March 21, 2005

Michael J. Farrell
Interim President
Marshall University
One John Marshall Drive
Huntington, WV 25755-2400

Dear President Farrell:

At its March 13-17, 2005 meeting in Palm Springs, CA, the Unit Accreditation Board of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) considered the application for continuing accreditation of the College of Education and Human Services as the unit that oversees the professional education offerings at Marshall University. I am pleased to inform you of the Unit Accreditation Board’s decision to continue the accreditation of the College of Education and Human Services at Marshall University at the initial teacher preparation and advanced preparation levels. This accreditation decision indicates that the unit and its programs meet rigorous standards set forth by the professional education community.

Let me take this opportunity to congratulate you and your professional education unit for displaying the high quality necessary to be granted national accreditation. I would also like to express appreciation for the cooperation received from the faculty, staff, and administration of your institution. The copy of this letter sent to the head of your professional education unit includes a certificate in acknowledgement of the unit’s accomplishment.

Strengths noted in the Board of Examiners report have not been reiterated but are certainly considered part of the institution’s accreditation visit record. You may use the information provided in the Board of Examiners report at your discretion. Any areas for improvement that have been cited are listed in the enclosed areas for improvement document.

The next NCATE visit is scheduled for fall 2009, which is seven years after the originally scheduled fall 2002 visit. You will begin to receive materials for that visit approximately two years prior to the visit. (In partnership states, the actual date of the visit must be determined jointly by the state and NCATE.) In addition, your institution will be required to complete a Professional Education Data System instrument each year during the accreditation period. You are not required to report specifically on progress in all areas for improvement cited, but you are encouraged to do so. During the accreditation period, you will be expected to report evaluations and changes in relation to all six standards.
Enclosed is a copy of NCATE’s Policies on Dissemination of Information, which describes the terms and dates by which your current accreditation action becomes a matter of public record and lists other parties who will be notified of accreditation action. If your state has a partnership agreement with NCATE, the state agency with program approval authority receives a copy of this letter.

To assist you in letting potential students and the public know the benefits of attending a professionally accredited institution, we have also enclosed an information packet in the copy of this letter sent to the head of the education unit. Please feel free to contact NCATE’s Communications Department if you would like further assistance.

Should you have any questions regarding NCATE’s action or the items reported herein, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Respectfully submitted,

[Signature]

Arthur E. Wise

Enclosures

cc: Tony Williams, Interim Dean, College of Education and Human Services
    Bruce Flack, Director of Academic Affairs, Higher Education Policy Commission
    Serena L. Starcher, Coordinator, Teacher Education, West Virginia Department of Education
    Board of Examiners Team
May 6, 2010

Dr. Calvin F. Meyer, Program Director
Elementary and Secondary Education
GSEPD

Dear Cal:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the EdS (Education Specialist) Program’s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric is still relatively new and, as you will see, it raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this rubric.

As I mentioned on the Early Childhood Education assessment, an analysis of frequency counts or mean performance across students on each trait of a rubric will allow a more meaningful assessment of outcome strengths and weaknesses. However, I realize that you had a limited number of graduates during this assessment cycle, making more in-depth assessment difficult. You are to be commended on the level of detail of reporting.

Please see the attached rubric, which contains both my comments and additional comments from Graduate Council reviewers. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Teresa Eagle, Dean, GSEPD
April 5, 2009

Dr. Cal Meyer, Program Director
Elementary and Secondary Education
GSEPD

Dear Cal:

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the EdS’ s assessment of student learning. This letter will provide my general comments and suggestions for improvement. Although the scoring rubric we used to evaluate assessment reports is attached, I will not include numerical ratings in this letter. The reason for this is that we used the attached rubric for the first time this year and, as you will see, it has changed considerably from the ones used in previous years. It raises the bar for what is considered excellent assessment considerably and, since it was not shared with programs before this assessment cycle, I’m not comfortable using it to give programs a formal rating this year. However, I ask that you use it for formative purposes to help improve your assessment plan. We also would appreciate your comments concerning this new rubric.

