Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025		
College of Education and Behavioral Sciences	School of Leadership and Professional Studies	
Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership #0467		
Dr. Tanja Bibbs		
Is this an online program? Yes □ No Please make sure the □ Yes, they match!	e Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)	

<u>Instructions</u>: For the 2024-25 assessment, we are asking you to reflect on the last three-year cycle rather than collect data. It's important to take time to look over the results from the last assessment cycle and really focus on a data-informed direction going forward. In collaboration with your assessment team and program faculty, review each submitted template from 2021-2024 and consider the following for each Program Learning Outcome, add your narrative to the template, and submit the draft to your ASL Rep by May 15, 2025.

Program Student Learning Outcome 1	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Evaluate core concepts of organizational leadership theories, models, and approaches.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? If it has recently changed, please explain. Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? Do you have the appropriate numbers of SLOs to measure regularly? Please consider choosing the most important. Based on data from the last three assessment cycles, this program learning outcome remains relevant. The outcome is measurable and uses appropriate action verbs from Bloom's Taxonomy. It is not double- or triple-barreled. Currently, we have a manageable number of program learning outcomes that can be measured regularly. The PLO has been revised as part of the transformation of the Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership to the Master of Science in Organizational Leadership effective Fall 2025 with integration of this content area within a broader context for practical application.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? For LEAD 500, the leadership analysis assignment used in this course is a direct measure of the SLO. The assignment requires students to select a real-world leader and analyze their behaviors, actions, and decisions using leadership theories presented in the course (e.g., trait theory, transformational leadership, path-goal theory, etc.). This clearly aligns with the SLO, as students must demonstrate an applied understanding of core leadership concepts—not just in naming the theories, but in connecting specific leader behaviors to theoretical

definitions and frameworks. The assignment goes beyond recall and asks for synthesis, analysis, and evaluation, all of which are appropriate for measuring this SLO.

If the SLO were to shift toward something more skill- or behavior-based (e.g., "Demonstrate leadership behaviors in team settings"), this assignment would no longer be the best tool and might need to be supplemented or replaced by a performance-based task (like simulations or peer-reviewed leadership projects). However, for a theory-based evaluative outcome, this artifact remains highly appropriate.

The rubric currently in use generally supports the outcome well, as it assesses both theoretical understanding and application. That said, one area of improvement would be to more explicitly require students to "show, not tell"—ensuring they illustrate and connect specific behaviors or decisions to the components of leadership theories, not just label a leader with a particular style. This clarification could be emphasized in the rubric under theory application or analysis.

AI-generated content is a rising concern, particularly for assignments involving synthesis of well-known leadership figures. While AI may assist with surface-level definitions or summaries, it struggles to produce original insight or deeply connected analysis across multiple theories. Continued use of plagiarism detection, oral follow-ups (if needed), and assignment prompts that require personal interpretation and unique leader choices help mitigate this risk. Nonetheless, future rubric revisions might also include language about originality, critical thinking, and personal synthesis to better account for the impact of AI tools.

The capstone experience offers two summative assessments options for students to choose from: the portfolio (Option 1) and the project (Option 2). Both instruments are designed as direct measures of student learning outcomes and have been evaluated using detailed rubrics that emphasize leadership theory integration, application, ethics, diversity, and professionalism.

For the portfolio, reflection papers aligned with each SLO allow students to demonstrate conceptual knowledge and its application. Artifacts drawn from across the program or from the students' application of the concepts in their workplace provide evidence of applied learning. The rubric ensures assessment of both content quality and personal growth. or the project, students are assessed through a multi-part structure that includes problem identification, implementation, and reflection.

The portfolio is at a higher risk for AI usage given that students are expected to show artifacts. A student could easily load those artifacts into AI and ask for it to develop a paper that highlights how those artifacts show their success in mastering that learning outcome. However, the AI usage could be an asset as it would help the student make a better connection with the learning outcome and their competency level. The project is less likely to have AI integration, since it requires journaling and direct interaction with an organization.

Faculty may consider revising rubrics to ensure students explain how artifacts are reflective of each SLO keeping in mind an employer or future employer is the audience for the final portfolio. Project rubrics may need to be adjusted to accommodate diverse project types.

