

2004

Office of Program Review & Assessment

To: Dr. Jane McKee, COEHS; Dr. Carl Johnson, COE
From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
Date: June 20, 2005

Bob Edmunds

Yearly Assessment Report for: BA Elementary Education

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 2005-2006.

The Yearly Assessment Report for documenting AY 2004-2005 assessment activities is due by October 3, 2005. If the program is scheduled for a program review during the 2005-6 academic year, the Program Review will suffice as the documentation of assessment activities and no separate report will be due.

Reviewer summary of yearly assessment report:

What follows is a brief critique of the report you submitted for the academic year 2003-2004. In most cases the report has been reviewed by 3 members of the University Assessment Committee.

Yearly Assessment Report Critique	
I. a. Program goals:	Program goals well stated and comprehensive
b. Learning outcomes and data collection:	Standards are well stated according to NCATE requirements
c. Results:	Results listed throughout the report.
II. BOT Initiative #3:	Met.
III. Plans for current year:	Activities include matching course outcomes to WV CSO's.
IV. Assistance needed:	Time, money, faculty position
V. Lessons learned:	The program is a strong program and is using assessment data to make decisions about the program.

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 a program does 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.

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. This year the report shows program scores from 2000-2001 to the present.

Scores:				
Categories	Scores			
	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004
I. Learning Outcomes	3	3	3	3
II. Assessment Measures	3	3	3	3
III. Feedback Loop	3	3	3	3
Overall Score:	9	8.7	8.7	9
Level of Implementation (efficacy of assessment)	3	3	3	3

Score Ranges	
Score Ranges 0-3 in each category	A score of 0 indicates minimum activity in the category
	A score of 1 indicates that a program is in the beginning stages of assessment
	A score of 2 indicates that a program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program
	A score of 3 indicates that a program is in the maturing stages of its assessment program

Levels of Implementation Efficacy of Assessment	
A total score between 0 and 3 indicates	Level 1: the program is in the beginning stages of its assessment of student academic achievement
A total score between 4 and 6 indicates	Level 2: the program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program
A total score between 7 and 9 indicates	Level 3: the program is in the maturing stages of continuous improvement of student academic achievement
The goal is to have the majority of our programs in level 3 by May 2006.	

Interpretation:

The BA Elementary Education program at Marshall University is a strong program. The Unit completed the rigorous analysis by NCATE and the WV Dept. of Education during the 2004-2005 academic year. The program has maintained its high level of assessment activities and has matured into a highly successful program in terms of its efficacy of assessment.

Recommendations:

The program is to be commended for its rigorous assessment program and its success in maintaining consistently high standards.

General Comments:

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

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

Enclosures

Program: BA in Elementary Education
Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level
Marshall University
PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS
NCA Levels of Implementation 2003-2004
DATE: Spring 2005

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 1 and Level 2 plus:

- They are comprehensive.
- They are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- 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 1 and Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- 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.

Marshall University Program Assessment

Excellent

Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2003-2004

Program: *BA in Elementary Education*
College of Education & Human Services

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	<i>Yes</i>
b. Learning outcomes data collection	<i>Clear</i>
c. Results	<i>Yes</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>Even included a model</i>
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) <i>/</i>
III. Plans for current Year	<i>Yes Pg (11)</i>
IV. Assistance needed	<i>Yes, Mred Faculty Pg (11)</i>
V. Most important thing learned through this process	<i>Yes</i>

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation 2003-2004

DATE: Spring 2005

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 1 and Level 2 plus:

- They are comprehensive.
- They are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- They are measurable.
- They support Marshall's educational goals.
- They span multiple learning domains.

Few too many

3

Not in table Appendix C but standard defined by NCAATP

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 1 and Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- 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.

Appendix C - First table does not fit in the report

3 *Based on NCAATP standards*

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. *- NCAATP*
- 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.

3

**Assessment Committee Analysis of Yearly
Departmental/Program Assessment Reports
Report for the Academic Year 2003-2004**

Winnie Black

Program: BA Elementary Education

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	Appendix A - Very Comprehensive
b. Learning outcomes data collection	Outcomes are not outcomes standards have clear outcomes
c. Results	Not really listed in Appendix C - sprinkled throughout report
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	<p>Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/></p> <p>Appendix C - terminology does not work w/ Marshall terminology</p>
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) Yes
III. Plans for current Year	p. 11
IV. Assistance needed	p. 11
V. Most important thing learned through this process	p. 12

Actions Taken - C

in later table

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation 2003-2004

DATE: Spring 2005

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 1 and Level 2 plus:

- They are comprehensive.
- They are appropriate in number.
- They describe student behaviors.
- 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 1 and Level 2 plus:

- They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
- They are multiple.
- 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.