

Office of Program Review & Assessment

2004

To: Dr. John Kiger, Program Coordinator, Park Resources and Leisure Services
 From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment
 Date: July 26, 2005



Yearly Assessment Report for: BS Park Resources and Leisure Services

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:	Student goals were not listed. The report appears to focus on faculty goals and course outcomes as opposed to student performance
b. Learning outcomes and data collection:	There were no learning objectives listed in the narrative. The objectives listed in the assessment summary chart appeared to be the general categories for assessment. However, there are no accompanying data. The program is accredited with a particularly stringent set of student outcomes listed; the program should be measuring these outcomes specifically. Are the student outcomes listed in the chart outcome categories listed by the accrediting agency? No data collection is apparent.
c. Results:	Satisfactory is not very descriptive. What are some specific results the program has obtained?
II. BOT Initiative #3:	Not listed, but the accrediting agency should have some performance indicators.
III. Plans for current year:	Recruitment of faculty members. New accreditation standards to be launched in 2007.
IV. Assistance needed:	Funding—nothing that can be supplied by the Office of Program Review and Assessment.
V. Lessons learned:	The program values the assessment of the program. Strengths and weaknesses can be identified and used as a basis for decision making.

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.

The assessment summary chart is present. The program appears to base its assessment primarily on course performance. The outcomes are not listed in measurable format. No specific standards or benchmarks were presented. No specific results were listed other than 'satisfactory.' No action was taken.

Student performance in classes is not specific. Good practices of assessment indicate that student grades in classes are not accurate representations of student academic achievement. The program needs to select particular artifacts from the courses to use as assessment evidence. Many courses were listed in the assessment approach column. Could the program place the course performance in some type of hierarchy and use artifacts from upper level courses as the determining gauge for student performance?

Efficacy of Assessment:

As Marshal 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		1	0	1
II. Assessment Measures		1	1	1
III. Feedback Loop		1	1	0
Total Overall Score:		1.5	2.3	1.67
Level of Implementation (efficacy of assessment)	Assessment Plan Submitted	1	1	1

Score Ranges	
Score Ranges 0-3 in each of the three categories	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 overall score between 0 and 3 indicates	Level 1: the program is in the beginning stages of its assessment of student academic achievement
A total overall score between 4 and 6 indicates	Level 2: the program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program
A total overall 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 program outcomes were listed, but not in a measurable format. Program evaluation is based primarily on student performance in courses. No specific standards were mentioned. What kind of performance in courses is required? No specific measures were identified and no evidence presented. The report does not specifically indicate how evidence is used to make programmatic decisions.

Recommendations:

The program should revisit the learning outcomes and restate them so that they are measurable. The program needs to identify specific artifacts as indicators of student academic achievement and collect

data to support the conclusions reached. At the present time, it appears that all students are performing exceptionally well. Is this really an accurate gauge of student academic achievement?

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

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

Program:

BS Park Res.

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator=s Comments
I.a. Program Goals	The report focuses much too much on personnel and not nearly enough on the goals of the program in terms of student benefit and skills. There was no mention about how program function was related to program structure. The mention that is made of program aspirations is not well developed.
b. Learning outcomes data collection	No learning objectives were listed. It is recommended that the Chair or his/her designee meet with the Director of Assessment to familiarize the department on what good assessment entails.
c. Results	None were provided
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ the appropriate assessment tools/ standards/results/actions taken.)	Yes _____ No <u> X </u> I am sure the author of the report is well intentioned, however, it seems obvious that the process of assessment is not understood. If it is not understood there can be no understanding and therefore no "buy-in" on the part of faculty
II. BOT Initiative #3 (<u>Undergraduate</u> Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) There is no evidence of standardized baseline national standards for comparison.
III. Plans for current Year	Plans for the upcoming year are good ones but have little to do directly with assessment.
IV. Assistance needed	The department does need the things listed but the assistance needed is in the collections of data to determine whether learning objectives are being met. It seems the department does not fully grasp the nature of assessment.
V. Most important thing learned	The department cannot fully realize the benefits of assessment

through this process	until assessment, itself, is better understood.
----------------------	---

Program: BS Park Res

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level

Marshall University

PRIMARY TRAIT ANALYSIS

NCA Levels of Implementation 2003-2004

DATE: Spring 2005

1. Learning Objectives

3. Feedback Loop

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.

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 2003-2004**

Program:

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	Yes
b. Learning outcomes data collection	No learning outcomes data collection
c. Results	No data collected, no report
(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"/> Chart does not identify objectives and appropriate assessment tools, standards, results, actions data collected, need chart performance data.
II. BOT Initiative #3 (Undergraduate Programs Only.)	(This is for undergraduate programs only.) NA
III. Plans for current Year	Yes
IV. Assistance needed	Yes
V. Most important thing learned through this process	Yes

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.

*evaluation
discussions
conferences*

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.

Assessment Report

BS in Parks and Leisure Services

Division of Exercise Science Sport and Recreation

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.

March 31, 2005 (10:28AM)

Form borrowed in part from Oakton Community College, Des Plaines, IL 60016
BSPLS04

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

C. Result:

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 evaluation 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 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:

There are two full-time faculty members in the BS in Parks and Leisure Services. One of the full-time faculty members will be retired in August 2005. We need to recruit a qualified faculty member to replace the position. The other full-time faculty member also plans to retire in 2005 or 2006.

The new accreditation standards will be launched in 2007. In the old standard, we need three FTE faculty members to meet the accreditation requirement. Most of the time, we will have three adjunct faculty members for three courses to cover 1 FTE. However, in the new standards, we are required to have 4 adjunct faculty members to cover for four courses for each semester. We need to require more adjunct faculty members.

In the upcoming year, it would be a challenge to replacing all the full-time faculty members and recruiting four adjunct faculty members within a short period of time. On the other hands, it would be the best opportunities enhance the current curriculum with new ideas and faculty members.

III. ASSISTANCE NEEDED:

We need to full the open faculty positions with qualified tenure-track member. We need extra funding to pay for the additional adjunct faculty members which required by the new accreditation standard.

March 31, 2005 (10:28AM)

Form borrowed in part from Oakton Community College, Des Plaines, IL 60016
BSPLS04

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

IV. WHAT IS THE ONE MOST IMPORTANT THING THE PROGRAM HAS LEARNED THROUGH THIS PROCESS?

Evaluation of our programs is essential, 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, BS:

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	