Criteria & Targets

Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful--ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? If you have successfully made your targets consistently, consider a more challenging target.

In LEAD 500, students are performing well in identifying and describing key leadership theories, models, and approaches. Most students are meeting or exceeding expectations when it comes to accurately defining core concepts from the textbook and applying them to chosen leaders. However, consistent with previous assessment cycles, a common area of struggle remains providing deep critical analysis that connects observed behaviors to specific components of leadership theories. While the criteria for success may remain appropriate, the targets

may need refinement.

Moving forward, it would be beneficial to more explicitly emphasize the expectation of analytical depth in both the assignment instructions and rubric language. For example, instead of simply noting that a leader "uses transformational leadership," students should be required to demonstrate how the leader embodies the four components (e.g., idealized influence, inspirational motivation). As students have begun to meet the current targets consistently, a more challenging target could be introduced—such as requiring that at least 75% of students earn a minimum of 90% on theory application sections of the rubric, or incorporating a new criterion focused on evidence-based reasoning.

In LEAD 600 (the capstone course), students are excelling in portfolio creation and project assignments. While students are able to clearly articulate a definition for leadership theories and models, they are falling short when it comes to providing a critical analysis of different leadership theories and models. While criteria may remain the same, critical analysis might be added to encourage deeper thinking. This will make the course more challenging and promote rigor.

Results & Conclusion

Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain

Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.

For LEAD 500, the results of this assessment cycle were mostly consistent with previous years, but with some encouraging signs of growth. As expected, most students were able to accurately identify and define core leadership theories, models, and approaches. However, what stood out most in this cycle was the greater variety of leaders selected by students compared to past years. Traditionally, the same handful of leaders—such as military generals, U.S. presidents, or corporate CEOs—are selected, which can result in repetitive or superficial analyses. This term, students selected a broader and more diverse range of leaders across sectors (media figures, nonprofit leaders, political figures, and even international leaders), which made the application of leadership theories more dynamic and contextualized. Additionally, the writing quality and organization of the submissions remained strong, and most students successfully cited course texts and outside sources. What still emerged as a persistent challenge was the depth of analysis. While students can label a leader as transformational, for instance, they often struggle to break that concept into its components and show evidence that supports their claim. This suggests that while comprehension is strong, application and synthesis of theory remain developmental goals for many students.

The assignment structure—requiring students to select a leader and analyze them through multiple leadership theories—continues to be effective in helping students engage with course content in an applied, real-world way. Requiring use of course readings, the rubric's alignment with the SLO, and instructor feedback all contributed to successful outcomes. The rubric-based grading and feedback process allowed for targeted evaluation of each section, giving students clear insight into strengths and areas for growth. The increased variety of leader choices also showed that students were engaging more creatively and critically with the assignment.

The biggest challenge continues to be students' ability to move beyond summary into critical analysis. Despite having a detailed rubric and exposure to the theories in class, students frequently rely on broad or generalized claims (e.g., "this leader is a servant leader") without fully demonstrating why. This may be in part due to instructional pacing or not enough emphasis on analytical modeling during instruction. In

terms of support, it may also indicate that students need more scaffolding or examples to help them learn how to break a theory into components and link it to observable behavior.

Moving forward, we may need to adjust the instructional methodology slightly by incorporating more model essays, guided walkthroughs, or virtual workshops focused on theory application. Another potential solution could be adding a low-stakes draft component earlier in the term, where students analyze a single theory in-depth before building out their full project. Faculty might also benefit from sharing rubrics and strategies across sections to ensure consistent expectations and feedback practices.

Across the past three assessment cycles, results have aligned generally with expectations, though notable trends have emerged since the implementation of the revised capstone structure in LEAD 600.

Portfolio Submissions demonstrated student growth in reflecting on core leadership theories and personal development. Some students effectively connected theory to their professional practice, though synthesis and critical evaluation varied; whereas other students provided descriptive overviews of theories without consistently analyzing their limitations or comparing across models. There was also inconsistency in the depth and clarity of connections between leadership theory and applied artifacts.

