



Lumpkin College of Business and Technology  
Office of the Dean

Lumpkin Hall Room 4800  
600 Lincoln Avenue, Charleston, Illinois 61920-3099

Office: (217) 581-3526 | eiu.edu/lumpkin

---

April 27, 2021

Dr. Kelly Best  
Program Coordinator, Organizational Development and Leadership (ODL)

RE: Year 2 Program Assessment Review

Documents submitted and reviewed:

- 1) OD Assessment 7-31-20 (word document) [submitted by previous coordinator, Bruce Barnard]

<b>Evaluated Aspects of Program Assessment</b>	<b>Stage of Maturity</b> (Beginning, Developing, Acceptable, Exemplary)
A. Student Learning Outcomes	Acceptable
B. Measurement Tools and Assignments	Developing
C. Data Collection and Integrity	Beginning
D. Expectations and Results	Developing
E. Discussion and Analysis	Developing
F. Use of Assessment Results for Program Improvement	Beginning
G. Faculty Engagement in Assessment	Developing

### **Summary of Assessment Evaluation:**

The program has identified rubrics (though it has not provided copies of them and should for future review), and has established learning goals and objectives that are appropriate. The program needs to rely less on cumulative assignment grade and more on specific facets that align more closely with the learning objectives. Numerous areas for revision and improvement are identified in the following sections and I'd be happy to be part of a meeting with program faculty to clarify any of my suggestions. The proposed actions I've recommended or areas identified for action will likely simplify some of the data collection and provide more depth of analysis of the results.

Melody L Wollan, PhD, SHRM-SCP  
Associate Dean, Lumpkin College of  
Business and Technology  
mlwollan@eiu.edu

Academic Program	Organizational Development and Leadership
Evaluation Point	Year 2 (AY 2020) of 4
Program-level Accreditation	None
Academic Years in Reporting Cycle	AY19 - AY23
Reviewer Name, Title	Melody Wollan, LCBT Associate Dean

<b>A. Student Learning Outcomes (SLO)</b>			
Specific statements that articulate the discipline-specific content, skills, and/or dispositions students should gain or improve through engagement in the program			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SLO does not specify what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and/or at what point(s) in their progression through the program they will do so.</li> <li>SLO contains only imprecise verbs (e.g., “know,” “understand”), and thus is difficult to measure.</li> <li>SLO is too broad or vague to guide the assessment process.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it (e.g., majors, students in the program), but not at what point in their progression through the program they will do so.</li> <li>SLO contains action verbs that reflect an inadequate depth of knowledge for the program.</li> <li>SLO contains a general description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions to be measured, but the description is not discipline-specific.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SLO is clear about what group of students will achieve mastery of it, and at what point in their progression through the program they will do so (e.g., “seniors,” “graduates”).</li> <li>SLO contains precise, measurable, and observable verbs that reflect an appropriate depth of knowledge for the program.</li> <li>SLO contains a discipline-specific description of the content knowledge, skills, and/or dispositions that students will demonstrate.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A reasonable number of SLOs are identified — enough to adequately accomplish the mission of the program while still being manageable to assess on an annual basis.</li> <li>Overall SLOs reflect appropriate level of expectation for the program type/level.</li> <li>Overall SLOs stated in student-centered terms, reflecting what students should know, do, and/or think as they engage in the program of study.</li> </ul>
BEGINNING <input type="checkbox"/>	DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/>	ACCEPTABLE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	EXEMPLARY <input type="checkbox"/>
Comments:	<p>The program reports 7 SLOs that appear to address Bloom’s taxonomy at five of the six levels (analysis is not included but could logically be included in SLO 7 with some refinement).</p> <p>The linkage to undergraduate learning goals in the report table are problematic; each SLO either addresses a ULG or it doesn’t. For example, SLO 1 appears to have 4 measurements being taken; of these, the first two are not linked an ULG but the latter two are identified as being linked to R (Responsible Citizenship). Perhaps the content of the assignment was identified/labeled rather than the SLO? Please revise moving forward into documentation for Year 3 and Year 4 (including the Year 4 report). SLO 4 is linked to C – Critical Thinking; SLO 5 is linked to C and W (Writing and Critical Reading) as well as W alone (should be consistent with the SLO). An assignment can be used, if separate rubrics/measures are used, for more than one SLO. SLO 6 is linked to S (Speaking and Listening), and SLO 7 is linked to Q (Quantitative Reasoning).</p>		

There is no indication about the point of progression for assessment but this is perhaps not applicable to this specific program because it serves as a degree completion program and is composed of classes at the 3000-4999 levels only. Thus, it may be more difficult to see divergence between early degree and end of degree progression.

