CHAPTER SIX
Student Learning and Effective Teaching
Criterion Three: Student Learning and Effective Teaching

The organization provides evidence of student learning and teaching effectiveness that demonstrates it is fulfilling its educational mission.

Marshall University is a complex institution of higher education. Not only do we have degree programs that range from two-year programs to doctorates and medical degrees, but we serve a student body that is traditional/residential as well as older/commuter. We have two campuses and numerous sites at which we offer courses, but we also have online programs that allow students to work from the comfort of their homes. This complexity reflects our mission: to offer high quality undergraduate and graduate education.

In the ten years since Marshall’s last accreditation site visit, the state government and a succession of higher education governing bodies have emphasized access to higher education as a key to economic development for the state. At the same time, they have demanded accountability from the institutions to provide the best possible education for those we serve.

In terms of access, Marshall has expanded to include another campus—in South Charleston—and has increased the availability of distance education, especially online courses, in order to meet our obligations to offer this quality education to the citizens of a state which is primarily rural and has a low college-going rate.

The accountability movement encouraged us to look more closely at what we do and the extent to which we meet the expectations of the state and our students. This gave additional impetus to Marshall’s own pursuit of the development of an assessment culture on the campus. The core components of Criterion Three address much of what we have learned and achieved as well as what we have yet to do in this critical area.
**Core Component 3a**

*The organization’s goals for student learning are clearly stated for each educational program and make effective assessment possible.*

Following Marshall’s NCA site visit in 1995, the evaluation team recommended that the institution shift its focus from an assessment *plan* to implementation of an assessment *program*, with greater emphasis on actual evidence of student learning as reflected in departmental assessment reports. Marshall took this charge seriously and began a process to strengthen our assessment procedures. In 1996, the Office of Program Review and Assessment was established. This office maintains oversight of the assessment effort at Marshall University.

The Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment is a half-time position held by a senior professor assisted by one part time graduate assistant and a work study student. The coordinator presides over the committee structure upon which the assessment effort is based. Originally, two committees were formed, an Assessment Committee and General Education Committee, to evaluate assessment efforts and make recommendations to the faculty. However, because of redundancy and overlapping responsibilities, the two committees were fused in 2003 to form the University Assessment Committee. The committee has broad representation from each of the colleges, staff, administration, students, Faculty Senate, and graduate faculty. Evaluation and feedback are provided each year to assist the academic units in improving their assessment efforts.

The University Assessment Committee is responsible for monitoring the extent to which academic programs articulate and assess student learning outcomes. The work of the committee is performed by four subcommittees. Each year, the Assessment Plan Review Subcommittee evaluates the assessment reports submitted by all programs and the nine areas that comprise general education to determine whether appropriate criteria are being addressed with effective utilization of information gathered. The Course Syllabus Review Subcommittee examines course syllabi to determine whether course learning objectives are established and assessment conducted at the course level. The Student Satisfaction Survey Subcommittee prepares summaries and draws conclusions from student surveys including...
Course Outcomes Satisfaction Survey, Instructor Evaluations, Pre-graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, Incoming First Year Student Orientation Survey, and the Graduate and Alumni Survey. The General Education Subcommittee, comprised of the Chairs of all general education component committees, monitors the assessment of general education courses. In addition, the University Assessment Committee reviews the results of the Academic Profile Test, administered by the Office of Program Review and Assessment, to gather information on the success of the general education curriculum, and the new Collegiate Learning Assessment exam.

Summaries derived from the multifaceted efforts of the University Assessment Committee provide assessment findings that serve informational and advisory functions for Faculty Senate, ultimately responsible for approval of all curricular changes; for Graduate Council, responsible for graduate curricula; and for departments, responsible for curriculum at the programmatic level. Major program changes go to the Board of Governors.

1. The organization clearly differentiates its learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, and post-baccalaureate programs by identifying learning outcomes for each.

Each undergraduate and each graduate program is required to have an assessment plan on file with the Office of Program Review and Assessment. Under the leadership of the Coordinator, the University Assessment Committee (UAC) approves these plans initially and conducts an annual review of the plans. Part of the annual review is an evaluation of the assessment activities by each program. One of the items required in the annual Assessment Report from each department is an articulation of the learning outcomes for each program. This requirement has been in place since 2000. Graduate and undergraduate programs are required to have different learning goals.