Project submissions showed strong application of leadership concepts in real-world settings. These students effectively used leadership theories, ethical frameworks, and inclusive practices to guide organizational change. The multi-part structure of the project—especially the data-driven implementation and reflection components—showed clear alignment with intended learning outcomes. However, students in the project track may need more structured prompts to ensure equal emphasis on evaluating leadership theories—not just applying them.

In both tracks, students generally met the minimum performance expectations, but there is room to raise expectations and ensure consistency in depth of analysis, use of scholarly sources, and theoretical integration.

**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:

As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to:

- collect a more appropriate artifact
- create new program outcomes
- adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met
- need to reconstruct your curriculum map
- sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided

Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle.

LEAD 600 assessment cycle suggestions:

- 1. Review the theory evaluation component of both options to ensure students are completing similar analysis activities.
- 2. Add verification strategies for monitoring AI usage, particularly with the portfolio—or, AI should be integrated into the option.
- 3. Review rubrics to ensure they align with portfolio and project expectations.

Program Student Learning Outcome 2

Program Student Learning Outcome	Discuss behaviors of effective leaders.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? The learning outcome "Discuss behaviors of effective leaders" remains relevant and appropriate for a graduate-level course in Organizational Leadership. It is measurable and uses a clear, single action verb from Bloom's Taxonomy ("discuss"), which is appropriate for both written and applied assessments. The outcome is not double- or triple-barreled and supports the program's emphasis on leadership development, ethical reasoning, and inclusive practices. Continued alignment with real-world leadership behavior makes this SLO valuable to students preparing for mid- and senior-level roles. However, the PLO has been revised as part of the transformation of the Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership to the Master of Science in Organizational Leadership effective Fall 2025 with integration of this content area
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted?
	The current leadership analysis paper in LEAD 500 is an appropriate and direct measure for this SLO. The assignment requires students to identify, describe, and analyze leadership behaviors within theoretical frameworks, aligning well with the outcome. If the SLO were revised to place more emphasis on critical evaluation or context-specific behavior, the assignment would still be useful, but the rubric may need slight modifications to better emphasize behavioral analysis and application. For example, rubric categories could be adjusted to specifically reference leadership behaviors, such as task-oriented or relationship-oriented actions.
	The rise of AI tools may influence how students complete this assignment, particularly in summarizing theories or traits without deeper analysis. However, the assignment's emphasis on applying theory to real-world leadership behaviors still requires individual insight that is difficult to outsource to AI. Overall, both the assignment and rubric are effective, though periodic updates and increased emphasis on applied behavioral analysis will help maintain rigor and alignment with the learning outcome.
	In LEAD 600, this SLO is assessed through either the capstone portfolio or the capstone project. The portfolio includes a dedicated reflection section focused on leadership behaviors. Students are expected to illustrate behaviors they've demonstrated, observed, or learned, supported by personal experiences and program content. In the project, students must document leadership behaviors exhibited during their change initiative in journal reflections and the final report.
	Both are direct measures of student learning. However, evidence from portfolios artifacts show inconsistent depth in analyzing behaviors—some students default to describing actions rather than analyzing why they were effective or how they relate to theory. Meanwhile, project submissions provide strong behavioral documentation, especially through team coordination, conflict resolution, and implementation feedback.
	For AI considerations, the portfolio is more susceptible to AI-generated summaries, particularly in reflective writing. To address this, we the faculty could consider adding optional oral reflections or video walkthroughs.
	In addition, rubrics should be updated to clearly define what constitutes effective analysis of leadership behavior (e.g., linkage to theory, use

