In Fall 2021, the Academic Assessment and Program Review Committee (AAPRC) reviewed the method used to assess graduate Institutional Learning Outcomes (ILO). This review was precipitated by multiple factors including a growing number of graduate programs at HPU, different ILOs for graduate and undergraduate students, and disparate capstone requirements among programs at the graduate level (e.g. theses, projects, presentations, performances, portfolios). Importantly, data analysis, reporting, and "closing the loop" processes warranted dedicated, separate treatment of the ILO assessment outcomes from both graduate and undergraduate students. The AAPRC spoke with faculty and administrators from each of the existing graduate programs to solicit comments and edits. In short, rather than conducting an annual assessment of one graduate ILO each year, the AAPRC proposed a composite rubric with all four graduate ILOs combined into one straightforward document (see rubric below). This composite rubric would be

students in their capstone course, thesis defense, portfolio review, etc. To make the process as uncomplicated as possible, this initial trial was conducted manually: faculty were asked to print and mark the rubric document or edit the Word document with their scores and return the rubric to the AAPRC co-chair along with a writing sample for assessment archives (e.g. abstract or conclusion section from a thesis or a final written project). For those programs in which graduate students have a committee of multiple readers, all committee members were invited to use the rubric and the scores for that student averaged for this report. It is the intention in the future to import the final rubric into Watermark so that faculty can upload the written samples and score against the rubric using the Watermark software as is done for several of the undergraduate ILO assessment projects.

In Spring 2022, Fall 2022, and Spring 2023, the work of 53 graduate students was assessed against the new rubric and written artifacts were collected and archived. This sample represents 47 Master's students from six programs (MA Sustainability, MA Diplomacy and Military Studies, MA Strategic Communication, MS Marine Science, MA Business Administration, Master's Public Health) and six Doctoral students from the Doctorate in Nursing Practice. Table 1 shows the number of students who scored in each of the four rubric categories across each rubric criterion. Table 2 presents the mean Master's (*n*=47) and Doctoral (*n*=6) scores (mean ± stdev) for each rubric criterion.

	Number of Students Scoring in Each Category			
	1-Deficient	*2-Acceptable*	*3-Proficient*	*4-Exemplary*

 *see note in the Discussion: oral communication is not a graduate ILO but was assessed for some students who presented their capstone orally

	Scholarly Mastery	Critical Thinking	Written Communication	Oral Communication* (if applicable)	Information Literacy
Masters, *n*=47	2.7 ± 0.8	2.8 ± 0.8	2.8 ± 0.7	2.9 ± 0.8	2.8 ± 0.8
Doctoral, *n*=6	4 ± 0	4 ± 0	4 ± 0	4 ± 0	4 ± 0

*see note in Discussion: oral communication is not a graduate ILO but was assessed for some students who presented their capstone orally

chairs to discuss this finding and make suggestions as to how the program might address this shortcoming in their individual disciplines.

o The AAPRC will continue to collect and report out graduate ILO assessment data using this updated process. Assessment results from this project will provide a baseline or starting point from which our new and legacy graduate programs may begin to determine annual trends in student performance on all four graduate ILOs.

Critical Thinking: *identify and explain issues, analyze evidence, assess assumptions, define their perspectives and positions, and present the implications and consequences of their conclusions*				
	__ Reflects an unacceptably low level of critical thinking.	__ Reflects acceptable level of critical thinking.	__ Reflects above-average level of critical thinking.	__ Reflects outstanding level of critical thinking.
	__ Reflects an unacceptably low level of critical thinking.	Reflects acceptable leve		