The UAC rates each program’s identification of learning outcomes by using the Efficacy of Assessment, Primary Traits Analysis. In this analysis, the 0 Level indicates that learning outcomes have not been identified; Level 1 means the program has begun to identify learning outcomes; Level 2 signifies programs that are making progress in identifying learning outcomes; and Level 3 refers to programs with learning outcomes in the maturing
stage of continuous improvement. In 2001-2002, the UAC found that, of the 69 reporting, 13 programs were at the 0 level; 18 were at level 1; 30 were at level 2; and only 8 programs were at level 3. The data from the 96 programs reporting in 2002-2003 were: 19 programs at the 0 Level; 21 at Level 1; 30 at Level 2; and 26 programs at Level 3.

Although the number of programs at the 0 Level is too high, the increase in programs at Level 3 is especially encouraging. This reflects a vigorous effort on the part of the Coordinator in educating department faculty and Chairs about the importance of student learning outcomes to the strength and viability of their programs. To achieve this result, the Coordinator has done workshops with the Council of Chairs, with departments that have approached him for assistance (seven during the 2004-2005 AY), and hosted a well-attended workshop for all faculty in May 2004 entitled “Program Assessment,” by Susan Hatfield of Winona State. This effort to educate faculty and Chairs continues and our goal is to have the learning outcomes of all programs at levels 2 or 3 by 2008.

2. Assessment of student learning provides evidence at multiple levels: course, program, and institutional.

Marshall University does assess student learning at multiple levels. The University Assessment Committee tracks this assessment activity through the review of course syllabi, department assessment reports and the general education annual reports.

At the course level, the Office of Program Review and Assessment collects course syllabi for every course every year. The Course Syllabus Review subcommittee prepares a report on the contents of the course syllabi, looking particularly to see if learning outcomes are identified and assessment measures are in place. The Coordinator sends the results of this review to the instructor, to the department Chair and to the Dean of the college.

The Criterion 3a subcommittee also looked at a random sampling of 114 course syllabi collected in fall 2004, using the criteria outlined in the North Central Association Handbook on Assessment. This review revealed that 71.9% of the courses articulated student learning outcomes. In 65.5% of the courses, the course objectives reflected measured outcomes. And,
perhaps most importantly, of those that contained both, 78.1% demonstrated a connection between intended outcomes and measured outcomes.

The need for faculty development in this area is being addressed by the Office of Program Review and Assessment. To assist faculty in constructing an appropriate course syllabus, the Coordinator does workshops for new faculty and for continuing faculty (including Chairs and Deans). The keynote speaker for the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) in the fall of 2005 was Dr. Dee Fink on the topic of course design and student outcomes. This workshop for all faculty attracted over 100 instructors. In addition, the New Faculty Fall Seminar in 2005 represented a continuation of this theme of course design and student outcomes. A small pilot group participated in a similar workshop in the summer of 2005 sponsored by the CTE and the Director was very enthusiastic about the results. The project will be continued in the future.

At the department level, the overall assessment effort is reported in the annual departmental assessment reports. Units continually monitor their program goals in relation to the Marshall University Mission Statement and their individual disciplines. The Assessment Plan Review Subcommittee of the University Assessment Committee evaluates the progress each program has made in implementing a viable assessment program, by using the Efficacy of Assessment Primary Traits Analysis. For the academic year 2000-2001, 9.78% of university programs were at level 0, meaning they had not yet begun to develop their assessment program; 30.43% were at level 1 (beginning implementation); 28.6% were at level 2 (making progress); and only 17.39% were at level 3 (maturing stages). In 2001-02, these numbers were: 0 Level=4.21%; Level 1=29.47%; Level 2=34.74%; and Level 3=18.95%. By 2002-2003, the numbers showed real improvement with no programs at the 0 level, 20.83% at Level 1, 40.63% at Level 2, and 22.92% at Level 3. This shows a maturing overall assessment effort at the department level.

At the institutional level, Marshall assesses student learning in two ways: 1) administration of the national Academic Profile Test given to students who have completed 60 credit hours, which measures critical thinking, scientific reasoning and math reasoning, and the new

Chapter 6 – Criterion Three (3a)
Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) exam (begun in fall 2004); and 2) collection of data from general education courses, including the Marshall Plan.

a.) Although it is too early for results from the CLA, the Academic Profile has been administered since 1999 and has produced results for the UAC to review. The University Assessment Committee has established a benchmark of 60% of students performing at Level 1 or better on the Writing Skill Dimension. In 2001-2002, 67% of students tested (N=583) met this standard.