**B. Measurement Tools and Assignments**

Description of the measurement tool and the associated assignment, how they align with the SLO, and their validity

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLO is assessed with only indirect measure(s) (i.e., surveys).</li> <li>• No information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SLO is assessed with direct measure(s) (i.e., objective tests, rubrics).</li> <li>• General description is provided of the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s).</li> <li>• General information is provided about how the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) relate to the SLO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Detailed description of measurement tool(s) and its alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ for an objective test measurement tool, individual questions are identified and valid to the SLO (or element of the SLO), and expected levels of mastery are indicated;</li> <li>◦ for an analytic rubric measurement tool, each trait is mapped to the SLO (or element of the SLO) and each level details expectations.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Detailed description of the assignment(s) and alignment with the SLO is provided. This includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ for an objective test assignment, representative test items are described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery;</li> <li>◦ for a performance-based assignment evaluated with an analytic rubric, the assignment prompt is described to indicate relevance to the SLO and the expected level of mastery.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Measurement tool(s) will provide a direct/observable result and are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.</li> <li>• Assignment(s) are appropriate to the SLO and the level of mastery expected.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct measures may be supplemented with indirect measures.</li> <li>• Includes both formative and summative measures.</li> <li>• A description of the development process for the measurement tool(s) and assignment(s) is included to illustrate their appropriateness to the SLO.</li> </ul>
---	---	---	--

BEGINNING <input type="checkbox"/>	DEVELOPING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ACCEPTABLE <input type="checkbox"/>	EXEMPLARY <input type="checkbox"/>
------------------------------------	--	-------------------------------------	------------------------------------

<b>Assessment Methods: What type of assessment methods does the program use?</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Direct Measures</b> Measures that require students to demonstrate knowledge and skills. Provide tangible, visible, and self-explanatory evidence of what students have and have not learned. Actual student behavior or work is measured or assessed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Indirect Measures</b> Assessments that measure opinions or thoughts about student’s knowledge, skills, attitudes, learning experiences, perceptions of services received or employers’ opinions. Do not measure students’ performance directly
--	--	--

<b>Measurement Tools: What type of measurement tools does the program use?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Objective Test</b> Measure that has right or wrong answers and can be quickly and unambiguously scored by anyone with an answer key.	<input type="checkbox"/> <b>Analytic Rubrics</b> Measures that are subjective for performance-based assignments. Resembles a grid with criteria for student project listed in the leftmost column and with all levels of performance listed across the top row. The cells within the center contain descriptions of what specified criteria look like for each level of performance. Each of the criteria is scored individually	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Surveys</b> Measures for collecting data from a pre-defined group of respondents to gain information and insights on a topic of interest	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <b>Other</b> Could include a holistic rubric (single scale with all criteria being considered together), or a checklist (only two performance levels possible and no descriptions included).
--	---	---	--	---

Comments: No rubrics were provided with the Year 2 report. Review of the table of measures/instruments appear to refer to a single score grade on an assignment, and not assessment of factors. This is an undesirable approach to assessment. Assessment rubrics should be created that could be assigned point values for grading purposes, but a holistic grade on an assignment is not a viable measure for assessment. Some assignments refer to “the case study rubric”, but

expectations are set on what appears to be a holistic grade for the assignment using >90%, between >70%-90%, and < 70%. For SLO 1, reference is made that indicates three concepts are utilized by the rubric that align with the SLO. Why are the individual scores of that rubric for each of the three concepts not collected individually and then counted?

Surveys of ‘active and graduating students are administered annually’ that ask students to rate each course. This is rather broad and assessment should be viewed as assessment of a program, and not a rating of individual classes. As such, I would encourage you to evaluate and revise your survey with this in mind, rather than pinning SLOs to specific courses which likely have concepts that overlap in multiple courses (i.e., such as planning, organizing, and directing).

Similarly, the remaining SLOs and information provided in the table of measures needs to be heavily revised with the above improvements incorporated. I’d be happy to assist in this revision with the faculty and help clarify such that standard rubrics are developed and used to measure SLOs in multiple courses.

