

Assurance of Student Learning Reflection 2024-2025	
<i>College of Education and Behavioral Sciences</i>	<i>School of Leadership and Professional Studies</i>
<i>Bachelor of Science in Organizational Leadership #545/E</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	Apply 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 learning outcome remains highly relevant to the goals of the Organizational Leadership program and aligns well with both workforce expectations and academic preparation. It focuses clearly on the integration of foundational knowledge, making it one of the most important outcomes to continue assessing. Given that the outcome aligns directly with how leadership concepts are utilized in practice, it should remain a core SLO for the program. While we currently assess five program learning outcomes, this one is foundational and should be measured each cycle.

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? In LEAD 300, the primary measurement instruments for this outcome include a Leadership Case Study Analysis and a Personal Leadership Traits Infographic, both of which require students to apply leadership theories, models, and approaches from the course to real-world or personal contexts. These are direct measures that align closely with the outcome, as they prompt students to connect theoretical frameworks (e.g., transactional vs. transformational leadership) to practical leadership scenarios or self-reflection. With the rise of AI tools, both assignments remain largely AI-resilient due to their emphasis on individualized application and personal integration of course material. Rubrics may benefit from refinement to more explicitly assess the depth of theoretical application and the authenticity of the student's connection to leadership content from the course. In LEAD 400, the measurement instruments include the Leadership Skills & Competencies Map, in which students reflect on specific leadership concepts studied across the program and map those to real-world skills, and the Organizational Leader Profile, where students identify their personal leadership style and connect it to theories and models they studied. These instruments directly measure students' application of leadership concepts and allow for both reflection and synthesis, especially in LEAD 400. Both assignments are direct measures and align closely with the outcome. With the rise of AI tools, the reflection-based structure of the Competencies Map and the creative design of the Organizational Leader Profile remain appropriate and mostly resistant to AI misuse, as they require personalization and integration of lived academic experience. However, rubrics may be refined to include criteria that assess authenticity and connection to course-specific knowledge.
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. Since LEAD 300 was revised beginning in Fall 2024, the current cycle represents the first use of new assignments and rubrics aligned with this student learning outcome. As such, no formal criteria for success or performance targets have been established in previous cycles. Moving forward, a baseline criterion will be that students should score an average of 80% or higher on rubric dimensions directly tied to the application of leadership theories, models, and approaches. The initial program target will be for at least 85% of students to meet or exceed this threshold. These criteria and targets will be reviewed after one full year of data to determine whether they are appropriately rigorous. As assignment formats (e.g., infographics and case applications) are designed to promote deeper engagement and originality, the program will also monitor rubric alignment to ensure it accurately reflects the complexity and authenticity expected in applied leadership work. In the class the current target is that 90% of students score at least 80% (or 4/5) on rubric items aligned with the SLO. This target has been consistently met in the past three assessment cycles. Therefore, the instructor plans to raise the target to 90% of students scoring at least 85% to increase rigor and better prepare students for post-graduation roles. Rubrics used for both the Skills Map and Leader Profile will be reviewed and adjusted to ensure more emphasis on explicitly naming and applying key leadership theories and models in both reflective writing and creative profile development.
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. Because LEAD 300 was significantly revised and implemented for the first time in Fall 2024, there are no prior assessment cycles using the new structure to compare against. As such, this academic year is serving as a baseline cycle for data collection and performance benchmarking. While final assessment results are still being gathered, early indications suggest that students are engaging well with the revised assignments, particularly those requiring personal application and multimedia formats. Results from the leadership traits infographic and ethics case study video suggest students are able to articulate personal connections to leadership theory, though some students need more support in using scholarly sources and APA citation accurately. These patterns will be monitored closely as part of establishing a data-informed performance baseline. Over the past three years in LEAD 400, results have consistently met or exceeded expectations. Students demonstrated a strong ability to articulate and apply leadership concepts across both assessments. Many students were able to accurately align personal experiences and course learning with major leadership theories. The Skills & Competencies Map (new in 2024-2025) helped students scaffold their understanding across courses. The Organizational Leader Profile encouraged integration of theory and professional branding. Some students struggle to recall some leadership theories suggesting reinforcement needed in leadership courses leading to the capstone course.
<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, in LEAD 300, the program will: • Analyze baseline assessment data from the newly implemented assignments (e.g., infographic, video case study, and interview project) to determine if current criteria and targets are appropriate and to identify areas for instructional improvement. • Refine and calibrate rubrics to ensure consistency across course sections and strengthen the measurement of theoretical application, originality, and authentic student voice. • Evaluate how LEAD 300 scaffolds with other leadership courses and determine if revisions to course sequencing or prerequisites are needed to ensure students are prepared to apply leadership theories effectively. • Align the course more closely with the broader program-level curriculum map to ensure theories, models, and application skills are introduced and reinforced before mastery in the capstone.

