure and academic freedom issue. Most important they experienced the changes in student access, student life; and the relationship between students and colleges, including current social movements.

3. Comprehensive Seminar Paper/Final Exam:

The final paper/exam allowed students to comprehensively learn and historically develop a topic of their choice. Students selected a single historical topic, an incident, a particular policy, or the career of a historically significant figure or institution, or group. The goal was to thoroughly understand and critically analyze the changing historical trends, issues, ideas and events in the development of American
higher education regarding their topic of choice. Similarly and within the context of their topic and if applicable, students were required to describe the changes in the curriculum, student access, student life; and the relationship between students and colleges. They also needed to identify the institutional type, and its governance structure and financing. If applicable, students connected a variety of issues regarding tenure and academic freedom, as well as the changing role the Federal Government played in the development of higher education more generally and with their topic more specifically.

Assessment of Learning Outcome 4: Finance & Budgeting

Critical reviews papers (3) critically examine the topic based on the week’s readings and prior readings from this course; The budget overview should include the institution’s economic environment, budget process, roles of senior administration and line managers, and to present a 10-15-minute budget overview of a higher education institution (public, private or proprietary; community college, regional comprehensive four-year college, or research university); The State Finance Report and the oral report should clearly present and explicitly compare the three states in terms of characteristics and features such as: the state context (e.g., economy, demographics, politics, public/private higher education system, governing or coordinating bodies, etc.) for financing higher education.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes Finance &amp; Budgeting EDH 710</th>
<th>Critical Review Papers 1-3</th>
<th>Budget Overview Presentation</th>
<th>State Finance Report</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Understand national, state, and institutional finance and funding concepts related to postsecondary education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the implications on educational values of how higher education systems are financed</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understand the economic concepts that underlie higher education systems; how they are funded, and actors’ decisions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesize and interpret critical finance and economic concepts</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Finance and Budgeting Learning Outcomes:

The learning objectives of this course included the understanding of how higher education systems and institutions are funded and the issues that accompany higher education finance and economics. We examined the implicit and explicit implications of funding mechanisms on such things as affordability, access, and efficiency. A secondary objective for this course was to introduce students to basic research and writing skills as a foundation for developing graduate-level writing assignments throughout the higher education program, including course research papers, critical reviews and other assignments.

Critical Review Papers (3): Students were asked to write three critical response papers over the course of the semester. The first critical response paper focused on the week’s topic (Federal Financing in Higher Education). The first review (10pts) gave students an opportunity to gauge my expectations for writing. The remaining two reviews were worth 15 points each. The Critical Reviews examined the topic based on the week’s readings and prior readings from this and other courses. Similar to your discussion questions, the papers were thought provoking and reflected a close analysis of the readings.
**Budget Overview Presentation:** Working in teams (two to three) students were expected to present a 10-15-minute budget overview of a higher education institution (public, private or proprietary; community college, regional comprehensive four-year college, or research university). The presentation required students to conduct some research on specific institutions. Students were able to retrieve budget information on the institutions, the state agency, IPEDS and/or from national organizations’ websites. The budget overview included the institution’s economic environment, budget process, roles of senior administration and line managers. Questions addressed during the presentation included, but were not limited to: What does the budget say about the priorities of the institution? Through an examination of the budget, what areas of program emphasis are most apparent? Your presentation should also incorporate readings to date in this and other courses. Good presentations were engaging, well organized and provided the class (audience) food for thought. Be creative.

**State Finance Report:** The written paper and the oral report clearly presented and explicitly compared the three states in terms of characteristics and features such as: the state context (e.g., economy, demographics, politics, public/private higher education system, governing or coordinating bodies, etc.) for financing higher education; trends and patterns in higher education finance (e.g., recent and current years’ enrollment and tuition/fees at public/private, 4-year/2-year institutions, state appropriations and related state budget issues, state need-based and merit-based aid for students, tax capacity and tax effort, affordability issues, income per capita, endowments/fundraising, state/institutional expenditures on research/instruction, etc.), and critical issues influencing the financing of higher education in the state (e.g., outlook for state funding, changes in political leadership, new initiatives, pending legislation, tax laws being discussed, society’s support for higher education, concerns about tuition and aid programs, special attention to issues related to two- or four-year or public or private institutions, etc.). In addition, when possible and appropriate, comparisons with national averages and trends were also conducted.

**Assessment of Learning Outcome 5: Organizational Theory**

**Journal Article Reading Papers** (3): Through this assignment, students will gain guided practice with reading and taking notes from empirical research studies, published as journal articles. Each research study has five key elements: 1) the problem or issue that motivates the study, usually labeled the “research problem”; 2) the purpose of the study – that is, what the study seeks to accomplish in relation to the problem or issue; 3) methods and data sources; 4) study findings; and 5) implications and recommendations based on those findings. **Organizational Analysis Papers** (3): Each seminar member will develop an organizational analysis of a higher education institution with which he or she is familiar (or a department or unit within such an organization). Each of the three papers will provide: (1) A brief description of one – and only one – organizational problem, challenge, or opportunity that the institution (or department/unit) is encountering. The problem, challenge, or opportunity must be related to the organizational construct on which the paper focuses (e.g., structure, human relations, power, or culture), (2) an analysis of that problem using one – and only one – organizational theory related to the organizational construct on which the paper focuses. **Literature Review** (1): Each seminar member will write a literature review. Seminar members will select from five possible topics (External environment, organizational structure, human relations in organizations, organizational power/politics, and organizational culture). Each topic contains a defined set of journal articles. Use the articles to develop a literature review that achieves the following goals: (1) Uses the literature to describe a higher education organizational problem, challenge, or opportunity on which the paper will focus; (2) Explains
why the problem, challenge, or opportunity is important to the field of higher education; (3) Uses the study findings in these journal articles to identify and discuss important dimensions of the problem, challenge, or opportunity; and (4) Provides a set of recommendations for practice, which are based on the analysis of the literature in relation to the problem, challenge, or opportunity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Outcomes Organization Theory EDH 715</th>
<th>Journal Article Reading Papers</th>
<th>Organizational Analysis Papers</th>
<th>Literature Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Define and describe relationships among the positivist, social constructionist, and postmodern paradigms in the social sciences</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Describe and apply theories associated with five prominent constructs in the field of organizational theory: external environments, internal structures, human relations, organizational power, and organizational culture</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and discuss the prominent research findings in the literature on higher education organizations</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(2) Organization Theory Learning Outcomes:

Journal Article Reading Papers (3): Students completed a note-taking template, which was designed to record information related to each of the five elements noted above. Students completed and submitted to the instructor the note-taking template for 3 articles. Completed templates were evaluated on the basis of the following criteria: (1) The completed template clearly and concisely identifies the research problem and the purpose of the study; (2) the completed template clearly and concisely identifies the methods and data sources used by the authors in their analysis, and (3) the completed template clearly and concisely identifies the key findings of the study, and the implications and recommendations that follow from those findings.

Organizational Analysis Papers (3): These papers were evaluated based on the following criteria:
- The paper clearly describes an organizational problem, challenge, or opportunity, using terminology associated with organizational analysis (that is, terms and concepts that we have used in class).
- The paper identifies and briefly describes a theory that is well-suited to explain the organizational problem, challenge, or opportunity identified previously.
- The paper uses the theory to explain and deepen the reader’s understanding of the problem, challenge, or opportunity.
- The paper’s conclusion points toward specific recommendations for leadership practice; these recommendations clearly emanate from the analysis in the previous section of the paper.
- Components of the paper are linked by effective transitions
- Few errors in grammar, word usage, reference citations, and punctuation

Literature Review: The following Assessment Criteria were used:
- introduction clearly and concisely describes the problem, challenge, or opportunity
- the significance of the problem, challenge, or opportunity is articulated clearly and concisely
- a unique, integrative analysis is presented (not just a reiteration or summary of the articles)
- sufficient and appropriate evidence from the literature is used to support arguments
• recommendations are clearly based in the analysis (emerge from the analysis)
• content would be clear to a general higher education audience whose members have not read the articles
• components of the paper are linked by effective transitions
• few errors in grammar, word usage, reference citations, and punctuation

Additionally, the seminar members acquired the following skills and understandings from the assignments:

Skills
1. use theory to think critically about colleges and universities as complex organizations
2. use theory to analyze, diagnose, and address organizational problems, challenges, and opportunities in colleges and universities
3. use theory to develop strategies for enacting organizational change in higher education institutions
4. through academic writing, analyze, integrate, and synthesize research findings from the literature on higher education organizations to develop more extensive understandings of key organizational issues and questions
5. be able to convey information about research problems, methods, and findings, and be able to draw implications from those findings

Understandings
Seminar members will be able to use a range of organizational theories to:
1. understand and assess their own leadership practice
2. reflect on colleges and universities as organizational systems
3. reflect on leadership as an organizational process
4. reflect on the opportunities and challenges associated with organizational change in higher education
5. reflect on the social justice, ethical, and equity implications of organizational structures, cultures, and practices
## APPENDIX A: Higher Education
### Evaluation for Grading Doctoral Written Comprehensive Examinations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Descriptor</th>
<th>General Summation of Response/ Evaluative Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Outstanding</td>
<td>Response integrates major research or relevant studies into an analytical perspective. A well-organized, high-level response that illustrates synthesis and evaluation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Response is logically constructed and integrates some research into statement. Knowledge of field is demonstrated by high-level of response. Analysis and synthesis are evident.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Satisfactory</td>
<td>Well-organized response, covering all portions of the question and showing knowledge of the field. More integration of research or relevant studies is needed, although evidence of the latter is observable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Inadequate</td>
<td>Response tended to be over generalized. More specifics are needed. Few citations were integrated into the response. Respondent seems to be writing about the comprehension level.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Adequate organization, but with little, if any, current research or relevant literature integrated into the response. Responses tended to be at knowledge level, showing little, if any, high-level analysis or synthesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Unsatisfactory</td>
<td>Responses tended to be vague and superficial. The writer used few, if any citations, showed little or no integration of relevant research or literature in response. Evidence of analysis, synthesis, or evaluation is not observable in the written response.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR</td>
<td></td>
<td>No response by rater.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B
Higher Ed Curriculum Changes 2017-18

Higher Education M.Ed. Program changes

Admissions requirements: Omit GMAT or LSAT options; only GRE accepted

Core – omit EDH 604 replace with EDH 627 College Students
  - Change EDH 627 to EDH 727 to meet Graduate College policy for 50% 700 level courses

Research core – Omit EPY 716 replace with EDH 730 Institutional Assessment

Student Affairs Emphasis
  - Omit EDH 627 (moved to core)
  - Omit EDH 624 Readings in Student Personnel Issues
  - Add EDH 714 Minority Serving Institutions
  - Change name and description of EDH 627 from Student Learning and Development to College Students in the United States / update from 627 to 727

Intercollegiate Athletics Emphasis
  - EDH 603 Role of Sport in Higher Education - name change to Intro to College Sport.
  - EDH 611 changed to 711 Marketing Institutions of Higher Ed

Elective change

EDH 623 – 723 Women in Higher Ed

Omit 730 title duplicate – Legal Aspects of Students in Higher Ed / Keep Institutional Assessment