	of examples, insight into outcomes) across both options.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets? For LEAD 500, The current criteria for success for the SLO appear appropriate, particularly if the target is that students score in the B range or higher (e.g., 80% or above) on rubric sections related to leadership behavior analysis. Most students are successfully identifying and labeling leadership behaviors, but there is room for growth in connecting those behaviors explicitly to leadership outcomes and theoretical models. If students are consistently meeting the target, it may be worth raising expectations slightly, such as requiring deeper analysis or including more explicit application of behavior-focused leadership theories like situational or behavioral approaches. Rather than changing the core criteria, the emphasis within the rubric might be adjusted to ensure students are not just describing behavior but evaluating its effectiveness within the leader's context. If consistently high performance continues, the target could be refined to require excellence in both behavioral identification and critical application to maintain program rigor. In LEAD 600, the current success criteria require students to earn a 3/5 or higher on the related rubric categories. Given the trend toward meeting this target with minimal depth; therefore, the faculty may elect to raise the target to a 4/5 on the rubric criterion related to leadership behavior and require students to cite specific leadership models when discussing observed behaviors. For the project, the faculty may consider adding an assessment completed by the person who authorized the project within the organization.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain
Zasaris & Conclusion	Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.
	The results for this SLO over the past three years were largely as expected. In LEAD 500, most students were able to correctly identify leadership behaviors and connect them to the leader's context. However, what stood out was a noticeable increase in originality and diversity of leader selections, which seems to correlate with stronger engagement and deeper analysis. While students are mostly successful at identifying behaviors, fewer consistently provide critical analysis of how those behaviors contributed to leadership effectiveness. This distinction between description and analysis continues to be a gap in performance.
	What worked well was the expanded range of leader choices encouraged in course design, allowing students to explore a more diverse and personal understanding of leadership. This likely contributed to improved engagement and stronger writing. The assignment format—requiring application of multiple theories—also continues to support integrative thinking. What hasn't worked as well is the tendency for some students to simply "label" leadership behaviors without sufficient evaluation or theoretical support. Going forward, rubric adjustments or added scaffolding around behavioral theories and their impact might help close this gap. No major instructional methodology changes have been made recently, but further emphasizing "show, don't tell" analysis in class discussions and assignments could improve outcomes.
	In LEAD 600, over the past three assessment cycles, students generally met expectations on this outcome. Portfolio students tended to focus on self-descriptions (e.g., communication style, conflict management) but varied in their ability to connect those behaviors to theory. Project students demonstrated strong behavioral evidence in applied settings but did not always label or discuss behaviors using leadership language

	from the program.
	The portfolio option still requires more structured prompts to support deep reflection on behaviors. The project tends to elicit real-world leadership behaviors; however, students do not typically cite relevant theories or models. Rubrics may need to be reviewed to ensure consistency in behavior assessment. Scaffolding leadership theory throughout the program may assist with this.
	The organizational leadership graduate program is transitioning from a Master of Arts to a Master of Science degree effective 2025-2026, with newly adopted program learning outcomes. While these revised PLOs maintain a core focus on discussing effective leadership behaviors, we anticipate the need for updates to our assessment tools and rubrics. This structural change presents an opportunity to address the theory-practice integration gaps identified in both LEAD 500 and LEAD 600 through intentional curriculum design and assessment alignment with the new MS program framework.
**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to:
	collect a more appropriate artifact
	create new program outcomes
	adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met
	need to reconstruct your curriculum map
	 sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided
	Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle.
	For LEAD 500:
	1. Update rubric to clearly define expectations for demonstrating and analyzing "effective leadership behaviors" with evidence and theory.
	2. Pilot a short reflective component asking students to connect selected leadership behaviors to specific theories.
	3. Reassess the learning outcome to determine if "discuss" remains the most appropriate verb for the intended level of analysis.
	For LEAD 600:
	 Update rubrics and scoring guides for both options to clearly define expectations for "effective leadership behavior." Consider oral defense of projects or portfolios to allow students an opportunity to explain their behaviors.
l	3. Reassess the learning outcome to see if "discuss" is the best verb for the expectation.

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Explain personal and organizational ethics.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is

	the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy?
	While this LO is still relevant, the ethics LO has been revised for the new MS Program: Synthesize ethical leadership principles and approaches to address implications of change. It does use measurable Bloom's verbs.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted?
	The measurement instrument used in the past needed to be revised, as noted on the 2022-2023 cycle report. The Personal Ethical Reflection did not completely capture the learning outcome, as it only measured <i>personal</i> ethics and not organizational. An option would have been to have also evaluated the Organizational Ethics Analysis.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets?
	There were notes in the 2022-2023 cycle report that the rubric needed revision and development. When that is done, target levels for the new MS LO should remain at 80% until the new rubric, program, and course are stabilized.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain
	<u>Conclusions</u> : What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.
	I suspect the results—86% achieving 80% or better on the rubric—were both expected and unexpected. Expected due the rubric needing revision and unexpected because the assessment chosen was not appropriate as it did not have students demonstrate both personal and organizational ethics knowledge. Both the LO and course are changed for the measurement of ethical learning achievement in the new MS program, and the assessment chosen for the measurement will be, as well.
**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map • sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to
	implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle.
	In the past, students have completed a personal ethics statement, a personal ethical development plan, an organizational ethical analysis, and