For the Critical Thinking/Creative Thinking Skills, the UAC has a benchmark of 60% of students performing at Level 1 or better on Reading/Critical Thinking Dimension. In 2001-2002, 66% met this standard. In Science/Math Literacy, the UAC has not established a benchmark, but in 2000-2001 and 2001-2002 80% or more of the students met the minimum competency standard. This information is shared with the Math Committee, Science Literacy Committee, Writing Committee, Oral Communication Committee and the WAC Committee.

b.) The University Assessment Committee also gathers data on general education at Marshall through annual reports from representatives of the component skills. At the institutional level, the general education core is the Marshall Plan. It consists of one writing intensive course, one mathematics course (MTH 121 or above), one integrated science course, one multicultural studies course, two international studies courses, computer literacy and competency, and a capstone course. When the Marshall Plan was developed, each of these components had general learning goals. Each component, with the exception of the capstone courses and mathematics, is monitored by a faculty committee. These committees have further articulated the learning goals for each component. For example, writing intensive courses are found in many different disciplines but the Writing Across the Curriculum Committee has established the learning outcomes that are common to all and distributed these to all faculty who teach writing intensive courses. Learning goals for the other components may also be found at the Assessment website.
In addition to the Marshall Plan, Marshall undergraduates have general education expectations at the college—and sometimes, program—level. The learning goals for these are established by the department offering the course(s). One example, which is common across all the colleges, is a requirement for written communication, satisfied by two composition courses offered by the English Department. The assessment of this requirement is done in the second of the two courses (English 102 or its honors or junior-level equivalent). The English Department Writing Committee evaluates a sample of research papers every spring for the writing project. For the Oral Communication requirement, the Oral Communication Committee evaluates 50-75 student speeches each year. Results are reported to the home departments (English and Communication Studies) and to the University Assessment Committee.

The benchmark for the written communication component is a score of 3 or better on the research paper. In spring 2001, 78 papers were examined and 51.3% met or exceeded the benchmark. In spring 2002, of 120 papers reviewed, only 30.8% met the benchmark. The Chair of the Writing Committee believes the lower percentage may be a reflection of the scoring rubric that was used. As a result, the Committee switched to a different rubric in 2003 and 63% of the 126 students scored acceptable or above. In 2004, 75% of the 202 papers were at the acceptable level or above and in 2005, 65% of the 163 students were in that range. These scores are comparable to the results of the Academic Profile scores for the same years. The conclusion of the Writing Committee Chair-woman is that 65% of Marshall students are proficient in writing at the freshman exit-level courses. The Writing Committee plans to develop specific tools to identify problems that students exhibit and methodologies to address these problems.

3. **Assessment of student learning includes multiple direct and indirect measures of student learning.**

Each year, the Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment, working with the Course Syllabus Subcommittee of the University Assessment Committee, examines all course syllabi for certain assessment criteria but the evidence of multiple direct and indirect measures of
student learning was not initially included. The Subcommittee began addressing this issue in spring 2005. In the meantime, the analysis of 114 syllabi conducted by the Criterion 3a Subcommittee in fall 2004 found that 76.3% had both direct and indirect measures of learning provided in the objectives and/or grading requirements. These were graduate (31), undergraduate (48), and 400/500 (35) courses.

4. Results obtained through assessment of student learning are available to appropriate constituencies, including students themselves.

The Office of Program Review and Assessment monitors each program through a system of periodic Program Review as mandated by state law and the Marshall University Board of Governors. Each program prepares a Program Review on a five year cycle. Program Reviews are evaluated by the Graduate Council (for graduate programs) or the Academic Planning Committee (for undergraduate programs), the Provost/Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs, the President, and the Board of Governors. The procedures for Program Review are approved by the faculty through the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council. One section of each Program Review is devoted to assessment. Programs must report on their assessment activities and results in the program review self-study. At each stage, evaluators may ask for more information or a follow-up report. In the 2004-2005 cycle, several programs were asked to submit follow-up reports on assessment topics such as placement rates of graduates, student satisfaction surveys, curricular changes, etc.

