



Office of Program Review & Assessment
400 Hal Greer Boulevard
Huntington, West Virginia 25755-2003
304/696-2494 Fax: 304/696-6612

2002

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dr. John Kiger, Division Chair, Park Resources and Leisure Services
FROM: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
DATE: August 11, 2003

SUBJECT: Review of Yearly Assessment Report
PROGRAM: BS Park Resources and Leisure Services

1. Thanks for submitting the yearly assessment report for BS Park Resources and Leisure Services. Your report has been reviewed by members of the University Assessment Committee. What follows is a brief summary of the reviewers' comments as well as some suggestions for the program to consider as it begins its assessment work for 2003-2004.
2. Guidelines for Yearly Assessment Reports:
 - a. Program Goals: UAC feels that the summary of program goals was a bit short. Further explanation of the program goals for student academic achievement would have been helpful.
 - b. Learning Outcomes and Data Collection: The learning outcomes match the requirements of the accrediting body. This needs to be mentioned. No data were collected.
 - c. Results: No analysis was detailed.
 - d. Assessment Chart: The chart was present. No specific tools, no standards, and no results were mentioned.
 - e. BOT Initiative #3: None mentioned.
 - f. Plans for the current year: Well stated. Objective evaluations are necessary.
 - g. Assistance needed: Not clear. If you need assistance, please contact UAC.
 - h. Lessons learned: Well stated.
3. The feedback loop from data collection, analysis and interpretation to the addressed faculty will be important in future reports. Specific changes in the courses, program, requirements, etc., should be well documented. Programmatic changes should be based upon careful examination of the data presented.

C:\2003-2004 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT\BS PARK RESOURCES AND LEISURE SERVICES.WPD

4. Primary Traits Analysis: As a part of our ongoing accreditation process with NCA/Higher Learning Commission, UAC has completed a chart identified as Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level. This is based on the student academic achievement assessment levels of implementation. Here is the committee's perception of the program's Efficacy of Assessment:
 - a. Learning Objectives: Level 1
 - b. Assessment Measures: Level 1
 - c. Feedback Loop: Level 1

Overall Score: 1.5

Range:

Level One: Beginning Implementation of Assessment Programs	1-3
Level Two: Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs	4-6
Level Three: Maturing Stages of Continuous Improvement	7-9

Primarily because of the brevity of the report, the reviewers indicate that the program is functioning at Level One. Specific measurable outcomes, valid measures with standards, and sufficient data will help future reports to be evaluated more favorably.

5. The program is accredited; however, no mention was made of this accreditation and the requirements of the accrediting body. I believe that a combination of the requirements of the accrediting agency and the requirements for the assessment program can be beneficial to the program. UAC would be willing to assist the program in developing the specifics for the program. Please refer to the plan and all of the details worked out there. The accrediting agency does not specifically require student academic achievement data, but such is required to indicate successful meeting of the student outcomes. Specific data and specific standards would be helpful. What is the standard when you mention "performance in course-work?" Pick some specific standards of performance and note them with specific data. How are students performing in these courses? Show more results in the assessment summary chart. Please remember that not all objectives have to be measured every semester, but all should be measured on a fairly regular rotating basis. If there were any irregularities in the performance levels of students, how did the program seek to remedy any of them, even if they are minor?
6. Because of the accreditation, the assessment reports and data will not fit specific guidelines, but specific measuring instruments, standards, and data collection will help the program evaluate its teaching effectiveness and whether the students have the necessary competencies to succeed in this field.
7. Thank you for your report. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact this office.

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2001-2002**

Program: BS Parks & Leisure Services.

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	OK - but need to be centered around the program more.
b. Learning outcomes data collection	Outcomes need to be more in line with accreditation requirements
c. Results	NONE
(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"/> Not Detail is missing - Outcomes as listed cannot be measured - No specific standards - no analysis and no action.
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) Accreditation Requirements
III. Plans for current Year	Well stated
IV. Assistance needed	OK
V. Most important thing learned through this process	OK - good comments.

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

BS Park Resources

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation Academic Year 2002

DATE: Summer 2003

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

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

Level 3

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- 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

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

Level 3

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- 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 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

- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- 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 2001-2002**

Program: BS in Parks & Leisure Services

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	Goals very vague!
b. Learning outcomes data collection	None
c. Results	None
(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"/> Standard, Benchmarks, Results report is worthless no action taken!
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) no mention of this in report
III. Plans for current Year	no plans
IV. Assistance needed	Does not know what is needed
V. Most important thing learned through this process	Learned the importance of Program Evaluation

BS. Parks & Leisure Services
Marshall University
PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS
NCA Levels of Implementation 2002-2003

DATE: Mar 26 '03

1. Learning Objectives

Level 0

No objectives were provided.

Level 1

Learning objectives were identified.

Level 2

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

Level 3

- Comprehensive learning objectives are identified.
- Objectives are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are program, not class or course, objectives.
- They are clear.
- 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

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

Level 3

- Measures were identified.
- They relate to the learning objectives.
- 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 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

- Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve student learning.
- Clear performance expectations/standards have been established for all measures.
- Data are being shared with other appropriate constituents.
- 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.

