

## HEA 550 Final Project Guidelines and Rubric

### Overview

The final project for this course is the creation of an **analysis of higher education's response to a law or regulation**.

The enterprise of higher education is impacted by a myriad of laws and regulations. Taken individually and as a whole, these laws and regulations have a significant and continuous impact on institutions and their leadership, students, faculty, and staff. In addition, a majority of these laws and regulations have a diverse set of stakeholders, including policymakers, lawmakers, and individuals themselves. Administrators need to be able to systematically evaluate and respond to these requirements. To do this effectively, administrators need to gain a fundamental understanding of the requirements and what they mean to stakeholders, how they have impacted institutions, and how they might be improved. In this legal or regulatory analysis, you will have the opportunity to do just that.

The project is divided into **three milestones**, which will be submitted at various points throughout the course to scaffold learning and ensure quality final submissions. These milestones will be submitted in **Modules Two, Five, and Seven**. **The final submission will occur in Module Nine**.

**In this assignment, you will demonstrate your mastery of the following course outcomes:**

- Analyze contemporary legal and regulatory frameworks in which higher education operates for their effect on institutional policies, programs, and practices
- Analyze higher education stakeholder legal rights and associated policies and procedures for their application to institutional decision making
- Construct actionable strategies that conform to legal and regulatory frameworks in higher education and align to the institution's mission, values, and goals
- Evaluate the effectiveness of procedures and practices aimed at meeting institutional legal and regulatory requirements
- Communicate to stakeholders the impact of case law and relevant laws and regulations on current or proposed policies or practices to improve decision making

### Prompt

The final project, a legal or regulatory analysis, involves researching a legal and/or regulatory requirement that has a significant impact on a functional area of interest (for example, admissions, finance, student affairs, or human resources). You will select a legal and/or regulatory requirement from a provided list that has a significant impact on that functional area. . Then you will then analyze the legal and/or regulatory requirement for its impact on the higher education sector as a whole, including its origin and purpose; conduct a stakeholder analysis; analyze the impact of the requirement on both institutions and stakeholders; evaluate effectiveness; and make recommendations for improvement. When appropriate, you will differentiate the requirement's impact on different types of institutions. At the conclusion of the project, you will prepare an executive brief that will provide an overview of the requirement, evaluate its impact, and make recommendations for improvement.

Specifically, the following **critical elements** must be addressed:

- I. **Provide background** on the legal and/or regulatory requirement in the higher education sector overall.
  - A. **Describe the requirement.** What exactly is it? What body or organization is its source? What are the origins and purpose of the requirement? What was the impetus for the requirement? Why was it put in place, and what was its intent or purpose? How does the application of this requirement differ by type of institution (private vs. public, two-year vs. four-year, for-profit vs. non-profit)?
  - B. **Describe the requirement's stakeholders.** What stakeholder groups are impacted or involved with the requirement? What is each group's position on the requirement, and what are their goals and motivation relative to the requirement?
- II. **Analyze the impact** of the legal and/or regulatory requirement on institutions and stakeholders.
  - A. **Describe how institutions of higher education have responded** to the legal and/or regulatory requirement, by type of institution. What policies, procedures, and practices have been put in place? What challenges, if any, have institutions faced when responding to the requirement? What have been the differences by type of institution? For example, have there been differences for private vs. public institutions, two-year vs. four-year, for-profit vs. nonprofit?
  - B. Analyze the impact of the requirement **on institutions**. Select areas of impact relevant to your requirement (for instance, you might choose three of the following: quality, organizational structure, budget, decision making, institutional culture, mission, or other relevant areas). How has the regulation impacted those aspects of institutions? For the areas that you have selected, what have been the differences by type of institution? For example, have there been differences for private vs. public institutions, two-year vs. four-year, for-profit vs. nonprofit?
  - C. Analyze the impact of the requirement **on stakeholders**. How has it impacted their rights, responsibilities, modes of conduct, overall experience with higher education, or other relevant aspects that affect stakeholders? What have been the differences for stakeholders by type of institution? For example, have there been differences for stakeholders at private vs. public institutions, two-year vs. four-year, for-profit vs. nonprofit?
- III. **Evaluate the effectiveness** of the requirement and the institutional responses.
  - A. Evaluate the effectiveness of higher education's **response** to the law or regulation in relation to the intent/purpose. How effective was the higher education sector's overall response? From the point of view of the various stakeholder groups identified in Section 1, to what extent has the intent/purpose of the requirement been achieved? Does your assessment of effectiveness differ by type of institution? For example, does effectiveness differ between private and public institutions, two-year and four-year, for-profit and nonprofit? If so, how?
  - B. Evaluate the **pros and cons** of the law or regulation within the context of the need for administrators to create fiscally sound programs that capably address students' academic and non-academic needs. What are the benefits of the requirement? What are the negative aspects of the requirement? Do the benefits outweigh the negative aspects?
- IV. Make **recommendations** for improvement.
  - A. Based on your analysis, formulate **strategies** for how institutions can improve their responses to the requirement, keeping in mind the institution's mission, vision, or goals. What specifically can be improved? Why should these strategies bring improvement?
  - B. Based on your analysis, formulate recommendations for change to **the requirement itself**. Can lawmakers or policymakers contribute to improved effectiveness? If so, how? Can other stakeholders contribute to improved effectiveness? If so, how?
- V. **Executive Brief** [*This section is to be written after the Regulation/Requirement Analysis is completed, but placed at the beginning of the final submission to serve as a traditional executive summary/brief.*] The intended audience for this executive summary is a group of aspiring leaders in higher education. The goal of the executive brief is to provide the audience with information they would need to improve decision making. Members of the group have five to 10 years of mid-level experience (chair, director, etc.) and are preparing for senior-level positions. At a minimum, include the following:

- A. **Describe the requirement** in relation to the audience. As you do so, consider what details regarding the purpose and impetus of the requirement are germane for your audience.
- B. **Summarize the requirement's impact** on the audience's institutions and stakeholders. Think about what details regarding the institutional impact are germane for this audience. Consider which sets of stakeholders should be addressed in this communication.
- C. **Summarize the requirement's effectiveness** in relation to the audience. Determine which details regarding the effect versus the intent are germane to this audience and their institutions.
- D. **Present recommendations** to improve both higher education's response and the requirement itself. Choose the recommendations most germane to your audience and your purpose. Present them in a manner cogent to your audience.

## Milestones

### Milestone One: Law or Regulation Overview

In **task 2-2**, you will submit an overview of the legal and/or regulatory requirement that you selected from the following list as part of a non-graded task during Module One.

- Jeanne Clery Disclosure of Campus Security Policy and Campus Crime Statistics Act (Clery Act) and Violence Against Women Act
- Title IX of the Education Amendment of 1972
- Americans with Disability Act
- Family Education Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA)
- Higher Education Act of 1965
  - Federal Work Study
  - Gainful Employment
  - Title IV Funding
- National Labor Relations Act

Your analysis and overview will focus on the law or regulation in terms of the higher education sector overall, and how the law or regulation that you selected has or will have a significant impact on a functional area of interest to you. Evidence of the impact of a law or regulation on higher education is evident through a quick perusal of several sources, including the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and the *Journal of College and University Law*. Both are available through the Shapiro Library. Please support your research of the law or regulation with source citations. **This milestone is graded with the Milestone One Rubric.**

### Milestone Two: Institutional Response and Impact Analysis

In **task 5-2**, you will submit your analysis of how institutions of higher education have responded to the legal and/or regulatory requirement that you have selected for the final project. Describe **response** by type of institution, and address policies and practices that have been put into place along with associated **challenges**. Analyze the impact of the requirement on selected aspects of institutions of higher education, highlighting differences by type of institution when appropriate. Finally, analyze how the requirement impacts stakeholders, highlighting differences by type of institution when appropriate. Support your research of the law or regulation with source citations. **This milestone is graded with the Milestone Two Rubric.**



Milestone Three: Evaluation of Effectiveness

In **task 7-2**, you will submit your evaluation of the effectiveness of higher education's response to the law or regulation that you selected for the final project in relation to its intent, including an assessment of the pros and cons of the requirement within the higher education environment. Based on your evaluation, you will make recommendations for improvement to (a) how institutions respond to the requirement, and/or (b) how the requirement itself might be adjusted by the relevant governing body for improvement. Support your research of the law or regulation with source citations. **This milestone is graded with the Milestone Three Rubric.**

Final Project Submission: Legal or Regulatory Requirement Analysis

In **task 9-2**, you will submit **legal or regulatory requirement analysis**. It should be a complete, polished artifact containing **all** of the critical elements of the final product. It should reflect the incorporation of feedback gained throughout the course. **This will be graded using the Final Project Rubric.**

**Deliverable Milestones**

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Deliverables</b>	<b>Module Due</b>	<b>Grading</b>
1	Law or Regulation Overview	Two	Graded separately; Milestone One Rubric
2	Institutional Response and Impact Analysis	Five	Graded Separately; Milestone Two Rubric
3	Evaluation of Effectiveness	Seven	Graded Separately; Milestone Three Rubric
	Final Project Submission: Legal or Regulatory Requirement Analysis	Nine	Graded separately; Final Project Rubric

## Rubric

**Guidelines for Submission:** The final project analysis must follow these formatting guidelines: double spacing, 12-point Times New Roman font, and one-inch margins. This will be written in report format, which may include the use of headings, bulleted lists and other techniques where appropriate. Citations should be referenced in APA style, and a reference page included.