Students have access to assessment data through their participation on university committees, departmental curriculum committees, and representation on the Board of Governors. For example, program reviews are presented to the Academic Affairs Committee of the Board of Governors. Each year, the student member of the Board of Governors participates in this process. In our procedures, the Deans and Chairs appear before the Academic Affairs Committee to answer questions about their programs that arise out of the program reviews. This gives the student member a good vantage point from which to analyze programs at Marshall. Students also have representation on the Academic Planning Committee where undergraduate programs are reviewed and on the Graduate Council where graduate programs are reviewed. Although this does not represent widespread access for students, it is an avenue
of student input and involvement. With the HLC self-study now a public document, students will have full access.

Moreover, recognizing that our constituencies have an interest in the assessment of student learning and student achievement, the Office of Program Review and Assessment has a website that summarizes all assessment results for each program (excluding individual course evaluations.) This provides students, as well as prospective students, alumni, parents and other interested parties, with access to assessment data.

5. The organization integrates into its assessment of student learning the data reported for purposes of external accountability (e.g., graduation rates, passage rates on licensing exams, placement rates, and transfer rates).

Annual departmental assessment reports and 5-Year Program Reviews contain information on student performance/mastery as measured by graduation rates, passage rates on licensure exams, and placements rates. In addition, all of these are reported annually to the Higher Education Policy Committee which, in turn, reports these to the Legislative Oversight Committee on Educational Accountability.

For the programs with licensure, the rates from July 1, 2004 - June 30, 2005 reflect that Marshall graduates perform well. At the baccalaureate level, 100% of the students in Cytotechnology passed, as did 91% of those in Nursing, and in Medical Technology (which had two students take the exam) there was a pass rate of 50%. At the graduate/first professional degree level, Speech Pathology and Audiology, and Nursing Administration had 100% pass rates; Teacher Education, Praxis II had a 98% rate; for medical students it was 85%; for dietetics, 88%; and of those taking the national certified counselor exam, only 68% passed. Those taking the United States Medical Licensing Examination (USMLE) administered by the National Board of Medical Examiners (NBME), for the first time in academic year 2005-2006 had a pass rate of 91% for Step 1, and 100% for Step 2 Clinical Knowledge.

Transfer rates are not currently a part of any reporting mechanism at the program level. During the 2003-2004 Program Review cycle, the Academic Committee of the Board of
Governors asked program Chairs for information on students who transfer out of their programs. As a result, these programs have begun collecting this information. The University Assessment Committee is considering a recommendation to add this information to the Program Review form. Any changes to the form would have to be approved by the Academic Planning Committee, the Faculty Senate and the Graduate Council.

6. The organization’s assessment of student learning extends to all educational offerings, including credit and noncredit certificate offerings.

Marshall has over 20 graduate certificates and one undergraduate certificate. These are all credit offerings. These certificates are not subject to program review so there is no formal assessment of these programs. The courses within the certificates are assessed each semester and the certificate curriculum and faculty would be covered in a general way by departmental assessment plans and reports, but no separate assessment exists. Nonetheless, we will recommend that certificates and minors be added to the program review process as a segment of the curricular offerings of each program. Some certificate programs, however, are already evaluated as part of some specialized accreditation processes.

7. Faculty are involved in defining expected student learning outcomes and creating the strategies to determine whether those outcomes are achieved.

Since formal assessment plans and reports were first collected centrally in 1996, efforts by the Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment were directed toward involving the departments, faculty and Chairs in a meaningful assessment process. A period of education was required to explore with faculty the importance of assessment in curriculum and program development. A clear linkage had to be established between identifying student learning outcomes that were pertinent and could be measured by carefully designed or adapted assessment tools and meaningful changes in curricula to better serve the needs of students.

Faculty participation in program assessment is now widespread, ranging from the course to program to institutional levels. At the institutional level, the assessment effort is led by faculty members. The Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment is a senior faculty member with reassigned time to direct assessment activities. The Coordinator works closely
with the University Assessment Committee members, the majority of whom are faculty representatives from each college. The UAC members are responsible for reviewing all course syllabi each year, all departmental/program assessment reports each year, all surveys conducted by the Office of Program Review and Assessment each year, and the results of institutional tests (Academic Profile and CLA) and general education assessment. Working with the Coordinator, the UAC reports back to the program Chairs and to the faculty an evaluation of their assessment efforts.