	Over the next three assessment cycles, in LEAD 400, the program will: 1. The update the rubric for the final assignment that includes a section requiring naming and correctly applying leadership models. 2. Connect leadership theories and models in each leadership course prior to the capstone. 3. Embed competency connections to each LEAD course to help students reflect on their learning in LEAD 400.
--	--

Program Student Learning Outcome 2	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Analyze 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 outcome remains highly relevant to both the academic and professional objectives of the Organizational Leadership program. The outcome focuses on a core element of leadership education—understanding how leader behavior impacts individuals, teams, and organizations. It is distinct from outcomes that focus on theory or ethics and has stood the test of time as an essential leadership competency.
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? In LEAD 300, the Leadership Traits Infographic and Application-Based Activities (ABAs) directly measure students’ ability to analyze the behaviors of effective leaders. These assignments require students to reflect on their own traits or evaluate leadership behaviors in scenario-based contexts, encouraging critical thinking and connection to leadership theory. While SmartBook and Chapter Assessments reinforce foundational knowledge, the infographic and ABAs best align with this outcome as direct measures. The use of AI is a minimal concern, as these tasks require personal application and context-specific responses. Existing rubrics are effective but may benefit from refinement to better distinguish between simple description and deeper behavioral analysis tied to course content and theory. This outcome is assessed through two primary assignments in LEAD 400 including the Leadership Skills & Competencies Map and the Organizational Leader Profile. In the first activity students reflect on leadership behaviors they have learned, observed, or practiced. They connect these behaviors to specific activities, projects, and courses, and assess how their understanding has evolved. In the Organizational Leader Profile, students describe their personal leadership style and provide supporting evidence from assessments, leadership experiences, and reflections that highlight key behaviors. These are direct measures that align well with the outcome. They prompt students to go beyond listing traits—they must assess the effectiveness and context of various behaviors, which aligns with the analytical verb in the SLO.

	While the use of AI is rising, the authentic, reflective, and experience-based nature of these assignments mostly helps protect against misuse. AI-generated content lacks the individualized depth that is required in both assessments.
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? To ensure 90% of students will earn at least 85% on the rubric dimension tied specifically to leadership behavior analysis, faculty will revise the rubric language for the Leadership Skills Map to distinguish between identifying leadership behaviors and analyzing the impact and effectiveness of those leadership behaviors.
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 performance met expectations. Most students successfully described leader behaviors and linked them to specific projects or experiences. Students who performed best used leadership terminology from earlier coursework (e.g., LEAD 200/300/325) and incorporated personal examples. Encouraging the use of DISC, Strengths, and real-world examples led to more authentic analysis. The group reflections in LEAD 400 created a space for students to compare behaviors and get feedback, deepening their analysis. The Competencies Map's structure (Identify–Explain–Develop) supported analysis rather than simple description. A small number of students showed difficulty in connecting behaviors to leadership theory, which made their analysis less rigorous. Some students submitted generic behaviors (e.g., “good listener”) without deeper insight into how or why those behaviors were effective.
<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: 1. Embed more behavioral analysis activities into LEAD 300 and LEAD 325, such as analyzing leadership decisions using real-world case studies. 2. Revise the Competencies Map instructions to include a prompt that asks: “What leadership behaviors were demonstrated, and how effective were they?” These efforts will help ensure that by the time students reach LEAD 400, they are well prepared to think critically about leader behavior and its effectiveness in context—fully supporting this outcome.
--	--

Program Student Learning Outcome 3	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Apply 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 program learning outcome "Apply personal and organizational ethics" appears to be relevant and appropriate. The outcome is measurable as it focuses on application, which is an appropriate level on Bloom's Taxonomy. It's not double or triple barreled - it has a single focus on applying ethics in both personal and organizational contexts. The verb "apply" is measurable and follows Bloom's Taxonomy at the application level, making it suitable for assessment.
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 has been used as the primary assessment tool. The statement requires students to identify their values, discuss their personal ethical perspective, connect their perspective to philosophical frameworks, and provide real-life examples of application. This structure allows students to demonstrate understanding and application of ethics. The assignment challenges students to analyze what is important to them ethically and requires them to apply theoretical knowledge in a personalized context. Further, the inclusion of real-life experiences bridges theory and practice. The Professional Ethical Analysis assignment in LEAD 330 complements this assessment by focusing on profession-specific ethical

