

2004

Office of Program Review & Assessment

To: Dr. Shelia Kyle, Chair, MU/St. Mary's School of Nursing Program
 From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
 Date: July 8, 2004



Subject: Yearly Assessment Report, ASN, Nursing

1. Thank you for submitting the Yearly Assessment Report for the program, ASN Nursing . Please use the information in this report to guide your assessment activities during AY 2004-2005.

2. What follows is a brief critique of the report you submitted for the academic year 2002-2003.

I. a. Program goals:	Program goals well identified.
b. Learning outcomes and data collection:	Learning outcomes in congruence with NLN accreditation requirements
c. Results:	Results are listed in a variety of charts.
II. BOT Initiative #3:	Meets the need of Senate Bill 653 for a national test (Licensure test)
III. Plans for current year:	Implementation of the Systematic Program Evaluation Plan and planst to continue the Remediation Program.
IV. Assistance needed:	Assistance with graduate survey information.
V. Lessens learned:	Well stated.

3. Review of the Assessment Summary Chart "Marshall University: Assessment of Student Outcomes."

This chart will help the program and the University Assessment Committee monitor a program's patterns of evidence. Please remember that you do not have to assess every outcome every year; however, within a 3-4 year period of time all program objectives must be evaluated, results analyzed, and actions taken (feedback loop) documented.

The chart is present. All appropriate data is present.

4. Efficacy of Assessment:

As Marshal approaches its ten year self—study by the North Central Association's Higher Learning Commission, programs will be measured in terms of their efficacy of assessment. Programs are evaluated in terms of the development of measurable learning outcomes; the use of viable assessment measures and the implementation of an effective feedback loop. The current report has been evaluated based on these categories. Scores can range from 0-3 in each category. Overall total scores ranging from 1-3 indicate that the program is in the Beginning Stages of developing a viable assessment program. Overall scores ranging from 4-6 indicate that a program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program and overall scores ranging from 7-9 indicate that a program is in the maturing stages of continuous improvement. All programs should be in Level 2 (overall score 4-6) (Making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program) or Level 3 (overall score 7-9) (Maturing stages of continuous improvement) by May 2005.

Scores:	
I. Learning Outcomes	3
II. Assessment Measures	3
III. Feedback Loop	3
Overall Score:	8.3

Interpretation: With an overall score of 8.3 the program remains in Level 3 of the NCA/HLC levels of implementation. Congratulations.

5. Recommendations:

As with any accredited program, the ASN Nursing program continues to be an outstanding example of continued high assessment of program performance. The passage rate for the licensure exam is commendable. Continue the superior efforts.

6. General Comments:

It is imperative that programs keep a record of their assessment activities and have this information available for the NCA/HLC site committee if requested.

7. Thanks so much for continuing to aid Marshall in its ongoing assessment efforts.

Enclosures

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2002-2003**

Program: *St. Mary's/MU Associate in Science in Nursing.*

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>Congruent with the mission of MU & St. Mary's Medical Center</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>Structured to meet the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission, the recognized accrediting body for nursing</i>
c. Results	<i>Several charts reflect data collections</i>
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) <i>meets the requirement of Senate Bill 053</i>
III. Plans for current Year	<i>Implementation of the systematic program evaluation plans to continue to enhance the remediation program for students who need academic assistance</i>
IV. Assistance needed	<i>Continued timely return of course & graduate evaluation data</i>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<i>Program strengths & weaknesses are identified for the faculty</i>

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2003

DATE: Summer 2004

1. *Learning Objectives*

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

All in level 1 plus:

- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

All in level 2 plus:

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. *Assessment Measures*

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

All in Level 1 plus:

- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. *Feedback Loop*

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data routinely are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2002-2003**

Program: **ASN NURSING**

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	✓+
b. Learning outcomes data collection	✓
c. Results	✓
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) ✓
III. Plans for current Year	✓
IV. Assistance needed	✓
V. Most important thing learned through this process	✓

Program: BSN NURSING
Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level
Marshall University
PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS
NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2003
DATE: Summer 2004

1. *Learning Objectives*

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

All in level 1 plus:

- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

All in level 2 plus:

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. *Assessment Measures*

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

All in Level 1 plus:

- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. *Feedback Loop*

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data routinely are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.

1. *Learning Objectives*

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

All in level 1 plus:

- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.

Level 3

All in level 2 plus:

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

2. *Assessment Measures*

Level 0

No measures were identified.

Level 1

Measures were identified.

Level 2

All in Level 1 plus:

- They relate to the learning objectives.
- They include direct measures of student learning

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- They emphasize direct learning.
- They focus on real-world tasks.
- They stress higher order learning.
- They are integrated in the curriculum.
- They allow performance to be gauged over time.

3. *Feedback Loop*

Level 0

The feedback loop was not described.

Level 1

- Some data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
- No performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Assessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.

Level 2

- Data routinely are being collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Performance expectations/standards have been established.
- Data are being shared by other appropriate constituents.
- Data are considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.

Level 3

All in Level 2 plus:

- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
- The improvement of student learning is central to the department.
- Assessment is a part of the culture of the department.