At the program level, the department Chair works with the faculty to write the original assessment plan and then submits an annual report on the results of that plan. To help faculty improve their articulation and measurement of student learning outcomes, the Coordinator frequently meets with department Chairs and departmental assessment committees. The MU Primary Traits Analysis Report contains information on the status of each program at Marshall University and a comparison of trends in the three areas serving as sub-categories of the evaluation. It is clear that a majority of the departments are at Level Two, Making Progress in Implementing Assessment Programs, or Level Three, Maturing Stages of Continuous Improvement. The percentage of departments rising to Level Three and Level Two has increased over the past three years and the percentage in Level One, beginning Implementation of Assessment Programs, has declined. Some examples of assessment reports include MA/MS Biological Sciences, English, Geology, and Secondary Education. These reports are not submitted as exemplars, but instead they were chosen because all four have made significant progress in improving the assessment effort.

At the course level, faculty articulate their learning outcomes in their syllabi. The UAC reviews every single syllabus each year to ascertain the progress that is being made at this level in identifying learning outcomes and measuring these outcomes. When this effort first began, many faculty members did not have learning outcomes on their course syllabi. Some have included them only because it is required as part of their program assessment plan. Others have embraced the value of learning outcomes to their teaching and their students’ learning. This ongoing process is aided by the Coordinator presenting information each year to new faculty about construction of course syllabi and about assessment.
Core Component 3b

The institution values and supports effective teaching.

Marshall University’s central focus on student learning through effective teaching is highlighted in its Mission Statement which describes “innovative undergraduate and graduate education” as Marshall’s principal reason for existence. Likewise, the University Creed puts “An Educational Community in which all members work together to promote and strengthen teaching and learning” as its first descriptor of the university. From its beginning, Marshall University has had the education of students as its primary responsibility, and in order to accomplish this, the teaching role of the faculty is both valued and supported.

Curricular changes inevitably follow the continuous examination of the definition of, and needs for, an educated citizenry, and Marshall University’s faculty have always owned the curriculum and its development in order to tie the expectations placed on students with the work of the faculty. As students, curriculum, and society change, the faculty and teaching approaches must also be constantly examined and changed. The university has a long history of encouraging and facilitating such change.

In 1996, Marshall University began an institutional effort to improve undergraduate student learning across all colleges and departments by implementing a new General Education graduation requirement. This new requirement (named “the Marshall Plan”) required each student to demonstrate a number of meta-disciplinary proficiencies through specially designated courses both in and outside the major—namely, courses that utilize Writing Across the Curriculum (WAC), courses that provide a multicultural and international approach to texts, issues, and debates in a particular discipline; courses in computer science and integrated science; and a capstone experience in the major. As an initiative of a faculty ad hoc General Education Committee, the Marshall Plan drew the support and cooperation of faculty and administrators across the institution.

The faculty had previously decided that to adequately extend writing instruction beyond the purview of the 6-hour freshman composition course sequence, faculty in all colleges would
need to be trained in the WAC pedagogy. The WAC program was initiated in 1992 by faculty committed to the value of writing in the teaching and learning process. Since that year, a WAC program/office has been budgeted by the Office of Academic Affairs with a quarter-time director; writing intensive courses became an integral requirement of the Marshall Plan, and training and certification for WAC courses and instructors occur every year. Each fall the WAC program provides an off-campus weekend of training in the effective use of writing activities in teaching, learning, and assessment. The weekend covers much more than writing, however. It includes evidence-based teaching tips, pedagogical applications and theory, and reflective activities. By the fall of 2004, 266 faculty had attended a weekend training session and 55 faculty were certified to teach writing intensive courses.

Although the development of the WAC program predates the 1996-2006 period of review for this Self Study, WAC inaugurated a period of marked institutional growth in the area of faculty development and has served as the primary model for newer programs that focus on the improvement of teaching and learning at Marshall University. Specifically, new initiatives such as the Women’s Studies Program, the Center for Teaching Excellence, and the Service Learning Program (SLP) each have followed the pattern of institutionalization first carried out by WAC: a member of the faculty or the administration introduces a program idea, a steering committee is formed, proposals for seed money or pilot projects are drafted by the committee and submitted to administrators, modest financial support is granted, a program director either volunteers or is appointed, pilot projects are implemented, and further institutional support is requested and granted. Marshall University has repeatedly executed the broad strokes of this sequence to the benefit of faculty and students alike. In short, program needs have been first identified by faculty in relevant disciplines, while strategic planning and program implementation have also emerged from the ground up—that is, from within the ranks of qualified faculty.