	dilemmas, which strengthens the measurement of the organizational ethics component of the outcome. The Professional Ethical Analysis assignment requires students to identify ethical dilemmas in their profession, apply ethical theories and perspectives to analyze these dilemmas, connect professional ethics codes to practical situations, apply leadership models (Kouzes and Posner's Five Practices) to ethical challenges, and integrate personal ethical perspectives. The assignment encourages students to apply ethics to their specific professional context rather than hypothetical scenarios which creates an authentic assessment experience that mirrors real-world settings. In LEAD 300, the Personal Ethics Case Study Video is a primary direct measure for the SLO “Apply personal and organizational ethics” and could be considered as an alternative measurement instrument. This assignment requires students to identify an ethical dilemma, analyze it using frameworks such as moral development stages, virtue ethics, duty-based ethics, and organizational values, and articulate how their personal values align or conflict with those frameworks. The case study format ensures students apply ethics in a practical, contextualized way, making it an appropriate and effective artifact. The Application-Based Activities also reinforce ethical decision-making in simulated workplace scenarios. These are both direct measures of the outcome. The personalized and scenario-based nature of the video project makes it largely resistant to AI misuse, especially when students are required to integrate specific course concepts and cite sources using APA format. Rubrics may be strengthened by clarifying how well students connect ethical theories to real-world or personal decisions, but overall, the current instruments are well-aligned with the learning outcome. The Personal Ethics Statement is vulnerable to AI misuse particularly in sections where students struggle to connect philosophical frameworks and ethical theories to their personal values. AI tools can easily generate sophisticated connections between personal values and the philosophical frameworks without genuine understanding. To address this vulnerability, the assignment could require students to share their ethical statements in live presentations or incorporate reflection on the process of developing connections between personal values and philosophical frameworks.
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? Based on the rubric, the criteria for success have been well-defined. Students achieving excellence need to clearly identify and discuss three ethical dilemmas in their profession, analyze in depth how the most critical dilemma relates to both ethics and leadership, apply various ethical concepts and perspectives with good detail and examples, specifically cite provisions from professional ethics codes, apply Kouzes and Posner's model with detail, summarize and apply their personal ethical perspective, and demonstrate strong writing skills and proper APA format. The current 80% target appears to be appropriate since most students are meeting or exceeding this threshold.
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. The assessment data for the Personal Ethics Statement has been limited due to ongoing program transformation efforts that were indicated on previous reports. Additionally, not every PLO is assessed each year. Despite these limitations, preliminary observations from completed Personal Ethics Statements show that while students generally demonstrate strong abilities in identifying personal values and providing real-life applications, they consistently struggle with connecting these values to philosophical frameworks and ethical theories. This gap in demonstrating theoretical connections while maintaining authentic personal reflection represents the most significant area for improvement in student performance.

	Both the Personal Ethics Statement and the Professional Ethical Analysis assignment in LEAD 330 serve as complementary direct measures that together provide a comprehensive assessment of PLO 3. Rather than viewing one as more effective than the other, these instruments should be seen as addressing different but equally important dimensions of the learning outcome. Together with the Personal Ethics Case Study Video in LEAD 300, these assessment measures provide a holistic picture of students' ability to apply ethics across both personal and organizational contexts, strengthening the validity of our assessment approach for this learning outcome.
<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: • Scaffold the personal ethical statement assignment. Students will first identify and define personal values in a preliminary assignment, explore philosophical frameworks through guided exercises, and integrate these components in their statement • If continuing with the application of Kouzes and Posner, have students practice connecting leadership practices with ethical scenarios