a professional ethical analysis. The assessment chosen for this outcome has not been the best one to address both personal and organizational ethics. As we move toward the MS program and LEAD 510 replaces LEAD 525, assessments are being revised and merged. The Organizational Ethical Analysis will merge with the Professional Ethical Analysis to create one assignment that will be used for this LO's assessment, and the Personal Ethical Code and the Personal Ethical Development Plan will be merged to create an assignment that might also be used to assess this LO, as well. While targets have been consistently met, with this new course it is important to continue to use those used prior until the course is stabilized. There has also been mention in past reports of identifying Master's-only students for the assessment, and that should also be part of our plan going forward.
 With this in mind, our plan is: Consider which of the new assessments is best suited to evaluating this LO: The Professional & Organizational Ethics Analysis or the Personal Leadership Code & Development Plan, or both. Continue target at 80% meeting or exceeding, but adjust that as the new course stabilizes Identify Master's-Only students for this assessment

Program Student Learning Outcome 4	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Determine the role of diversity and culture on the leadership process.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? Diversity and culture are very relevant to understanding organizational leadership and our PLO should reflect contemporary leadership practices. As such, the PLO has been revised as part of the transformation of the Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership to the Master of Science in Organizational Leadership effective Fall 2025 to integrate diversity and culture within a broader context for practical application. The current outcome is somewhat measurable. While related, diversity and culture are two distinctly different ideas. The leadership process is ambiguous and could refer to many aspects of leadership. The PLO does include measurable verbs following Bloom's taxonomy but could be considered relatively low for a master's level program.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted? Looking at the past assessment cycle, students have effectively analyzed cultural and diversity issues through Bolman and Deal's frames. However, these analyses go beyond "determining the role" to applying their understanding to create proposed solutions. This suggests the PLO or the measurement instrument should be modified. Because LEAD 580 will be embedded into the repackaged courses for the newly revised MS, the artifact may be appropriate with some modifications and a different focus.

Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets?
	The Criteria for Success and targets need to be changed. Assessment rubrics were not created for this measurement instrument, so it is necessary to create a rubric that aligns with the revised program outcome and includes standardized criteria that can evaluate student performance consistently.
Results & Conclusion	<u>Results</u> : Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain
	Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.
	The organizational analysis in LEAD 580 was successful in prompting students to examine diversity and culture through multiple theoretical lenses. The mini cases the students analyzed prior to completion of the organizational analysis were effective in scaffolding and strengthening the students' understanding. Student feedback indicated a need for a more definitive assignment prompt to coincide with the rubric. That was refined for the 2024-2025 academic year. The MA has been transformed into a Master of Science in Organizational Leadership. LEAD 580 is part of the teach out for the MA and components of that course will be embedded throughout the newly revised core for the MS (effective Fall 2025).
**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met • need to reconstruct your curriculum map
	• sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle.
	As part of the transformation of the MA program and this PLO, the following have been identified to improve our assessment practices: 1. Create a more appropriate artifact based on the revised PLO 2. Develop a comprehensive assessment rubric