Marshall University faculty have always identified themselves primarily as teaching faculty, dedicated to higher education through the educational process and student learning, rather than as research faculty who only incidentally teach. As part of this history, the role of faculty as educators has always been valued and supported by the university. The goal for the future is to
integrate an increasing emphasis on the research productivity of the faculty while maintaining the importance of teaching. Research, as evidenced by the capstone requirement, is increasingly being viewed as a teaching tool. The university can achieve this transition through the visibility and availability of programs which support excellence in teaching and learning.

1. The organization provides services to support improved pedagogies and demonstrates openness to innovative practices that enhance learning.

While the earliest formal program for supporting teaching and learning development at Marshall University occurred with the institution of the Writing Across the Curriculum program in 1992 as described above, the touchstone program of the last decade has been the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE). Founded in 1999, the CTE is housed within the Office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. The mission of the center is to help faculty enhance the educational experience of all Marshall students through instructional and professional development opportunities. The activities of the center encourage innovative and effective teaching methods which will stimulate student learning.

The center has a half-time director, a modest budget, and some office space, and is administratively linked to the WAC office, the Office of Assessment, and the Service Learning Program. A variety of center programs serve over 400 faculty participants annually. Nationally recognized workshop presenters have been brought to campus (e.g. Dr. James Eison, Dr. Raoul Arreola, Dr. Edward Zlotkowski, Dr. Meggin McIntosh, Dr. Barbara Cambridge, Dr. Charles Walker, Dr. Tony Grasha, Dr. Mel Silberstein, and Dr. Dee Fink). Topics for these workshops have included active learning, service learning, classroom assessment techniques, time and paper management, course design and student learning outcomes, and the scholarship of teaching. In addition, throughout the year Marshall University faculty and staff provide workshops in topic areas such as: the scholarship of teaching, entrepreneurship education, plagiarism, classroom management, cognitive psychology and teaching and learning, writing course objectives and learning outcomes, syllabus design, etc.
The center has provided some travel money to faculty, offers a $5,000 grant annually to a department or program to improve teaching and learning, provides summer stipends to faculty for course design, and has recently offered peer mentoring in specific techniques (rubrics, games/simulations, virtual lab design, teaching through discussion, and service learning). In 2004 CTE, WAC, and the West Virginia Writing Project collaborated to organize and run faculty writing groups to facilitate professional writing. Thirty faculty participated in these groups during 2004-2005.

The $5,000 program grants offered by the CTE have been an excellent way to encourage departments and programs to create and implement innovative teaching or assessment activities. Funded programs to date have included a program and curricular review by Integrated Sciences, an external review and assessment of all the programs in the College of Fine Arts, the development of program assessment materials in Political Science and in Psychology, the integration of team teaching throughout the curriculum of the Department of Religious Studies, the development of program-wide student outcome goals and assessment measures in all courses in Communication Disorders, and innovative teaching methods in Chemistry and in English courses. It is anticipated that the kind of activity undertaken by these programs will have an impact on the quality of teaching and assessment, thereby influencing student learning for years to come. The yearly number of CTE applications by programs has increased from 5 in the first year (2002) to 15 in 2005. Clearly programs and colleges are becoming more interested in improvement and innovation. The money for these activities is made possible from a donor who is committed to improvement and change in teaching as a means of providing quality education for West Virginia students.

Since 2000, the CTE and the Office of Academic Affairs have cooperated to jointly coordinate, plan, and conduct a 2.5 day New Faculty Orientation. In addition, a New Faculty website was created. During this time, 250 new faculty have attended. The Orientation includes the annual fall faculty development workshop with a nationally recognized presenter. Approximately 50% of the sessions are devoted specifically to teaching-related issues – teaching and learning with writing, use of the library resources for teaching, service learning, teaching undergraduates through research, use of technology for teaching and learning, teaching and learning with students with special needs, etc. Throughout the fall semester, new
faculty members are invited to attend a series of New Faculty Seminars which further encourage faculty to think about their teaching. These programs are not mandatory, and attendance is typically around 8-10. It is expected that this work with newly hired faculty will increase the collective examination – and continuous improvement – of teaching effectiveness throughout the campus community.

Each summer, seven Marshall University faculty members are nominated by the Office of Academic Affairs to attend the West Virginia state sponsored “Great Teachers Seminar” which provides interaction with faculty from across the state to facilitate innovative teaching.