**C. Data Collection and Integrity**

When measurement tools are applied, to whom, at what point in the program, and how the program ensures consistency across multiple administrations of the tools and assignments (reliability)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is unclear how the information provided relates to this assessment cycle.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information is provided about the data collection process in this cycle, but not enough to generate confidence in the findings (e.g., sample size is too small, student motivation conditions are inconsistent, rubric is not normed with raters, etc.)</li> <li>• Process will provide limited information for guiding instruction and curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enough information is provided about administration of the measurement tool and data collection process to generate confidence in the findings. This includes:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ adequate student population targeted with an assignment and measurement tool;</li> <li>○ sufficient sample size for statistically significant results (especially if different than the student population), with a rationale for representative sampling (if appropriate);</li> <li>○ consistent student motivation conditions across multiple administrations of the assignment and measurement tool;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Process will provide useful information for guiding instruction and curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Information provided demonstrates that data collection occurs throughout the curriculum and involves multiple faculty members.</li> <li>• Information is included about how data are collected and responsibility is shared among faculty members.</li> <li>• An ongoing, inclusive, systematic process is in place for collecting data to make decisions and improve learning within the program, appropriate to the program’s internal and external constituencies.</li> </ul>
<p>BEGINNING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>ACCEPTABLE <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>EXEMPLARY <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Comments: It is not clear when or where data was collected, or the size of the reported results. Information is limited as to the actual factors being measured. Because holistic measures are being created by individual faculty for what appears to be grading purposes, I'm not sure the resulting data will be sufficient to draw conclusions or take action in a curricular review cycle over the four-year period currently represented by this Year 2 report.

**D. Expectations and Results**  
 SLO have clearly identified expectations that reflect size and maturity of the program. Clear and concise illustration/presentation of data collected. Includes narrative or table/figure with sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges as appropriate to the assessment tool

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No expectations are presented, or it is unclear how the expected results relate to the SLO.</li> <li>• No results are presented, or it is unclear how the results relate to the SLO.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expectations and results are presented and relate to the SLO, but a lack of specificity does not allow useful conclusions to be drawn.</li> <li>• Presentation is insufficiently detailed; only overall student scores or averages are presented.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expectations and results are presented by SLO.</li> <li>• Tables and graphs effectively communicate results, including sample size, count, averages, percentages, and ranges, as appropriate to the measurement tool.</li> <li>• For objective tests, results are presented according to items or groups of items connected to a SLO.</li> <li>• For rubrics, results are presented according to rubric trait and level, including counts and percentages.</li> <li>• Results include all applicable locations and/or delivery modes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Expectations and results are easily understood, as well as their implications.</li> <li>• Results are presented for all locations and/or delivery modes showing an equivalent level of rigor and detail.</li> </ul>
--	---	---	--

BEGINNING       DEVELOPING       ACCEPTABLE       EXEMPLARY

Comments: The identification of measures/instruments is sometimes very broad – for example, in SLO1, the objective is to ‘plan, organize and direct activities in the workplace’. The first identified measure, a case study in ODL 4835, appears to be strongly aligned with this purpose. The second measure – an annual exit survey question does not seem to align given wording of the results and indication of the measure: “extent to which each course prepared them for current and anticipated PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES report(ing) being well-prepared or somewhat well prepared”. Likewise, the third measure is of ethical case aspects, which do not fully align with plan, organize and direct. I’m also recommending a revision of the anticipated results. Right now they are set up as 20% exceed, 75% meet, 5% will not meet. Instead, results should be framed as 20% exceed, 95% meet expectations or are rated higher. In the current context, you are setting up a situation to not meet your expected results if you have too many excellent results and not enough meets. The way I’ve repositioned it, this will be avoided. This pattern is consistent throughout the assessment plan. I am also discouraging the use of overall rubric scores (which are essentially grades) on cases and assignments. Instead, determine which of the rubric criteria best fit the learning objective and only count cases of that criteria from your rubric. It would also be appropriate to report the actual number of items in your measures so that your results read 25/125 (20%) students enrolled in AY21 were “exceeds” (expectation was 20%), and 120/125 (96%) were “meets” (expectation was 95% would meet or score higher). The current EIU templates asks programs to identify clearly (bold? Separate statement) that you Met or Did not Meet Expectations for each measure. Note that dating the sample allows you to isolate and identify a pattern of results with annual data points since this report is intended to be cumulative over a four-year period.