Program Student Learning Outcome 4	
Program Student Learning Outcome	Interpret 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 PLO addresses important contemporary leadership competencies focusing on diversity and culture and is highly relevant in today's leadership landscape. Although related, the PLO could the diversity and culture concepts for more precise measurement. The verb interpret is measurable and at an appropriate level of 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? In LEAD 300, the Diversity Interview Project serves as the primary direct measure. This assignment requires students to engage in a recorded interview with someone from a background different from their own and reflect on the individual's cultural values, experiences, and perspectives related to inclusion and leadership. By analyzing both personal insights and organizational practices through the lens of diversity, students explore how culture shapes leadership approaches and decisions. The Application-Based Activities also support this SLO by presenting scenarios that require consideration of cultural differences in team dynamics and workplace interactions. These are direct measures, and the personalized, interview-based format of the project makes it highly resistant to AI misuse, particularly when paired with analysis, integration of course concepts, and APA citation. Rubrics used for this assignment may be strengthened by including criteria that assess how well students interpret cultural influence on leadership and synthesize personal insight with broader organizational implications.
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? Since LEAD 300 was revised beginning in Fall 2024, the current cycle represents the first use of new assignments and rubrics aligned with this student learning outcome. As such, no formal criteria for success or performance targets have been established in previous cycles. Moving forward, a baseline criterion will be that students should score an average of 80% or higher on rubric dimensions directly tied to the application of diversity and culture on the leadership process.
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. Because LEAD 300 was significantly revised and implemented for the first time in Fall 2024, there are no prior assessment cycles using the new structure to compare against. As such, this academic year is serving as a baseline cycle for data collection and performance benchmarking. While final assessment results are still being gathered, early indications suggest that students are engaging well with the revised assignments, particularly those requiring personal application and multimedia formats.
<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, in LEAD 300, the program will: • Consider the double-barreled nature of this outcome • Analyze baseline assessment data from the newly implemented assignments (e.g., infographic, video case study, and interview project) to determine if current criteria and targets are appropriate and to identify areas for instructional improvement. • Refine and calibrate rubrics to ensure consistency across course sections and strengthen the measurement of theoretical application, originality, and authentic student voice. • Evaluate how LEAD 300 scaffolds with other leadership courses and determine if revisions to course sequencing or prerequisites are needed to ensure students are prepared to apply leadership theories effectively. • Align the course more closely with the broader program-level curriculum map to ensure theories, models, and application skills are introduced and reinforced before mastery in the capstone.
--	---

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? This outcome is essential to the mission of the Organizational Leadership program, particularly as a capstone expectation. It challenges students to synthesize what they've learned and articulate a leadership approach that is personally meaningful and professionally applicable.
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? In LEAD 300, the Personal Visionary Development Plan is the primary direct measure for this SLO. This assignment requires students to craft a personal vision statement and outline a strategic action plan that integrates self-leadership, influence on others, and future organizational impact. It draws from leadership concepts related to visioning, motivation, alignment, and execution, helping students connect course theories to their personal and professional aspirations. Elements of self-awareness are also introduced in the Leadership Traits Infographic, which supports this outcome by prompting students to reflect on their current leadership style and potential areas of growth.

	Both assignments are direct measures and are appropriately designed to foster authentic, future-oriented leadership planning. Because these artifacts are highly personalized and require integration of leadership theory with the student's lived experience and goals, they are resistant to AI misuse. Rubrics may be reviewed to ensure they capture the development of a holistic leadership approach—including clarity of vision, alignment with theory, and practical application across self, team, and organizational contexts. This outcome is directly assessed using the Leadership Skills & Competencies Map and the Organizational Leader Profile in LEAD 400. The Leadership Skills & Competencies map scaffolds the development of a personal leadership approach through a semester-long process of reflection, skill identification, and planning. Students connect leadership theory, personal values, and competencies to leadership at different levels (self, others, organization). The Organizational Leader Profile is the culminating artifact where students present their leadership story and goals, and synthesize assessment data (DISC, Jung Typology, High 5 Strengths) and reflections. They are required to define and illustrate their leadership approach clearly. Both assessments are direct measures, well-aligned with the SLO. They require personalization, context, and the synthesis of prior learning. Students cannot complete these well without having developed a leadership approach that applies across levels. The rise of AI may affect assignment authenticity, but the personalized and integrative nature of both assignments—especially when tied to specific personal assessments and WKU Career Center resources—continues to make them authentic.
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 targets require that 90% of students earn at least 80% on rubric dimensions aligned with this outcome. As students have consistently exceeded this, the target may be adjusted to 90% of students will earn at least 85% on rubric components related to leadership approach development. The rubrics for the Organizational Leader Profile should be updated to evaluate cohesiveness across the different levels of leadership (self, others, and 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 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. Over the past three cycles, in LEAD 400, results showed that students were generally able to develop and articulate a personal leadership approach that reflected their learning and professional goals. Most demonstrated growth in understanding leadership as a layered, relational process. Requiring real-world applications like the resume, elevator pitch, and digital persona helped students align their approach with workplace readiness. Using personality and strength assessments, students are able to make concrete connections to competencies.
<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. To improve measurement and instructional alignment with this outcome, the program will: 1. Add targeted prompts in the Competencies Map asking students to write explicitly about leading oneself, others, and organizations in separate mini-reflections 2. Create a repository of student sample profiles for use in future semesters to model strong integration and balance across leadership levels
--	---