The departments (Communication Studies, English, Math and Psychology) using Teaching Assistants (TA’s) in the classroom require a teaching seminar and provide some faculty supervision while the TA’s are teaching. Concomitantly, new Teaching Assistants attend mandatory two-day TA Training Workshops each fall, and the sessions are devoted to teaching strategies. Hundreds of fledgling TA’s have been exposed to a variety of pedagogical approaches in this way, prior to their first teaching experience.

The most recent development in the university’s encouragement of innovative practices is the establishment of the Service Learning Program, as described in the next section.

A faculty-wide survey which received 112 responses asked faculty about their participation in faculty development activities and the influence of those activities on teaching. Faculty from 6 colleges responded and the mean number of programs attended per year ranged by college from 0.33 programs to 6.96 programs on campus, and ranged from 0.76 programs to 4.78 programs per year at other venues. The average rating by college of these programs’ effect on teaching ranged from 2.0 - 2.62 (2= “teaching has improved somewhat” and 3= “teaching has greatly improved”).

2. The organization supports professional development designed to facilitate teaching suited to varied learning environments.

In fall 2003 the university added the Service Learning Program (SLP) within the Center for Teaching Excellence. In the planning stages since 1996, this new program encourages faculty
to extend the learning environment into the surrounding community. Marshall first joined *West Virginia Campus Compact* (WVCC) in 1996 and appointed a faculty member to serve as liaison to WVCC. In 1998 Marshall also set up a steering committee through which initial proposals for the creation of an SLP were vetted. Although these proposals were never formally submitted to the administration, they ultimately gave shape to CTE’s vision for a Service Learning Program.

In spring 2001, CTE identified a potential SLP director from within the ranks of Marshall faculty and sponsored her participation in a national conference on service learning. In search of seed money to fund a quarter-time SLP director position, CTE approached the John Deaver Drinko Academy for American Political Institutions and Civic Culture in spring 2002 and received the requisite funding for a director. With an SLP Director in place for Academic Year 2002-2003, the SLP began work in earnest, particularly in the area of curriculum development. A newly formed SLP Curriculum Committee drafted course designation criteria, while an advisory committee approved a logo for the program. After one year of initial activity, the SLP approached the Vice President of Academic Affairs with a formal proposal for institutionalization and received a small budget and a graduate assistant. The Department of English donated office space. The SLP continues operations today with joint funding from Academic Affairs and Drinko Academy.

While the university features strong internship and community-based learning programs in departments and disciplines that seem naturally suited to a practicum pedagogy (nursing, medicine, education, business), the Service Learning Program seeks to fill community-based learning gaps elsewhere in the curriculum. For example, while internships are usually geared toward advanced students, service learning accommodates student learning at any level. Moreover, this pedagogy expands the number of disciplines for which the community can be a site of deep learning. Now students of philosophy, literature, and history not only have an opportunity to enhance their learning of theory through application in a community setting but also are encouraged to experience civic engagement as a form of learning in its own right. While service learning is a pedagogy applicable to disciplines in all colleges and units at Marshall, the SLP has, in particular, enabled disciplines in the College of Liberal Arts to make significant progress in broadening the range of learning environments it offers to students.
The Service Learning Program supports faculty in a number of ways. The Program offers three types of faculty workshops throughout the academic year: an **Introduction to SLP** (once yearly in the fall), an **Advanced SLP Course Construction Workshop** (twice yearly in fall and spring), and a **Service Learning across the Disciplines Roundtable Discussion** (once yearly in the spring). Since spring 2004, approximately 40 faculty members have participated in introductory workshops, while 13 faculty members have been trained in the 3-hour Advanced Course Construction workshop.

The Program also provides faculty with an extensive website with links to sample syllabi, course development materials, a catalogue of interested community organizations and their needs, etc. Finally, the Program offers extensive course development and course management services to ease some of the logistical problems that faculty encounter when teaching SLP courses for the first time. In the first one-and-a-half years that the Program was institutionalized, ten courses were reviewed by the Service Learning Curriculum Committee, and seven courses (across six departments and two colleges) were permanently granted the SLP designation, with six SLP-certified faculty participating. The SLP listserv subscribed 73 faculty members, as of the fall of 2004, and upwards of 20 faculty members were actively developing SLP courses for curriculum approval as of the spring of 2005.