Critical Elements	Exemplary (100%)	Proficient (90%)	Needs Improvement (70%)	Not Evident (0%)	Value
<b>Provide Background: Describe the Requirement</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate a multi-faceted insight into the requirement’s relation to the higher education sector overall	Describes in detail the legal or regulatory requirement in relation to the higher education sector overall	Describes the legal or regulatory requirement but is cursory or does not address the relation to the higher education sector overall	Does not describe the legal or regulatory requirement	7
<b>Provide Background: Stakeholders</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate a nuanced insight into the interplay between stakeholders and requirement	Describes who the requirement’s stakeholders are and their goals and motivation relative to the requirement	Describes the requirement’s stakeholders but is cursory or does not address their goals and motivation relative to the requirement	Does not describe the requirement’s stakeholders	7
<b>Impact: Institutional Responses</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate a nuanced insight into the differing responses and related challenges of types of institutions	Describes higher education institutional responses to the requirement and related challenges, differentiating among types of institutions	Describes higher education institutional responses to the requirement and related challenges but is cursory or does not differentiate among types of institutions	Does not describe higher education institutional responses and related challenges	7
<b>Impact: On Institutions</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and choice of institutional areas demonstrates a nuanced insight into the requirement and the differing responses of types of institutions	Analyzes the impact of the requirement on relevant institutional areas, differentiating among types of institutions	Discusses the impact of the requirement on institutional areas but areas chosen are not relevant, or discussion is cursory or does not differentiate among types of institutions	Does not discuss the impact of the requirement on relevant institutional areas	7
<b>Impact: On Stakeholders</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and the choice of relevant aspects that affect stakeholders demonstrates a nuanced insight into the requirement, its stakeholders, and its influence on differing types of institutions	Analyzes the impact of the requirement on relevant aspects that affect stakeholders, differentiating among types of institutions	Discusses the impact of the requirement on aspects that affect stakeholders but aspects chosen are not relevant, or discussion is cursory or does not differentiate among types of institutions	Does not discuss the impact of the requirement on relevant aspects that affect stakeholders	7

<b>Effectiveness: Response</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and details and examples demonstrate a multi-faceted insight into how the higher education sector has performed relative to the requirement	Evaluates the effectiveness of the higher education sector’s response to the requirement in relation to the requirement’s intent	Discusses the effectiveness of the higher education sector’s response to the requirement, but is cursory or inaccurate	Does not discuss the effectiveness of the higher education sector’s response to the requirement	12
<b>Effectiveness: Pros and Cons</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and the breadth and depth of the pros and cons demonstrate a multi-faceted insight into how the higher education sector has performed relative to the law or regulation	Evaluates the pros and cons of the law or regulation for its programmatic ramifications and provides an overall conclusion regarding pros and cons	Discusses the programmatic ramifications of the law or regulation, but pros and cons are cursory or inaccurate or overall conclusion is not reached	Does not discuss the pros and cons of the law or regulation for its programmatic ramifications	12
<b>Recommendations: Strategies</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and breadth and depth of strategic response demonstrate a nuanced insight into the interplay of requirement and institutional need	Formulates strategies, based on the previous analyses, for how institutions can improve their responses to the requirement	Formulates strategies for how institutions can improve responses to the requirement that are not based on the previous analyses, but strategies are cursory or inaccurate	Does not formulate strategies for how institutions can improve responses to the requirement	12
<b>Recommendations: Requirement</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and breadth and depth of the recommendations demonstrate a nuanced insight into the interplay of the requirement and its stakeholders	Formulates recommendations, based on the previous analyses, for changes to the requirement that improve its effectiveness	Formulates recommendations for changes to the requirement that improve its effectiveness that are not based on the previous analyses, but recommendations are cursory or inaccurate	Does not formulate recommendations for changes to the requirement	12
<b>Executive Briefing: Requirement</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and choice of details demonstrates a nuanced insight into the needs of the audience	Briefly describes the requirement in relation to the audience	Briefly describes the requirement but relation to audience is unclear or inaccurate	Does not briefly describe the requirement in relation to the audience	3
<b>Executive Brief: Impact</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and choice of details demonstrates a nuanced insight into the needs of the audience	Summarizes the requirement’s impact on the audience’s institution and its stakeholders	Summarizes the requirement’s impact but has gaps in articulating the impact on the institution or the stakeholders	Does not summarize the requirement’s impact on the audience’s institution and its stakeholders	3
<b>Executive Brief: Effectiveness</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and choice of details demonstrates a nuanced insight into the needs of the audience	Summarizes the requirement’s effectiveness in relation to the audience	Summarizes the requirement’s effectiveness, but relation to audience is unclear or inaccurate	Does not summarize the requirement’s effectiveness	3

# Southern New Hampshire University

<b>Executive Brief: Recommendations</b>	Meets “Proficient” criteria and choice of details demonstrates a nuanced insight into the needs of the audience	Presents recommendations to improve both higher education’s response and the requirement itself that are particularly germane to the audience	Presents recommendations but has gaps in addressing higher education’s response or in how to improve the requirement itself, or choices are not particularly germane to the audience	Does not present recommendations	3
<b>Articulation of Response</b>	Submission is free of errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, and organization and is presented in a professional and easy-to-read format	Submission has no major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization	Submission has major errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that negatively impact readability and articulation of main ideas	Submission has critical errors related to citations, grammar, spelling, syntax, or organization that prevent understanding of ideas	5
<b>Earned Total</b>					<b>100%</b>