

## Program-Level Assessment: Annual Report

Program: **MA Leadership and Organizational**

Department:

### Development

Degree or Certificate Level: **Master of Arts**

College/School: **School for Professional Studies**

Date (Month/Year): **August 2023**

Primary Assessment Contact: **Steven Winton PhD**

In what year was the data upon which this report is based collected? **2022-2023**

In what year was the program's assessment plan most recently reviewed/updated? **2021**

### 1. Student Learning Outcomes

Which of the program's student learning outcomes were assessed in this annual assessment cycle?

The MA LOD program has the following set of learning outcomes (LO's):

LO1: Graduates will be able to apply program-specific knowledge to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework.

LO2: Graduates will be able to utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context.

LO3: Graduates will be able to apply organizational development theory in intervention design.

LO4: Graduates will be able to apply leadership competencies appropriate for a given situation or context.

Additionally, the program instituted an assessment process whereby we analyze/review the data for all four LO's each year. We select one or two LO's to focus our efforts. This year we directed our attention on LO3.

### 2. Assessment Methods: Student Artifacts

Which student artifacts were used to determine if students achieved this outcome? Please identify the course(s) in which these artifacts were collected. Clarify if any such courses were offered a) online, b) at the Madrid campus, or c) at any other off-campus location.

Our new assessment protocol integrates data from three sources to evaluate student learning:

1. Each program LO is mapped to specific courses and artifacts within those courses. In Canvas, instructors complete an assessment of learning that is attached to the rubric of the artifact's grading rubric. It is important to note that this process is meant to gather data that is independent of grades given.
2. Faculty mentors complete a summative assessment on each student at the conclusion of their capstone. Mentor's assess the student's performance for each of the learning outcomes.
3. A student assessment of learning outcomes is also completed by students at the end of their degree. This indirect measure asks students to rate the extent they learned and developed on each LO. They also indicate what specific competencies they developed and which they feel they need additional development.

\*\*If we have a Madrid student in the program, then they would be fully admitted into the program.

### 3. Assessment Methods: Evaluation Process

What process was used to evaluate the student artifacts, and by whom? Please identify the tools(s) (e.g., a rubric) used in the process and include them in/with this report.

Each artifact is assessed according to a standard rubric in Canvas. Within Canvas we then attach associated learning outcome measures to those rubrics. Instructors, after grading the artifact, rate the student in terms of their learning

mastery. The learning outcome assessment is separate from the grade given on the assignment. We pulled raw survey data from each of the courses in Canvas. We then tabulated the quantitative data to provide a high-level overview.

Please note that the Canvas approach was new this year. Previously, data was collected independently through a survey in Qualtrics.

#### 4. Data/Results

What were the results of the assessment of the learning outcomes? Please be specific. Does achievement differ by teaching modality (e.g., online vs. face-to-face) or on-ground location (e.g., STL campus, Madrid campus, other off-campus site)?

Overall, for the second year in a row, 100% of our students are satisfied with the program's quality, 100% feel challenged, and 100% would recommend the program to a friend. Furthermore, 100% of the students feel they developed significantly in each of the four learning outcomes (i.e., rated learning on each LO to a great or moderate extent). Overall, student perceptions of learning were similar to previous years. On the formative survey, instructors also perceived student achievement of LOs to be like previous years. The summative survey indicated high achievement of all outcomes, with few students assessed at low levels of mastery (i.e., students were assessed to be fully or moderately achieving all outcomes).

- **Student Assessment of LOs:** Students rated all four of the LOs very high (apply leadership competencies, apply OD, apply EBDM, and argumentation skills). For the two content-related LOs (apply leadership and OD), 100% of students rated that they learned 'to a great extent.' Student ratings of the LOs applying EBDM and argumentation skills were the highest ever reported by a graduating class, with 78% rating them 'to a great extent' and the remaining 22% rating that they learned 'to a moderate extent'.
- **Instructor Formative Assessment of LOs:** Instructors rated almost all students as meeting or approaching standards for both LO3 and LO4 (apply leadership and apply OD). Students were rated much lower on LO1 and LO2 (applying evidence-based framework and argumentation skills). It should be noted that the Ns for each LO are different. Courses with higher Ns typically have students across several programs. Further, some of these courses are introductory, meaning students are not necessarily expected to meet or exceed standards.
- **Instructor Summative Assessment of LOs:** On the summative assessment, instructors rated that students demonstrated full achievement of each of the LOs at the highest level in the past 4 years. While the sample size is small – and it may be that this was just a very strong cohort – it should be noted that almost 100% of students achieved a high degree of mastery on each of the four LOs. Again, these improvements suggest that programmatic changes are making an impact.
- **Trends:** Last year, it was noted that there is a discrepancy between the content-related LOs (LO3 – OD; LO4 – leadership) and the writing and research-related LOs (LO1 & 2). Once again, the gap seems to be shrinking. Instructors continue to indicate more of an issue with LO1 (methods, stats), while students reported learning less on LO2 (effective argumentation skills). Summative results, however, suggest that students are making strides in both argumentation skills and providing evidence. That is, the higher ratings from the summative instructor assessment and student exit surveys (above the formative assessment data) suggest that students improve as they progress in the program (particularly LOs 1 & 2), as these ratings reflect student competency at the conclusion of the degree. It should be noted that changes could also represent random differences among cohort samples.