Overall, this is an excellent assessment report that used both direct and indirect assessment measures. My only comment is to ask whether or not the IRB modules that you use to assess your first outcome, “An in-depth knowledge and understanding in core studies (e.g. research, statistics, writing and technology),” covers all of these areas? The reason I ask is that the IRB modules with which I’m familiar don’t, and I wonder if you need some supplementary assessment measures for these areas. Graduate Council reviewers suggested that you consider replacing “knowledge” and “understand” with measurable verbs and I agree with this assessment.

Overall, yours is an excellent assessment report. Please see the attached rubric and letter to Deans, Chairs, and Faculty detailing general suggestions for an effective assessment program. If you have questions or concerns, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds

Mary E. Reynolds
Director of Academic Assessment

C: Dr. Rudy Pauley, Dean, GSEPD
Office of Assessment & Program Review

April 1, 2008

Dr. Calvin Meyer, Program Coordinator
Elementary and Secondary Education
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development

Dear Cal,

The Graduate Council and I have completed our evaluation of the annual program assessment report for the EdS (Educational Specialist). This letter will provide feedback in the following manner. First, I will comment generally on each section of your report. Second, I will rate the following areas of the report on a four point scale {0 – 3, with 3 being the highest rating}: student learning outcomes, assessment measures, and the feedback loop. Although I considered feedback from committee members, I made the final decision on ratings for all reports submitted. Third, I will offer suggestions for your consideration as you plan your assessment for the 2008-2009 academic year. Fourth, I will include my evaluation using the Primary Traits Analysis rubric and will include reviewers' comments for your information.

General Comments

Your program objectives are good ones but, unlike with the Elementary and Secondary Education reports, I think these are too general to be considered student learning outcomes. Of course, I'm not suggesting that you intended them as such; it's just that I suggested that your program objectives for the other programs could be considered student learning outcomes.

As with the other programs, I'd suggest saving information that does not pertain directly to student learning for inclusion in the five-year program review.

As with your other programs, I think you do an excellent job of using assessment feedback to make improvements in your program. For the EdS, you specifically showed how you used information from the candidates' self-ratings, information from employer and graduate satisfaction surveys. I also note that you use the Praxis and final projects as direct measures of student learning.

I assume that the three outcomes listed on your chart are your student learning outcomes for this program. I think these are appropriate, but would encourage you to avoid the use of "demonstrate" in outcome 2, but rather state how students will demonstrate these skills. Also, the chart appears to indicate that outcomes 2 and 3 are assessed primarily with the use of indirect measures.
Ratings for Student Learning Outcomes, Assessment Measures, and the Feedback Loop

Student Learning Outcomes = 3. This rating was given because your current student learning outcomes are comprehensive, support Marshall’s educational goals, and span multiple learning domains.

Assessment Measures = 2. This rating was given because you use both direct and indirect measures and there are several reported. However, only two direct measures (Capstone and Praxis) were reported and these occur at the end of the program. I would recommend incorporating additional direct measures into the curriculum.

Feedback Loop = 3. This rating was given because your report showed that you are using data regarding student learning to identify student strengths and weaknesses and to make curricular changes within the program.

Suggestions to Consider as you plan your assessment strategies for the 2008-2009 academic year

My primary recommendation is for you to consider employing more detailed direct assessment measures and to decide which student learning outcomes you want to assess in depth during the 2008-2009 academic year. It is perfectly acceptable and encouraged to assess only a portion of your student learning outcomes each year. So, you may choose to do an in-depth assessment of one/third of your outcomes during year 1. If this is done using several assessment measures with detailed rubrics, you will be able to collect detailed data regarding the outcomes. These data should allow you to identify specific strengths and weaknesses regarding student learning (and hence, your program). Changes to strengthen these areas of learning can be implemented the following year, while you assess two more outcomes. This will allow you to assess all outcomes on a three-four year rotation and will give you sufficient time to allow curricular modifications to have an effect before the next assessment.

