

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
<i>College of Education and Behavioral Sciences</i>	<i>School of Leadership and Professional Studies</i>
<i>Graduate Certificate in Organizational Leadership #1723</i>	
<i>Dr. Tanja Bibbs</i>	
Is this an online program? ☒ Yes ☐ No	Please make sure the Program Learning Outcomes listed match those in CourseLeaf. Indicate verification here ☒ Yes, they match! (If they don't match, explain on this page under Evaluation)

Instructions: 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. This program learning outcome is relevant for the existing Organizational Leadership graduate certificate program. It is measurable and uses an action-oriented Bloom's verb to assess student's ability to critically analyze and apply leadership theories.
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? Over the past three assessment cycles, the Guided Leadership Reflection Paper and the Strategic Leadership Analysis (formerly the Leader Analysis) were both used to measure this outcome. In recent semesters, we shifted to the Leader Analysis Paper to become the primary measurement tool. 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., “<i>Demonstrate leadership behaviors in team settings</i>”), 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.
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. Students consistently met the established 80% success target across assessment cycles. 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.
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 <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. 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. Additionally, the organizational leadership graduate program is transitioning from a Master of Arts to a Master of Science degree effective 2025-2026. Because the certificate and the MA share courses, this change will affect the graduate certificate as well. A revised set of program learning outcomes has been adopted for the MS program and the certificate outcomes may change accordingly. While the revised program learning outcome for the MS maintains a focus on evaluating leadership theories and models, the curricular changes will likely lead to updates in the artifacts and rubrics to ensure stronger alignment with contemporary leadership needs and practices.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	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. Over the next three assessment cycles, we plan to: • Update the PLOs once the new curricular focus is finalized

	• Develop new assessment instruments aligned to the revised outcomes • Revise or replace the Leader Analysis assignment as needed to reflect the new learning goals • Develop a consistent process to separately track certificate students in assessment reporting
--	---

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? This PLO has been a relevant and measurable outcome for the existing Organizational Leadership graduate certificate program over the past assessment cycles. The outcome used an appropriate action verb aligned with Bloom's Taxonomy.
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 Leader Analysis paper in LEAD 500 was the primary instrument for this outcome. The paper requirements were revised during the 2022-2023 assessment cycle and again at the end of the 2023-2024 cycle. The updated assignment requires students to apply foundational leadership concepts from specific chapters of the course textbook. The instrument was more structured, comprehensive and aligned stronger with analyzing leadership behaviors based on theory. The leadership analysis paper 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.
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?

	Students continued to meet the established 80% target success rate. The current criteria for success for the SLO appear appropriate, particularly if the target is that students score in the <i>B range or higher (e.g., 80% or above)</i> 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 <i>and</i> critical application to maintain program rigor.
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 <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. The results for this SLO over the past three years were largely as expected. 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. The organizational leadership graduate program is transitioning from a Master of Arts to a Master of Science degree effective 2025-2026. Because the certificate and the MA share courses, this change will affect the graduate certificate as well. A revised set of program learning outcomes has been adopted for the MS program and the certificate outcomes may change accordingly. Future program learning outcomes for the certificate are still under consideration as part of the broader redesign. Potential shifts in focus will guide future assessment strategies, but no final decision has been made.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	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. Over the next three assessment cycles, we plan to: • Update the PLOs once the new curricular focus is finalized, including reassessing the LO to determine if “discuss” remains the most appropriate verb for the intended level of analysis • Revise or replace the Leader Analysis assignment as needed to reflect the new learning goals ○ If revising this assessment, update rubric to clearly define expectations for demonstrating and analyzing “effective leadership behaviors” with evidence and theory. ○ If revising this assessment, pilot a short reflective component asking students to connect selected leadership behaviors to specific theories. • Continue improving processes to distinguish certificate and degree-seeking students in assessment reporting
--	---

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? The outcome is still relevant, but with the upcoming revision of the certificate program, it might be changed. It is measurable and uses 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 Personal Ethics Statement/Code was used to measure this outcome. It measures half of the outcome but not all of it. Coupling the Organizational Analysis with this would measure the entire outcome. If we change the SLO, this may or may not capture all that is needed—it will depend on the outcome. AI would impact the assignment and measurement were students to use it. There were notes on both the 2022-2023 and 2023-2024 assessment reports that the rubric for this SLO needed to be revised.
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? With 100% achieving 80% on the rubric, both the assignment and rubric need adjusting. However, continuing the target at 80% would be