Please see attached appendix for executive summary of results.

## 5. Findings: Interpretations & Conclusions

What have you learned from these results? What does the data tell you?

Overall, the results tell us that students self-report that they are learning to a great extent on each LO. Furthermore, students are satisfied with their experiences in the program. Faculty generally agree that most students are demonstrating full achievement of LOs, but there is still a percentage of students only partially demonstrating learning. Most weaknesses relate to student writing abilities and APA knowledge, applying OD tools, utilizing sources and instructor feedback, and forming logical arguments.

## 6. Closing the Loop: Dissemination and Use of Current Assessment Findings

A. When and how did your program faculty share and discuss these results and findings from this cycle of assessment?

Each year a complete report is distributed among key faculty and administrators associated with the program for feedback. Recommendations and action items are discussed, shared, and implemented.

B. How specifically have you decided to use findings to improve teaching and learning in your program? For example, perhaps you've initiated one or more of the following:

Changes to the Curriculum or Pedagogies

- Course content
- Teaching techniques
- Improvements in technology
- Prerequisites
- Course sequence
- New courses
- Deletion of courses
- Changes in frequency or scheduling of course offerings

Changes to the Assessment Plan

- Student learning outcomes
- Student artifacts collected
- Evaluation process
- Evaluation tools (e.g., rubrics)
- Data collection methods
- Frequency of data collection

Please describe the actions you are taking as a result of the findings.

We continually work to improve the curriculum. In the past couple of years, we have updated every class. We have implemented a standard Canvas template/blueprint. The MA LOD program was the first program at SLU to have every course pass the new peer review process. Furthermore, much effort is taken to ensure that each course is considered in tandem to develop the MA LOD competencies. Although anecdotal, students completing their capstone routinely remark about how well the program progressively builds skills to develop mastery in each LO. Some of the updates we have made in the previous few years include:

- Implemented a series of orientation and graduate preparation courses (i.e., general orientation, writing, stats) to be taken prior to enrolling in the first course. As we cannot require these courses, we are working on different approaches to better direct students into these modules/courses.
- SPS faculty continue to refer students to our online tutorial platform, SmartThinking.
- Built rubrics and provided tutorials and coaching to assist with APA and general writing. Several classes updated resources and changed assignments (e.g., scaffolding, argument maps) to help students build stronger arguments.
- Regarding OD and Leadership, we have revamped ORLD 50101, 5100, 5150, and 5350. We plan to look at 5100 and 5150 to see if the two courses can be integrated. Further, we plan to review 5250 with an eye to a complete overhaul. The course ORLD 5450 has been updated to have students do more applied, service learning to utilize their OD skills.
- We have evidence that some of the biggest changes we need to consider may not be curricular but co-curricular. We have attempted to have more in-person networking sessions for students, but recent efforts have been poorly attended.

If no changes are being made, please explain why.

## 7. Closing the Loop: Review of [Previous Assessment Findings and Changes](#)

### A. What is at least one change your program has implemented in recent years as a result of assessment data?

We continue to “close the loop” on past assessment work. Past analyses of assessment data were used to inform recent curricular changes, some of which were made to directly influence student learning in LO3 (e.g., adding ORLD 5550 Consulting Skills). Another example was the new writing-focused orientation we implemented to improve student achievement of LO2.

Furthermore, based on this data, we intend to make additional changes to improve student learning in each LO. For several years the data suggests that the program is doing quite well on LO4 (i.e., recent changes are working to improve student learning). Similarly, the data suggests improvements on LO3 (OD). We noted last year that it may take several years to see the changes we intended (i.e., summative results are a lagging indicator). This year provides evidence that we are on the right track. LOs 1 & 2 seem to be a consistent area of concern even though curricular changes seem to be helping. One new issue that we are learning how to respond is the use of AI. We are trying to build opportunities for students to utilize it in the program to help with argumentation skills, but more work is needed.

### B. How has this change/have these changes been assessed?

It is difficult to comparatively assess how much these changes are impacting student learning as the sample sizes are small and the faculty who rate these each year also vary from year to year. There may also be an issue with the Canvas data collection as the assessment is not blind to students, which may impact the rating instructors give. Taken collectively, however, the data tell a story of improvement. For example, this year, the summative instructor ratings suggest that there have been improvements in student outcomes, particularly with few students at the low end of mastery. Perhaps the strongest evidence that curricular changes have impacted student learning is based on student exit survey comments. We have worked to build a seamless curriculum, and students noted how well the curriculum prepared them for their capstone, specifically noting its cohesive nature and how each course built on each other.