**E. Discussion and Analysis**

Explains the meaningfulness of the data presented (interpretation of results) with a clear, complete, and succinct analysis focusing on the interpretation of and reflection on the assessment data

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No interpretation is attempted, or the interpretation does not relate to the SLO and/or the results.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation is attempted, relates to the SLO and/or results, but the interpretation is either:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ insufficient to support programmatic decisions,</li> <li>○ not aligned with the program’s previous action plans,</li> <li>○ offering excuses for results rather than thoughtful interpretations leading to improvements in student learning.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation is aligned with the program’s SLOs.</li> <li>• Interpretation is explained in terms of the desired levels of student performance and is based on student achievement of those levels.</li> <li>• Interpretation is justified through current disciplinary standards, previous results and/or benchmarks.</li> <li>• Interpretation includes how courses, experiences, and/or the assessment process might have affected results.</li> <li>• Interpretation indicates the appropriate collaboration and consensus of multiple internal stakeholders (e.g., program faculty, committees, staff, and/or students).</li> <li>• Interpretation is detailed enough to justify programmatic decisions concerning changes in instruction and/or curriculum.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Interpretation directly addresses the program’s SLOs and action plans.</li> <li>• Interpretation addresses past trends in student performance, as appropriate.</li> <li>• Strengths and weaknesses in student learning are easily identified.</li> <li>• New findings are compared to past trends, as appropriate.</li> <li>• Interpretation identifies possible areas of improvement, thus initiating future actions.</li> </ul>
--	---	--	--

BEGINNING       DEVELOPING       ACCEPTABLE       EXEMPLARY

Comments: It appears the program has taken steps to make changes in 2019 (Year 1) but it is not clear on what basis (what results led to the changes?) What learning objectives were you trying to improve? The curricular actions seem more general than assessment driven. The most interesting action is “faculty have made numerous modifications to course content to more effectively address learning objectives”. This is exactly what should be answered in these analytical sections. What modification? What results demonstrated poor performance? What was changed?

For Question 2, I do not see the relevance of some of the items listed as the question asks you to describe improvements or declined results (actual measured results). None of these items reflect that because it is said at the top of the section “students are meeting or exceeding measure of learning on designated class activities and University data”. That reflects a statement of grades on assignments and not measures of assessment outcomes related to learning objectives. If in fact you are meeting all of your expectations, then you should consider evaluation of your expectations and see if the standards might need to be made higher or with more complexity. At this time, I do not think that is the case; I think previous sections of this report reflect opportunities to first work on the alignment of measures with the learning objectives.

### F. Use of Assessment Results for Program Improvement

Strategies planned and/or in progress for program improvement; actions designed to improve instruction and curriculum; rationale for action is based on data and analysis of results

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No actions proposed for the next cycle.</li> <li>• Proposed actions are not based on the data captured through the assessment process.</li> <li>• Proposed actions are unrelated to the improvement of the educational program, and therefore student learning.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The connection between proposed actions, results/discussion, and/or SLOs is not clear.</li> <li>• Proposed actions are too broad or vague to guide the improvement of the educational program and student learning.</li> <li>• Proposed actions do not demonstrate evidence of input from more than one person.</li> <li>• Proposed actions pertain only to assessment plan changes (process/measure only).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed actions are directly connected to the SLOs.</li> <li>• Proposed actions are data-driven, directly related to the results/discussion.</li> <li>• Proposed actions focus on the improvement of the educational program and student learning. If modifications are made to the assessment process, they are data-driven.</li> <li>• Proposed actions contain a process for evaluating their effectiveness.</li> <li>• Proposed actions demonstrate evidence of input from multiple internal stakeholders.</li> <li>• Carryover actions from the previous cycle are noted.</li> <li>• If a SLO is not addressed by any proposed actions, justification is given for maintenance of ongoing curriculum and instruction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Proposed actions are specifically detailed, including who will be responsible for implementation, approximate dates of implementation, and notes about where in the curriculum and in what specific classes they will occur.</li> </ul>
<p>BEGINNING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>DEVELOPING <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>ACCEPTABLE <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>EXEMPLARY <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>Comments:</p>	<p>Three actions have been identified for program improvement: 1) review of all courses/syllabi, 2) review impact of Covid-19 on occupational competencies and employer needs, 3) review admission criteria, orientation and advising. None of these is related to your learning objectives. These action items should be indicated not as part of #3's answer, but instead, build on identification of areas of improvement in both questions #1 and #2.</p> <p>The three actions are program issues for certain, but are largely related to process and the link to learning objectives is not apparent. I don't see how #3 activity is related to a learning objective at all. Justification based on results that aligns actions with learning goals is not provided. It may be that the description of what is taking place in the "review of all courses" is focusing on the learning objectives, but this is not clearly stated and no outcome or analytical tool for these reviews has been provided.</p>		