	appropriate after the changes.
Results & Conclusion	Results: Are the results what was expected or not? What stood out in the assessment cycle over the past three years? Explain The results are not what would be expected for this SLO, as the assignment does not cover organizational ethics in any way. That 100% of students are meeting it on the assessment rubric shows the flaws in the SLO's rubric. 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. Using the Personal Ethics Code to measure part of the SLO is appropriate, ut another assignment needs to be assessed to capture the learning about organizational ethics. If this SLO is changed with program revisions, the assessment pieces need to be revisited, as well.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	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. I suspect the certificate revision will include the new ethics course as part of it. Therefore, he 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 can 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 certificate-only students for the assessment, and that should also be part of our plan going forward. With this in mind, our plan is: 1. Collect both revised Professional & Organizational Ethical Analysis and the Personal Ethical Code & Development Plan to fully assess this SLO, or select appropriate pieces to assess a revised SLO 2. Continue target at 80% meeting or exceeding, but adjust that as the new course stabilizes 3. Identify Certificate-Only students for this assessment

Program Student Learning Outcome 4	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Determine the impact 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? This program learning outcome has remained relevant for this existing program over the past assessment cycles. It prepared students to lead effectively in multicultural environments which is an essential competency for today's leadership contexts. The outcome was measurable and singular in focus. The outcome aligns appropriately with graduate-level expectations for critical thinking and application. The organizational leadership graduate program is transitioning from a Master of Arts to a Master of Science degree effective 2025-2026. Because the certificate and the MA share courses, this change will affect the graduate certificate as well. A revised set of program learning outcomes has been adopted for the MS program and the certificate outcomes may change accordingly. Future program learning outcomes for the certificate are still under consideration as part of the broader redesign. Potential shifts in focus will guide future assessment strategies, but no final decision has been made.
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 Cultural Intelligence Development Plan used in LEAD 550 has proven to be a strong assessment tool. This assignment requires students to analyze their organization's current cultural diversity strategies and return on investment, assess their personal CQ levels across four dimensions (Drive, Knowledge, Strategy, Action), create personalized development plans for each CQ dimension with SMART goals, and craft leadership pledge statements connecting cultural intelligence to exemplary leadership practices The comprehensive nature of this assignment directly measures students' ability to determine how diversity and culture impact leadership by requiring both theoretical understanding and practical application. Students must demonstrate not only knowledge of cultural factors but also strategic thinking about how these factors influence organizational effectiveness and leadership approaches. The instrument's effectiveness could be enhanced by adding a reflection component specifically addressing how cultural factors influenced actual leadership situations, incorporating peer feedback elements to provide diverse perspectives, or developing a more specific rubric section for evaluating how deeply students connect cultural factors to leadership outcomes As the program transitions to the MS format, a similar comprehensive assignment should be maintained, though potentially modified to align with the new curriculum structure and any revised learning outcomes.

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 current scoring rubric effectively evaluates student performance across key dimensions of the assignment. Top scores require comprehensive identification of cultural strategies, thorough ROI analysis, feasible coping mechanisms, and complete development plans for each CQ dimension. The existing performance target has been 100% of students achieving scores in the "Excellent" or "Good but some issues" categories. This target has been consistently met, demonstrating strong student proficiency in addressing cultural leadership issues.
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. Students have consistently demonstrated proficiency in addressing the cultural dimensions of leadership through the Cultural Intelligence Development Plan assignment. Particularly strong areas include students' ability to articulate personalized development plans and connect cultural factors to leadership models. Areas where some students showed less sophisticated understanding included quantifying the return on investment for cultural diversity initiatives and developing specific action steps for implementing cultural intelligence strategies in organizational contexts. The consistently strong performance suggests the instructional approaches in LEAD 550 effectively develop students' understanding of how diversity and culture impact leadership. The comprehensive project-based assessment encourages deep engagement with both theoretical concepts and practical applications. As the program transitions from MA to MS format, these results indicate that cultural leadership competencies should remain a central component of the curriculum. However, the consistent achievement of targets suggests an opportunity to deepen expectations, particularly in areas of quantitative analysis and strategic implementation of cultural intelligence principles. One opportunity to strengthen the assessment includes incorporating more direct application components that require students to implement cultural leadership strategies in real-world contexts.
<u>**IMPORTANT - Plans for Next Assessment Cycle:</u>	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. Over the next three assessment cycles, we plan to: • Phase out the Cultural Intelligence Development Plan assignment with the sunseting of LEAD 550 • Update the PLOs once the new curricular focus is finalized • Develop new assessment instruments aligned to the revised outcomes • Continue refining tracking processes to distinguish certificate students during assessment cycles

