

file copy

2003

Office of Program Review & Assessment

To: Dr. Marty Amerikaner, Chair, Department of Psychology
From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
Date: August 13, 2004

Subject: Yearly Assessment Report, BA Psychology

1. Thank you for submitting the Yearly Assessment Report for the program. 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 were listed and explained.
b. Learning outcomes and data collection:	Learning outcomes from the previous year were listed with course grades listed as the primary assessment data.
c. Results:	Results listed, some analysis given, some action taken
II. BOT Initiative #3:	No specific measure listed. The program should begin to establish benchmarks of its own.
III. Plans for current year:	Plans for the current year include a revision of the outcomes to mesh with the APA outcomes adopted during the previous year.
IV. Assistance needed:	None listed.
V. Lessons learned:	The program is in the initial stages of a revision of program outcomes and therefore has recognized the need to evaluate student academic achievement.

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 assessment chart was present. Appropriate data was included. The chart prepared for the 2003-2004 academic year should reflect the changes in the outcomes based on the APA generated list. It is not necessary to measure all of the outcomes every year, but that a reasonable enough of them be measured so that within a 3-4 year period of time all of the outcomes can be measured. The program should begin to develop its own set of standards by which it measures student academic achievement. Since no national test exists or is economically feasible at this time, standards should be developed and measured.

4. Efficacy of Assessment:

As Marshall 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	2
II. Assessment Measures	2
III. Feedback Loop	2
Overall Score:	6

Interpretation: The program has achieved an overall score of 6 which places it at level 2 of NCA/HLC efficacy of assessment. As the program implements the new APA standards and begins to measure them, the efficacy of the program's assessment plan should begin to be established. At this juncture it is probably not wise to criticize the program. Also, as the new objectives are implemented new methods of measurement need to be established. Grades in some classes are appropriate, for example, internships, however general grades in classes tend to be course driven measures and not program driven measures.

5. Recommendations:

The program should fully implement the new set of learning outcomes with appropriate measures. Also, it would be wise to divide the outcomes into at least 2 or 3 groups and measure them alternately. In this manner, the assessment burden will not be too onerous. As the program accumulates data, the feedback loop can be completed.

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

311

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

Program: **BA PSYCHOLOGY**

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	Writing skills, Research skills, soft computer skills, experience, knowledge of subject.
b. Learning outcomes data collection	Grades in each class given by instructor.
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"/> Assessment tool used = grades. Students received in course work by professors.
II. BOT Initiative #3 (Undergraduate Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) none
III. Plans for current Year	Programs however used last year but separate.
IV. Assistance needed	None needed.
V. Most important thing learned through this process	?

Program: BA PSYCH
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.

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

Program: *Psychology - undergraduate*

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>goals listed - could be worded to reflect measurability</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>seemed to be well defined; data collection was clear</i>
c. Results	<i>good description</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"/> <i>showed assessment tools, good description of results and actions directed by results</i>
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate Programs</u> Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.)
III. Plans for current Year	<i>not clearly described</i>
IV. Assistance needed	<i>not discussed</i>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<i>not discussed</i>

Program: Political Science - undesignated
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.

Program: DA Psychology
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.

most relevant level of this trait.