**G. Faculty Engagement in Assessment**

Faculty engagement individually and collectively in the assessment process such as review of the outcomes data, revisions and updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment is done primarily by program coordinator/assistant chair.</li> <li>• Data is primarily collected in capstone activities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment reporting and analytical processes are conducted by the program coordinator or assistant chair with data being collected by faculty.</li> <li>• Faculty review outcomes and resulting data at least once per year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The program has an organized systematic plan in which all faculty participate in at least one stage of assessment.</li> <li>• Analysis of results informs faculty decision-making related to curricular and program improvements.</li> <li>• Faculty review outcomes and resulting data at least once per year collectively, but those discussions influence other program discussions made throughout the year.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Program faculty are highly engaged throughout the assessment process as demonstrated at all stages.</li> <li>• Faculty recommend interventions and participate in revising assessment activities for continuous program improvement.</li> </ul>
<p>BEGINNING <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>DEVELOPING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>ACCEPTABLE <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>EXEMPLARY <input type="checkbox"/></p>

Comments:

It is not clear which individuals make up the Program Committee, the Program Committee's charge or responsibilities, nor are the results from each meeting's review (January 2020, August 2020) identified. The History of Annual Review chart only indicates a process took place with a committee in two different months. It is also not clear which faculty teach which classes, in order to determine if all program faculty are participating in assessment, or at what stage of program (formative, summative) assessment data is collected. Given the nature of this program, the classes are all junior or senior level which reduces that availability of data in the formative stage, but an indication of the faculty involved, and to what extent, in assessment is important. As such, it is very possible that the program assessment is at a later stage than 'developing'.



## **Assessment Report for Organizational Development**

**MEMO  
8-31-2020**

The program assessment report for the Organizational Development Program follows.

The Organizational Development Program Committee, comprised of all full-time faculty in the program, has worked actively to improve the quality of our programs to better serve our customers and adapt to changes in the job markets available to our graduates. Our program was designed to meet the needs of adult transfer students with significant occupational experience.

In recent years we have used a number of methods to gather information about our students, employer needs, our program offerings, and program focus. Specifically we rely on:

1. Annual surveys of current students with both satisfaction and outcome measures.
2. Alumni surveys with both satisfaction and outcome measures.
3. Key informant surveys with current employers of our graduates.
4. On-going monitoring of student performance on key assignment measures linked to goals.
5. On-going tracking of graduations, applications, admissions, and class enrollment.
6. University level data.

Recent changes to the program resulting from these reviews include:

1. Modifications to program admission criteria and process.
2. Modifications to the prior learning assessment process.
3. Development of two minors (Organizational Leadership & Talent Development)
4. Expansion of the program core.
5. Adoption of an 8-wk term class for the program core and many electives which permits rolling admissions.

The Committee meets regularly to engage in discussions regarding improvement strategies, challenges, and opportunities.

## Non-Accredited Programs Only

### Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) for Academic Programs

Please list all of the student learning outcomes for your program as articulated in the assessment plan.

1. [SLO#1] Graduates will plan, organize, and direct activities in the workplace.
2. [SLO#2] Graduates will design effective workplace improvement initiatives in response to challenges.
3. [SLO#3] Graduates will understand and apply principles of personal and organizational adaptation to change.
4. [SLO#4] Graduates will be able to think critically and solve problems.
5. [SLO#5] Graduates will demonstrate professional writing competency.
6. [SLO #6] Graduates will demonstrate the ability to speak effectively in professional settings.
7. [SLO #7] Graduates will develop and describe quantitative information effectively.

### Overview of Measures/Instruments

<b>SLO(s)</b>  <i>Note: Measures might be used for more than 1 SLO</i>	<b>ULG*</b>	<b>Measures/Instruments</b>  <i>Please include a clear description of the instrument including when and where it is administered</i>	<b>How is the information Used?</b>  <i>(include target score(s), results, and report if target(s) were met/not met/partially met for each instrument)</i>
<p>1</p>		<p>Every major taking ODL 4835 (Supervision) will submit a case study analyzing and explaining a proposed response to a supervisory situation. ODL 4835 is a required core course for all OD majors. The instructors are responsible for determining the holistic score of the case study rubric. Expectations are:            20% will exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)            75% will meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)            5% will not meet expectations (&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>Performance expectations for the case study are based on a holistic score from a rubric integrated into ODL 4835. The rubric lists specific, desired outcomes based on the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- planning principles</li> <li>- organizing principles</li> <li>- directing principles</li> </ul> <p>During the reporting period for OD majors taking ODL 4835:            52% exceed expectations            36% meet expectations            12% did not meet expectations</p>
<p>1</p>		<p>Surveys of all active and graduating students are administered annually. One question asks students to rate the extent to which each course prepared them for current and anticipated professional opportunities.</p>	<p>The Coordinator is responsible for preparing and administering the survey and submitting results to the Program Committee.</p> <p>Performance expectations are that 75 percent of those who have completed ODL 4835 will report being well-prepared or somewhat well prepared. This goal was met with 84% in 2018 and 100% in 2019.</p>