### C. What were the findings of the assessment?

Formative data suggests there is still an opportunity to improve both LO3 and LO4, yet a focus on other LOs may be needed. We intend to renew our focus on LO1 and 2 as we approach our program review. Further, one of the lowest-rated items is not related to the LOs, but to the level of interaction in the program. (Students rated a sense of community and peer-to-peer interaction lower than normal.) While the pandemic has limited our ability to conduct co-curricular events, these scores suggest we must do more. We can also work on building better assignments in student MRPs as they grapple with real-world data, AI, and working with clients.

### D. How do you plan to (continue to) use this information moving forward?

We take a holistic approach to assessment. The plan will be reviewed annually to ensure it continues to meet the program’s needs. If a given learning outcome indicates areas needing focused assessment, especially related to one or more courses within the program or a foundational competency, then the schedule may be altered as needed, but this alteration will be temporary rather than permanent. As SPS programs continually evolve to meet changing market needs, this assessment plan will be considered dynamic and subject to change as the program evolves and new programs are offered.

**IMPORTANT: Please submit any assessment tools and/or revised/updated assessment plans along with this report.**

*Executive Summary*  
*School for Professional Studies*  
*MA Leadership and Organizational Development Program*  
*Assessment of Learning Outcomes*

This report provides insight into the achievement of the four learning outcomes for the Leadership and Organizational Development program at the School for Professional Studies:

1. Graduates will be able to apply program-specific knowledge to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework.
2. Graduates will be able to utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context.
3. Graduates will be able to apply organizational development theory in intervention design.
4. Graduates will be able to apply leadership competencies appropriate for a given situation or context.

Three reports detail information from faculty and student perspectives.

- The Instructor Summative Assessment includes the percentage of students’ degree of mastery for each learning objective.
- The Instructor Formative Assessment includes identification of a course artifact related to each outcome, strengths and weaknesses in student performance associated with the identified artifact.
- The Student Assessment includes demographics of students, their ratings of various factors that attracted them to SPS, descriptions of their personal and professional development since joining the program, ratings of competencies that were most useful for their personal and professional goals, and their satisfaction ratings of various program artifacts.

**Instructor Summative Assessment of Learning Outcomes**

Learning Objective	High degree of mastery (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021*, 2022*)	Moderate degree of mastery (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021*, 2022*)	Low degree of mastery (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021*, 2022*)
<i>Apply organizational development theory in intervention design. (2020: N=13; 2021: N=14; 2022: N=9)</i>	41%, 46%, 69%, 86%, 89%	59%, 31%, 31%, 14%, 11%	0, 23%, 0, 0, 0
<i>Apply leadership competencies appropriate for a given situation or context. (2020: N=13; 2021: N=14; 2022: N=9)</i>	52%, 54%, 94%, 93%, 100%	48%, 31%, 6%, 7%, 0	0, 15%, 0, 0, 0
<i>Apply program-specific knowledge to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework. (2020: N=13; 2021: N=14; 2022: N=9)</i>	55%, 54%, 63%, 71%, 100%	30%, 38%, 38%, 29%, 0	15%, 8%, 0, 0, 0
<i>Utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context. (2020: N=13; 2021: N=14; 2022: N=9)</i>	58%, 61%, 75%, 79%, 100%	36%, 31%, 25%, 21%, 0	6%, 8%, 0, 0, 0

\*2021 & 2022 utilized a different data collection method (i.e., via Canvas)

## Instructor Formative Assessment of Learning Outcomes

<b>Learning Objective</b>	<b>Meets Standard</b> (% of students who demonstrated <i>full</i> achievement of this outcome)	<b>Approaches Standard</b> (% of students who demonstrated <i>partial</i> achievement of this outcome)	<b>Does Not Meet Standard</b> (% of students who demonstrated <i>no</i> achievement of this outcome)
<i>Apply organizational development theory in intervention design.</i> (2018: N=143; 2019: N=73; 2020: 77; 2021: 56; 2022: 83)	2018: 56%; 2019: 59%; 2020: 68%; 2021: 71%*; 2022: 76%*	2018: 29%; 2019: 40%; 2020: 29%; 2021: 27%*; 2022: 18%*	2018: 13%; 2019: 1%; 2020: 4%; 2021: 2%*; 2022: 6%*
<i>Apply leadership competencies appropriate for a given situation or context.</i> (2018: N=117; 2019: N=44; 2020: 95; 2021: 58; 2022: 46)	2018: 64%; 2019: 52%; 2020: 68%; 2021: 83%*; 2022: 70%*	2018: 21%; 2019: 36%; 2020: 21%; 2021: 17%*; 2022: 24%*	2018: 14%; 2019: 11%; 2020: 11%; 2021: 0%*; 2022: 7%*
<i>Apply program-specific knowledge to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework.</i> (2018: N=118; 2019: 32; 2020: 47; 2021: 60; 2022: 21)	2018: 50%; 2019: 31%; 2020: 40%; 2021: 48%*; 2022: 48%*	2018: 35%; 2019: 59%; 2020: 40%; 2021: 35%*; 2022: 43%*	2018: 14%; 2019: 0%; 2020: 19%; 2021: 15%*; 2022: 10%*
<i>Utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context.</i> (2018: N=260; 2019: 97; 2020: 120, 2021: 114; 2022: 56)	2018: 57%; 2019: 45%; 2020: 48%; 2021: 54%*; 2022: 54%*	2018: 29%; 2019: 46%; 2020: 38%; 2021: 33%*; 2022: 43%*	2018: 13%; 2019: 8%; 2020: 14%; 2021: 11%; 2022: 4%*

