



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. Lynne Welch, Dean, College of Nursing and Health Professions  
Dr. Rebecca Appleton, Program Director, BSN  
Dr. Linda Scott, Program Director MSN  
FROM: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment  
DATE: August 28, 2003

SUBJECT: Review of Yearly Assessment Report  
PROGRAM: BSN, Nursing; MSM, Nursing

1. Thanks for submitting the yearly assessment report for BSN and MSN Nursing. 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:
  1. Program Goals: The program goals were thoroughly stated and analyzed in the accreditation report.
  2. Learning Outcomes and Data Collection: Evaluation criteria well stated with data presented.
  3. Results: The results were well stated. All criteria having been met.
  4. Assessment Chart: There were numerous charts present in the document.
  5. BOT Initiative #3: The licensure test for the NLN. Not applicable to graduate programs.
  6. Plans for the current year: Continue as is.
  7. Assistance needed: None stated.
  8. Lessons learned: None 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.
4. Primary Traits Analysis: As a part of our ongoing accreditation process with NCA/Higher

C:\2003-2004 PROGRAM ASSESSMENT\MSN NURSING.DOC

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:

1. Learning Objectives: Level 3
2. Assessment Measures: Level 3
3. Feedback Loop: Level 3

Overall Score: 8 for each program

Range:

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

The reviewers evaluated the programs with an overall score of 8. The reviewers had mixed opinions concerning the feedback loop. In all instances in the charts, the indication that no action was needed is stated. However, if any changes are made in the program content, the question is, how does the assessment process drive these changes?

5. The programs are well designed and the assessment process is ongoing. The standards imposed by the National League of Nursing are stringent and the program appears to produce results well within the League guidelines. The program is to be commended for this. In the League site visit/report, were any corrective actions noted? If so, what were the dispositions of these corrective actions? Please indicate them on the Yearly Assessment Reports due October 1. UAC would assume that measures have been taken during the 2002-2003 academic year.
6. 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: BSN \* MSN Nursing

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	- Merely stated in the Accreditation report.
b. Learning outcomes data collection	well stated - covering the outcomes + Data provided
c. Results	well done
(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"/> - Numerous charts -
II. BOT Initiative #3 ( <u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) Licensure test.
III. Plans for current Year	None stated
IV. Assistance needed	None stated.
V. Most important thing learned through this process	- not stated.

# Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

BSN-MSN NURSING

## 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: B.S. and M.S. Nursing

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	Stated in elaborate detail for the NLN accreditation visit
b. Learning outcomes data collection	Covered thoroughly
c. Results	Covered thoroughly
(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"/>  There are numerous charts (in line with the accreditation report).
II. BOT Initiative #3 ( <u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.)
III. Plans for current Year	not sure where to find this in their report.
IV. Assistance needed	None
V. Most important thing learned through this process	In their report, under implementation they usually indicate that no corrective action is needed. Occasionally they say that they will monitor trends. This is a weakness. They are making changes in their programs but they are not showing how the assessment process drive these changes.

Marshall University  
PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS  
NCA Levels of Implementation 2002-2003  
DATE: June 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. *- not clear how data is being 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.