1	R	<p>Every major taking ODL 4825 (Ethical Behavior) will submit a case study analyzing concepts of ethical conduct, responsible behavior and citizenship, and diverse ideas in the workplace.</p> <p>Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>Performance expectations for the case study are based on holistic score from the rubric integrated into ODL 4825 covering concepts including ethical thinking and standards, analyzing situations from an ethical framework, behaving ethically, and understanding diversity in the work context</p> <p>During the reporting period for OD majors taking ODL 4825:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Exceed expectations</td> <td>Target 20%</td> <td>Actual 53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meet expectations</td> <td>Target 75%</td> <td>Actual 47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below expectations</td> <td>Target 5%</td> <td>Actual 0%</td> </tr> </table>	Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 53%	Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 47%	Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%
Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 53%										
Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 47%										
Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%										
1	R	<p>Surveys of all active and graduating students are administered annually. One question asks students to rate the extent to which each course prepared them for current and anticipated professional opportunities.</p>	<p>The Coordinator is responsible for preparing and administering the survey and submitting results to the Program Committee.</p> <p>Performance expectations are that 75 percent of those who have completed ODL 4825 will report being well-prepared or somewhat well prepared. This goal was met with 95% in 2018 and 91 % in 2019.</p>									
2		<p>Every OD major taking ODL 4840 (Training Program Development) will submit a performance improvement plan. ODL 4840 is a required course for all OPD majors.</p> <p>Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>Performance expectations for the case study are based on a holistic score from a rubric integrated into ODL 4840. The rubric lists specific, desired outcomes based on the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- analyzing current performance status</li> <li>- setting performance goals</li> <li>- designing learning objectives for performance improvement</li> <li>- implementing and evaluating performance improvement activities</li> </ul> <p>During the reporting period for OPD majors taking ODL 4840:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Exceed expectations</td> <td>Target 20%</td> <td>Actual 32%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meet expectations</td> <td>Target 75%</td> <td>Actual 68%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below expectations</td> <td>Target 5%</td> <td>Actual 0%</td> </tr> </table>	Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 32%	Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 68%	Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%
Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 32%										
Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 68%										
Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%										
2		<p>Surveys of all active and graduating students are administered annually. One question asks students to rate the extent to which each course prepared them for current and anticipated professional opportunities.</p>	<p>The Coordinator is responsible for preparing and administering the survey and submitting results to the Program Committee.</p> <p>Performance expectations are that 75 percent of those who have completed ODL 4840 will report being well-prepared or somewhat well prepared. This goal was met with 82% in 2018 and 75% in 2019.</p>									

3		<p>Every OD major taking ODL 4830 (Organizational Perspectives) will submit a research paper in which they demonstrate the integration of principles concerning the interaction of personal and organizational adaptation and change. ODL 4830 is a required course for all OD majors. Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p> <p>Every OD major taking ODL 4820 (Change in Organizations) will submit an organizational change plan in which they demonstrate comprehensive understanding of factors affecting organizational adaptation to change. Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>During the reporting period for OD majors taking ODL 4830:  Exceed expectations Target 20% Actual 46%  Meet expectations Target 75% Actual 47%  Below expectations Target 5% Actual 7%</p> <p>During the reporting period for OD majors taking ODL 4820:  Exceed expectations Target 20% Actual 53%  Meet expectations Target 75% Actual 47%  Below expectations Target 5% Actual 0%</p>
3		<p>Surveys of all active and graduating students are administered annually. One question asks students to rate the extent to which each course prepared them for current and anticipated professional opportunities.</p>	<p>The Coordinator is responsible for preparing and administering the survey and submitting results to the Program Committee.</p> <p>Performance expectations are that 75 percent of those who have completed ODL 4830 will report being well-prepared or somewhat well prepared. This goal was met with 88% in 2018 and 91% in 2019.</p>
4	C	<p>Every OD major taking ODL 4870 (Coaching &amp; Mentoring for Critical Thinking) is tested on comprehension of the principles of critical thinking as presented in Paul and Elder's framework. Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>Performance expectations are based on comprehension of critical thinking concepts including egocentric thinking, sociocentric thinking, the elements of reasoning, evaluation of evidence, and a personal improvement plan evaluated by rubric. During the reporting period for OPD majors taking ODL 4870:  Exceed expectations Target 20% Actual 38%  Meet expectations Target 75% Actual 56%  Below expectations Target 5% Actual 6%</p>