I. Assessment activities:

A. Program Goals- Program goals for the students focus on knowledge and application in major course content areas. Program goals for faculty development include recruiting qualified faculty and adjunct faculty, and the involvement of faculty in scholarly activity, conferences, and workshops. We are meeting these goals by recruiting qualified faculty, qualified adjunct faculty, and encouraging faculty to continue to learn through additional training. Curriculum goals for the BS degree in Parks and Leisure Services include maintaining currency in the field and remaining flexible to meet the needs of the student and the changing profession. The focus is on preparing students for a broad range of leisure related careers.

B. Learning outcomes/data collection:

Student academic achievement: Student academic achievement is measured by successful completion of the required coursework and successful completion of a capstone experience, an internship in parks and recreation.

Faculty development: 1. The percentage of tenure track faculty teaching coursework was determined. 2. The percentage of non-tenure track faculty teaching coursework was determined. 3. Professional meetings attended by tenure track faculty were examined.

Curricular outcomes: 1. Reviewed student evaluations of each course, and surveys of graduates and employers.

Course outcomes: 1. Reviewed student evaluations of each course. 2. Used knowledge gained from individual student conferences. 3. Evaluated information from class discussions.

C. Results.

Student academic achievement. Student performance in the required courses is indicative of academic achievement.

Faculty development: 1. Tenure track faculty members are teaching approximately 60% of the major coursework in PLS. 2. Adjunct faculty members are teaching approximately 40% of the coursework. 3. All tenure track faculty attended at least one professional meeting in the past year.

Curricular outcomes: 1. A review student evaluations of each course indicates a positive student opinion of the courses in PLS. Student comments are generally positive. Surveys of graduates and employers were not sufficient enough to

February 3, 2003 (3:27PM)

Form borrowed in part from Oakton Community College, Des Plaines, IL 60016
BS Parks and Leisure Services

Prepared by the Office of Program Review and Assessment, Office of Academic Affairs, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755-2003

draw conclusions, but there are very positive comments regarding Dr. Busbee.

Course outcomes: 1. A review of student evaluations of each course indicates a positive relationship of outcomes to student expectations. 2. Individual conferences indicate no major problems. 3. Class discussions indicate a positive relationship of outcomes to student expectations.

II. Plans for the coming year:

This has been a learning experience for me as a new chair. I do think there are several areas we can improve in. First, I would like to consider outside professors evaluate the major project by students in specific classes. This will encourage both the student and the instructor to perform quality work, and to present the work in a way so the student's knowledge in that subject area is evident. There should be some way to evaluate the content of the courses to make sure the instructor is up to date and current with the material they are teaching. This could possibly be done by a peer evaluation, possibly from professors outside of our institution.

In my opinion, we need to come up with ways to objectively evaluate all objectives that are appropriate for objective evaluation. We need, whenever possible, to use more than one evaluation tool, which will allow some conclusions relative to the validity and reliability of the data.

III. Assistance needed:

At this time, I am unsure of exactly what type of assistance is needed. I plan to meet with the ESSR Division Coordinators and try and come up with more effective ways of measuring these objectives.

IV. What is the one most important thing the program has learned through this process?

Evaluation of our programs is very necessary, and if performed correctly, can be very useful. By putting this information on paper, we can see our weaknesses, and hopefully correct them. The evaluation process will help us avoid pitfalls, and will improve the overall quality of the program. This will be a process we should continue to work on and improve. Everything we do, in every major class, is important in this process, and can provide valuable information we need to make the best decisions for our program.

Marshall University
ESSR, Parks and Leisure Services, BA

Parks and Leisure Services, BA:

Component / Course / Program Level					
Student Outcome	Person or Office Responsible	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchmark	Results/Analysis	Action Taken
a. Conceptual Foundations	Course Instructor	PLS 101, 120, 210, 230, 270, 301, 411	Performance in coursework	Satisfactory	None
b. Leisure Services Profession	Course Instructor	PLS 101, 120, 210, 230, 270, 301, 401, 402, 411	Performance in coursework	Satisfactory	None
c. Leisure Service Delivery System	Course Instructor	PLS 101, 120, 210, 230, 270, 301, 401, 402, 411	Performance in coursework	Satisfactory	None
d. Program Strategies	Course Instructor	PLS 120, 210, 230, 270, 301, 411	Performance in coursework	Satisfactory	None
e. Assessment, Planning, and Evaluation	Course Instructor, Internship Supervisor	PLS 120, 210, 230, 270, 301, 401, 402, 410, 411	Performance in coursework and internship	Satisfactory	None
f. Administration/ Management	Course Instructor, Internship Supervisor	PLS 101, 210, 230, 401, 402, 410, 411	Performance in coursework and internship	Satisfactory	None
g. Legislative and Legal Aspects	Course Instructor	PLS 101, 120, 230, 401, 410, 411	Performance in coursework	Satisfactory	None
h. Field Experiences	Course Instructor, Internship Supervisor	PLS 270, 410, 490	Performance in coursework and internship	Satisfactory	None

February 3, 2003 (3:27PM)
 Form borrowed in part from Oakton Community College, Des Plaines, IL 60016
 BS Parks and Leisure Services
 Prepared by the Office of Program Review and Assessment, Office of Academic Affairs, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755-2003