Program Student Learning Outcome 5	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Develop a personal leadership approach to include leading oneself, others, and organizations.
Evaluation	Using the last three assessment cycles, is this program learning outcome still relevant, or should it be changed? Other things to examine: Is the outcome measurable? Is it double or triple barreled? Does it include measurable verbs following Bloom's Taxonomy? The learning outcome "Develop a personal leadership approach to include leading oneself, others, and organizations" is both relevant and essential to the goals of the Organizational Leadership graduate program. It supports application of theory, personal reflection, and
	leadership readiness across multiple contexts. The verb "develop" is measurable and appropriately placed at the synthesis level of Bloom's Taxonomy. The outcome is slightly compound in structure but remains manageable and purposeful. Each component—self, others, and organizational systems—is critical to holistic leadership preparation. As such, the PLO has been revised as part of the transformation of the Master of Arts in Organizational Leadership to the Master of Science in Organizational Leadership effective Fall 2025.
Measurement Instruments	Are the measurement instruments actually measuring the outcome? If you change the SLO, is this still the best instrument to use? Is this a direct or indirect measure? Is your artifact appropriate? If not, what other options are there? Will the rise in the use of AI affect the assignment and measurement? If there are rubrics, do they need to be altered to better fit the learning outcome? Does the rubric (if using) work or does it need to be adjusted?
	Assessment for this outcome is found in both capstone options. In the portfolio, students articulate their personal leadership philosophy and submit a professional development plan. These items, supported by applied artifacts and literature, collectively demonstrate how students understand and aim to lead across individual, relational, and organizational domains. In the project option, students must reflect on their leadership approach throughout the implementation and journaling process, including decision-making, collaboration, and ethical considerations. The final reflection synthesizes their leadership development journey.
	Both are direct measures of the outcome. Portfolio artifacts show clear integration of self-leadership, personal values, team management strategies, and organizational goals. Project reflections also demonstrate growth but may lack a formalized leadership framework.
	The portfolio's written reflection components may be susceptible to AI overuse.
	Rubrics may need to be adjusted to better define criteria more clearly around how well students articulate their leadership identity across the three domains (self, others, organization) and faculty should ensure the rubric applies consistently to both capstone options, with examples of what constitutes strong, developing, or unclear approaches.
Criteria & Targets	Does Criteria for Success (level of performance students will have achieved for your program to have been successful (ex., students will have earned 4/5 for documentation and citation on capstone essays) need to be changed? What about targets?
	Current performance targets (3/5 minimum) are being met by most students. However, to reflect the importance and synthesis-level complexity of this outcome, the program course raise the target to 4/5 in the rubric, embed a requirement that states their reflection must include a leadership theory, and include a formal self-assessment in the capstone course to show growth in the program and assist in the update of the leadership development plan.

Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain
	Conclusions: What worked? What didn't? Why do you think this? For example, maybe the content in one or more courses was modified; changed course sequence (detail modifications); changed admission criteria (detail modifications); changed instructional methodology (detail modifications); changed student advisement process (detail modifications); program suspended; changed textbooks; facility changed (e.g. classroom modifications); introduced new technology (e.g. smart classrooms, computer facilities, etc.); faculty hired to fill a particular content need; faculty instructional training; development of a more refined assessment tool.
	Student work over the past three assessment cycles reflects a general ability to articulate personal leadership philosophies. Portfolio students typically perform well on this element, as shown in both submitted samples. They outline values, approaches, and developmental goals with clarity. Some gaps exist in connecting their philosophy to organizational-level influence. Project students show strong reflection on personal growth but may not always formalize their approach across all three domains.
	While the outcome is being met, there is variation in how deeply students integrate leadership theory into their reflections and plans. In the future, the leadership plans may include a section where students must discuss how they lead self, others, and within an organization.
	Additionally, the organizational leadership graduate program is transitioning from a Master of Arts to a Master of Science degree effective 2025-2026. A revised set of program learning outcomes has been adopted for the MS program and while the PLOs maintains a focus on evaluating leadership theories and models, we anticipate the need to update our assessment and rubrics beyond what is stated above, if needed, to ensure alignment with the revised PLO.
**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:	As we work hard to improve our assessment practices and make them more meaningful and effective, it's important each program craft a three-year plan for the following assessment cycle (2025-26, 2026-27, 2027-28) – this process assists in "closing the loop." For example, you may decide to: • collect a more appropriate artifact • create new program outcomes • adjust targets because they are consistently exceeded or not met
	 need to reconstruct your curriculum map sequencing of classes might need to be adjusted, or additional class(es) provided Whatever your plan is, provide a narrative, in future tense, that indicates how you will approach future assessments. You will be expected to implement any needed changes before the next assessment cycle.
	 Provide a template to ensure updating of the personal leadership philosophy in LEAD 600. Include an updated self-assessment so students can describe their growth as leaders in the program. Assess documents to see gaps in leader development to help with program revisions.