5	C,W	<p>Every OD major taking ODL 4810 (<i>Principles of Career Development</i>) will submit a class portfolio related to their work experience. This portfolio will be assessed using the University's suggested rubric for writing. Performance expectations for the portfolio are based on a holistic score from the rubric integrated into OPD 4810. This rubric includes the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- content</li> <li>- organization</li> <li>- style</li> <li>- mechanics</li> </ul> <p>Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p> <p>Performance expectations for average EWP scores are to maintain mean scores at or exceeding the average score for all other programs at EIU.</p>	<p>During the reporting period for OD majors taking ODL 4810:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Exceed expectations</td> <td>Target 20%</td> <td>Actual 60%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meet expectations</td> <td>Target 75%</td> <td>Actual 33%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below expectations</td> <td>Target 5%</td> <td>Actual 7%</td> </tr> </table> <p>EWP submissions from Organizational Development students received a rating of 3.35 in 2018/19 compared to an overall rating of 3.35 for the School, 3.38 for the College, and 3.40 for all submissions.</p>	Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 60%	Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 33%	Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 7%
Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 60%										
Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 33%										
Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 7%										
5	W	<p>Surveys of all active and graduating students are administered annually. One question asks students to rate the extent to which each course prepared them for current and anticipated professional opportunities.</p>	<p>The Coordinator is responsible for preparing and administering the survey and submitting results to the Program Committee.</p> <p>Performance expectations are that 75 percent of those who have completed ODL 4810 will report being well-prepared or somewhat well prepared. This goal was met with 100% in 2018 and 75% in 2019.</p>									
6	S	<p>Every OD major taking ODL 4800 (<i>Strategies and Processes of Teaching and Training</i>) makes two oral presentations. The second oral presentation will be assessed for the ability to speak effectively. The University's suggested rubric for assessing individual and group presentations will be used.</p> <p>Every OD major taking ODL 4820 makes an oral presentation of their change management plan. The rubric includes organization of material, language, visual aids, verbal and non-verbal presentation.</p> <p>Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>Performance expectations for the oral presentations are based on a holistic score from the rubric. This rubric includes the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- organization</li> <li>- language</li> <li>- material</li> <li>- analysis</li> <li>- nonverbal delivery</li> <li>- verbal delivery</li> </ul> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Exceed expectations</td> <td>Target 20%</td> <td>Actual 47%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meet expectations</td> <td>Target 75%</td> <td>Actual 53%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below expectations</td> <td>Target 5%</td> <td>Actual 0%</td> </tr> </table>	Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 47%	Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 53%	Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%
Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 47%										
Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 53%										
Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%										
6	S	<p>OD Majors take Senior Seminars in which major speech data is reported and compared across campus.</p>	<p>Data is reported at the University level. We expect Organizational Development students to meet or exceed the campus average. In AY19 the average for Organizational Development students was 3.33 compared to 2.84 for the school, 3.09 for the College, and 3.30 overall.</p>									