\*2021 & 2022 utilized a different data collection method (i.e., via Canvas), and some classes were not included in the analysis due to missing data

## Student Assessment of Learning Outcomes

### To What Extent Students Learned

<b>Learning Objective</b>	<b>To a great extent</b> (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	<b>To a moderate extent</b> (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022,)
<i>Apply organizational development theory in intervention design.</i> (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	73%, 75%, 68%, 92%, 100%	27%, 25%, 32%, 8%, 0
<i>Apply leadership competencies appropriate for a given situation or context.</i> (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	87%, 95%, 84%, 92%, 100%	13%, 5%, 16%, 8%, 0
<i>Apply program-specific knowledge to address practical problems using an ethical, evidence-based framework.</i> (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	86%, 90%, 79%, 92%, 78%	14%, 10%, 11%, 8%, 22%
<i>Utilize argumentation skills appropriate for a given problem or context.</i> (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	59%, 70%, 63%, 62%, 78%	41%, 30%, 37%, 38%, 22%

## Student Satisfaction

Factors	Very satisfied (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	Somewhat satisfied (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	Moderately satisfied (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	Not at all satisfied (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)
The subject matter expertise of instructors (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	90%, 95%, 79%, 92%, 100%	6%, 0, 21%, 8%, 0	4%, 5%, 0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
The application of course material to your work (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	79%, 85%, 74%, 85%, 100%	21%, 0, 26%, 15%, 0	0%, 15%, 0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
Overall sense of community (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	28%, 50%, 53%, 31%, 75%	55%, 10%, 16%, 46%, 11%	17%, 35%, 26%, 15%, 22%	0, 5%, 5%, 8%, 0
Student-to-student interaction in SPS graduate classes (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	72%, 50%, 53%, 54%, 78%	14%, 0, 32%, 23%, 22%	14%, 45%, 11%, 15%, 0	0, 5%, 5%, 8%, 0
Faculty-to-student interaction in SPS graduate classes (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	53%, 65%, 63%, 69%, 100%	40%, 10%, 37%, 23%, 0	7%, 25%, 0, 8%, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
Communication with (i.e. availability and responsiveness of) the Program Director (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	97%, 90%, 100%, 92%, 100%	0%, 5%, 0, 8%, 0	3%, 5%, 0, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
Your understanding of Saint Louis University's Jesuit mission (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	68%, 50%, 58%, 92%, 100%	26%, 15%, 32%, 8%, 0	6%, 35%, 11%, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
Rigor of graduate classes at SPS (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	67%, 80%, 84%, 77%, 100%	30%, 0, 11%, 23%, 0	3%, 20%, 5%, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
Overall graduate experience at the School for Professional Studies (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	83%, 85%, 74%, 73%, 100%	13%, 0, 21%, 27%, 0	3%, 15%, 5%, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0
Overall quality of graduate education at the School for Professional Studies (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	67%, 85%, 74%, 85%, 100%	30%, 0, 21%, 15, 0	3%, 15%, 5%, 0, 0	0, 0, 0, 0, 0

	Strongly agree (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	Agree (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	Neither agree nor disagree (2018, 2019, 2020, 2021, 2022)	
My graduate degree from SPS has/will help me advance my career (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	50%, 70%, 79%, 54%, 78%	40%, 30%, 16%, 38%, 22%	10%, 0, 5%, 8%, 0	
Generally, my graduate courses challenged me (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	40%, 74%, 56%, 60%, 78%	56%, 26%, 33%, 30%, 22%	4%, 0, 0, 10%, 0	
I would recommend this program to a friend or colleague (2021: N = 14; 2022; N=9)	70%, 90%, 72%, 77%, 89%	23%, 10%, 22%, 23%, 11%	7%, 0, 5%, 0, 0	