



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

2002

To: Jane McKee, Associate Dean, COEHS  
 Carl Johnson, Chair, School of Education  
 From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment  
 Date: June 25, 2004

Subject: Yearly Assessment Report, BA Secondary Education

1. Thank you for submitting the Yearly Assessment Report for the program, BA Secondary Education. 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:	Well defined goals.
b. Learning outcomes and data collection:	Learning outcomes are consistent with NCATE standards. Data is being collected in a number of areas.
c. Results:	Results available from a number of different sources PPST; Praxis II; Student Teacher Scoring Rubric.
II. BOT Initiative #3:	Compliance: Praxis I and Praxis II.
III. Plans for current year:	NCATE
IV. Assistance needed:	Faculty and resources. Some help from MU Foundation and MURC
V. Lessons learned:	Data is important. Data Base Manager position created.

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.

Numerous charts to identify and present outcomes and data are present. These charts are extremely helpful. The narrative section provides an excellent summary of the assessment activities of the program.

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	3
II. Assessment Measures	3
III. Feedback Loop	3
Overall Score:	9

Interpretation: The program has achieved an overall score of 9 which places it in Level 3 (Maturing stages of continuous improvement). The presence of NCATE as an accrediting body has been one of the driving forces behind excellence in assessment by the BA Secondary Education program. Competency in pedagogical matters as well as competency in content matters has driven schools of education to develop and achieve high standards in assessment practices. Good work!

5. Recommendations:

UAC has no formal recommendations at this time. Be sure to keep up with the requirements from NCATE and the WV State Department of Education. Good luck with the NCATE visit during the fall 2004.

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: *BA Secondary Education*

*Excellent report!*

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>yes - clear</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>yes</i>
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"/> <i>no or attached</i>
II. BOT Initiative #3 ( <u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) <i>yes teacher certification</i>
III. Plans for current Year	<i>yes - a self study for NCATE visit 2004 (fall)</i>
IV. Assistance needed	<i>more faculty + more resources</i>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<i>Established a position Database Manager</i>

Program: BA - Secondary Ed  
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: *BA Secondary Ed*

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>Present - Clearly Stated</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>Present - Clearly Stated</i>
c. Results	<i>present - Clearly Stated</i>
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes <u><i>X</i></u> No _____ <i>Numerous charts, tables</i>
II. BOT Initiative #3 ( <u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) <i>Present - Clearly Stated</i>
III. Plans for current Year	<i>present - Clearly</i>
IV. Assistance needed	<i>presently - as per all MA - prog more \$ &amp; more resources ☺</i>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<i>Continued assessment - est. a Database Manager to assist c collection, sorting, etc.</i>

Program: BA Secondary  
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.

\* need a table to reflect  
1) Fac. det. outcomes -  
2) Comm. outcomes -