7	Q	<p>Every OD major taking ODL 4765 (Grant Writing) will submit a written needs assessment which involves critically evaluating and presenting quantitative demographic and performance information. The information is presented using narrative, charts, and graphs.</p> <p>Expectations are:  exceed expectations (&gt; 90%)  meet expectations (&lt;90% &amp; &gt;70%)  does not meet expectations(&lt; 70%)</p>	<p>Performance expectations for the needs assessment are based on a holistic score from a rubric integrated into ODL 4765. The rubric lists specific, desired outcomes based on the following concepts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- clarity in communication of quantitative information</li> <li>- analysis of available information and gaps</li> <li>- clarity of presentation using charts, graphs, and narrative</li> </ul> <p>During the reporting period for OD majors taking ODL 4765:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Exceed expectations</td> <td>Target 20%</td> <td>Actual 25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Meet expectations</td> <td>Target 75%</td> <td>Actual 75%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Below expectations</td> <td>Target 5%</td> <td>Actual 0%</td> </tr> </table>	Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 25%	Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 75%	Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%						
Exceed expectations	Target 20%	Actual 25%																
Meet expectations	Target 75%	Actual 75%																
Below expectations	Target 5%	Actual 0%																
1-7	ALL	<p>Surveys of all graduating seniors and current students are conducted annually to measure both satisfaction and perception of learning regarding each assessment goal including each University level undergraduate learning goals.</p> <p>70% will report improvement in critical thinking, writing &amp; critical reading, speaking and listening, quantitative reasoning, &amp; responsible citizenship,</p>	<p>The Coordinator is responsible for preparing and administering the survey and submitting results to the Program Committee.</p> <p>Performance expectations are that 90% of students will report improvement in each area.</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Critical Thinking</td> <td>2018, 100%</td> <td>2019, 100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing &amp; Critical Reading</td> <td>2018, 96%</td> <td>2019, 100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Speaking and Listening</td> <td>2018, 93%</td> <td>2019, 91%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Quantitative Reasoning</td> <td>2018, 100%</td> <td>2019, 100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Responsible Citizenship</td> <td>2018, 93%</td> <td>2019, 100%</td> </tr> </table>	Critical Thinking	2018, 100%	2019, 100%	Writing & Critical Reading	2018, 96%	2019, 100%	Speaking and Listening	2018, 93%	2019, 91%	Quantitative Reasoning	2018, 100%	2019, 100%	Responsible Citizenship	2018, 93%	2019, 100%
Critical Thinking	2018, 100%	2019, 100%																
Writing & Critical Reading	2018, 96%	2019, 100%																
Speaking and Listening	2018, 93%	2019, 91%																
Quantitative Reasoning	2018, 100%	2019, 100%																
Responsible Citizenship	2018, 93%	2019, 100%																

▲\*Please reference any University Learning Goal(s) (ULG) that this SLO, if any, may address or assess. C=Critical Thinking, W=Writing & Critical Reading; S=Speaking and Listening; Q=Quantitative reasoning; R=Responsible Citizenship; NA=Not Applicable

### Improvements and Changes Based on Assessment

1. Provide a short summary (1-2 paragraphs or bullets) of any curricular actions (revisions, additions, and so on) that were approved over the past two years as a result of reflecting on the student learning outcomes data. Are there any additional future changes, revisions, or interventions proposed or still pending?

April 2019: committee approved a recommendation to develop an online student orientation module, in response to student feedback, the module went live in September of 2019. This module supplements modifications to the website to encourage students to be more active in monitoring their own progress in meeting program requirements.

August 2019: the program adopted a faculty advising model. While this has created many challenges it has improved student access to career based advice and course selection based on existing competencies and deficits.

Faculty have made numerous modifications to course content to more effectively address learning objectives.

2. Please provide a brief description or bulleted list of any improvements (or declines) observed/measured in student learning. Be sure to mention any intervention made that has not yet resulted in student improvement (if applicable).

Students are meeting or exceeding measures of learning on designated class activities and University data.

A textbook change is being evaluated for ODL 4500 based on student feedback regarding program writing requirements and instructor observations of writing competency.

The Committee recommended changes to program admission criteria to encourage student focus on Organizational Development competencies. However, this initiative has been abandoned after encountering resistance at the College level. The concern for a focused program of study for our students remains and will be addressed within the limits of the existing admission criteria through advising.

January 2020: In response to evidence of working students overextending themselves to meet the requirements of the Transfer Excellence Scholarship, the Program Committee joined BGS in recommending the scholarship be extended to part time students. To date no reply has been forthcoming.

3. Using the form below, please document annual faculty and committee engagement with the assessment process (such as the review of outcomes data, revisions/updates to assessment plan, and reaffirmation of SLOs).

History of Annual Review		
Date of Annual Review	Individuals/Groups who Reviewed Plan	Results of the Review (i.e., reference proposed changes from #1 above, revised SLOs, etc...)
January 2020	Program Committee	Review of goals & measures for assessment
August 2020	Program Committee	Review of assessment data and report

Based on this assessment the Organizational Development Committee will take the following actions in the next year.

1. Develop a review schedule for all ODL courses. An initial review is conducted by those who teach the class regularly to prepare for a review by the full committee. Reviews include learning objectives, class activities, textbooks, principles and models, as well as student response to the class.
2. Initiate a review of the effect of COVID 19 on occupational competencies and employer needs. Evaluate the current Organizational

Development program in meeting those needs and addressing changes in work environments.

3. Review current admission criteria, student orientation, and advising strategies to ensure the program is selecting prospective students who can succeed and benefit from the program.