I appreciate the work you are doing to make your assessment stronger. If I can be of additional help, please do not hesitate to contact me at 62987 or at reynoldm@marshall.edu.

Sincerely,

Mary E. Reynolds
Interim Director of Assessment

C: Dr. Rudy Pauley, Interim Dean, GSEPD
August 26, 2007

Dr. Calvin F. Meyer, Program Director
Elementary and Secondary Education
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development
South Charleston Campus

Dear Cal,

The Subcommittee on Assessment Reports completed its review of your annual assessment report for the EdS (Educational Specialist) and I concur with their analysis.

The EdS (Educational Specialist) Program is performing at Level 3 (the highest level) in every category: Learning Objectives, Assessment Measures, and Feedback Loop.

In the area of Learning Objectives, Level 3 suggests that learning objectives are comprehensive, measurable, support Marshall’s educational goals, and span multiple learning domains.

In the area of Assessment Measures, Level 3 suggests that the program emphasizes direct measures of student learning, that these measures focus on real-world tasks, that they stress higher order learning, and that they allow performance to be gauged over time.

In the area of the Feedback Loop, Level 3 suggests that data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learning; that clear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performance; and that data are an integral part of departmental planning.

The Committee reviewers made the following specific observations:

- Program goals were clear, adequate, and appropriate to the field
- Data collection showed consistently high student achievement
- National test scores indicate stable levels with increased enrollment
- The chart identified each category very well
• For the current year, three viable goals were listed for continuing development and refinement of program assessment
• The program expressed a need for assistance in evaluating electronic courses
• The program is strongly influenced by NCATE and technology

Congratulations to you and your faculty for your assessment efforts. If the Office of Assessment and Program Review can be of any assistance, please don’t hesitate to call the new Director, Dr. Mary Beth Reynolds.

Sincerely,

Frances S. Hensley
Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs

C: Dr. Rudy Pauley, Interim Dean
Graduate School of Education and Professional Development
To: Rudy Pauley, Program Chair, EDS  
From: Bob Edmunds, Coordinator for Program Review and Assessment  
Date: July 27, 2006

Yearly Assessment Report for: EdS Education Specialist

Thank you for submitting the Program Review Assessment Report. Please use the information in this report to guide your assessment activities during AY 2006-2007.


Reviewer summary of yearly assessment report:
What follows is a brief critique of the report submitted in your program review. The report has been reviewed by members of the University Assessment Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Review Assessment Report Critique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Summarize the principal elements of the departmental assessment plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Provide summary information on the following elements: Student Outcomes: Assessment Tools or approaches/Standards/Benchmarks (BOT Initiative #3 if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results/Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Provide information on how assessment data is used to improve program quality. Include at least 3 specific examples drawn from the past 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/appropriate assessment tools/Standards/results/action taken</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000-</td>
<td>2001-</td>
<td>2002-</td>
<td>2003-</td>
<td>2004-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Learning Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Measures</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Feedback Loop</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Overall Score:</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of Implementation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(efficacy of assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Score Ranges**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score Ranges 0-3 in each of the three categories</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A score of 0 indicates minimum activity in the category</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of 1 indicates that a program is in the beginning stages of assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of 2 indicates that a program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A score of 3 indicates that a program is in the maturing stages of its assessment program</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Levels of Implementation Efficacy of Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A total overall score between 0 and 3 indicates</th>
<th>Level 1: the program is in the beginning stages of its assessment of student academic achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A total overall score between 4 and 6 indicates</td>
<td>Level 2: the program is making progress toward implementing a viable assessment program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A total overall score between 7 and 9 indicates</td>
<td>Level 3: the program is in the maturing stages of continuous improvement of student academic achievement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:**

The Unit has made steady progress in its assessment efforts over the past 5 years. Outcomes are in place and candidates are being measured as to competencies. Multiple measures are being used and the Unit is using that data to improve the quality of the program.

**Recommendations:**

The Unit should continue its assessment activities by gathering and interpreting data and use the results to improve the quality of the program.

**General Comments:**

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

**Enclosure**