As evidence that Marshall supports teaching suited to varied learning environments, the university has become a member of the [Council on Undergraduate Research](#) (CUR) and is encouraging faculty to teach undergraduate students through active involvement in research. Many students learn better when they are personally engaged in the process of discovery and the creation of knowledge through their own research and creative efforts. The New Faculty Orientation includes a session that describes ways faculty can work with students on research projects. In addition, university students with faculty mentors have been very active in a statewide [Undergraduate Research Day at the Legislature](#), where students display and discuss their research activities for the [West Virginia Governor and legislators](#). Some departments have created research courses that allow faculty and students to receive academic credit for small enrollment classes that engage students in scholarly work in their disciplines. There are plans under way on campus to increase the emphasis on teaching through student research by utilizing the services and training offered by CUR.
With an increasing interest in the delivery of distance courses, faculty are encouraged to develop full or partial online courses, as well as develop technology assisted components in traditional classrooms through a series of grants and student assistance. The Faculty Development Committee for Online and Multimedia Instruction was organized in 1998. Since then, about $326,500 has been dedicated to e-course development and multimedia projects for the classroom. Full-time and part-time student assistants are assigned to work closely with faculty who are developing electronic courses or multimedia projects. We currently have 104 approved courses, and during the spring 2006 semester we are offering 117 sections, with a total enrollment of 3,757.

Additionally, the university’s Faculty Development Committee provides travel money to instructors who attend professional meetings where they will learn new teaching methodologies. Funding opportunities provided by this committee will be described in more detail shortly.

3. **The organization evaluates teaching and recognizes effective teaching.**

The Marshall University Faculty Senate requires that all courses be evaluated by students every semester. In 2005 the Faculty Senate adopted a new faculty evaluation process and new items for student rating. It is recommended (although not required) that every college and program institute peer evaluation of teaching. Peer evaluation of teaching is currently required by some colleges for tenure and promotion (T&P) decisions. Each college specifies in its tenure and promotion requirements how evaluation of teaching will be conducted and used in summative and formative ways.

Historically, Marshall was primarily a “Teaching” institution with four courses per semester as the typical teaching responsibility. As a result, for most faculty, the evaluation of teaching heavily influenced the overall annual evaluation of the faculty member. This emphasis was sometimes expressed in college T&P documents as 50% or more of the evaluation. According to the [Faculty Handbook](#), a faculty member must be considered “Exemplary” or “Professional” (the two highest rating levels) in teaching in order to be promoted or to be granted tenure. In the fall of 2005 the university moved toward more flexible evaluation and workload practices.
As a result, there may be some faculty with higher than 50% of their evaluation based on teaching, while other faculty may negotiate less than 50% of their evaluation for teaching. Nonetheless, teaching will remain one of the major components of the evaluation system, and most faculty still teach four courses (12 hours) per semester. At this writing, the Faculty Senate is reviewing the first year’s results and soliciting input for possible improvements in the process.

University policy also requires that all adjunct faculty be evaluated by the head of the program in which they teach in addition to the student course ratings.

The university offers three competitive faculty awards annually that reinforce the value of teaching through recognition and financial awards. The Reynolds Outstanding Teacher award ($3,000) is based entirely on teaching excellence by a tenured faculty member; the Hedrick Outstanding Faculty award ($5,000) is based on excellence in both teaching and scholarship; and three Pickens-Queen awards are given to faculty with fewer than 6 years of employment who demonstrate excellence in teaching. Award-winning faculty are recognized at Commencement as well as at faculty awards ceremonies. In addition, the College of Liberal Arts, the School of Medicine, and the College of Business have outstanding teaching awards for faculty in the college. The Drinko Academy each year awards a Drinko Faculty Fellowship to one faculty member who receives reassigned time and resources to support a project in his/her discipline.

4. The organization supports faculty in keeping abreast of the research on teaching and learning, and of technological advances that can positively affect student learning and the delivery of instruction.

Travel to conferences and access to published scholarship are the two principal ways that faculty keep abreast of the scholarship of teaching and learning. The university provides some travel money, albeit limited in amount, to conferences of regional, national, and international scope. Disciplinary conferences have sections on the scholarship of teaching and learning and on innovative teaching strategies. There are two university wide sources of travel funding through the University Foundation and from Academic Affairs – Faculty Research money and Faculty Development money – as well as some department and college support for travel.
Faculty Development Committee (a standing committee of the Faculty Senate) provides travel money on a competitive basis for faculty who wish to travel in order to improve or change their teaching; the committee also funds campus programs to enhance teaching effectiveness. In the year 2004-2005 the committee had an allocation of $28,000, and also had a carry-over balance from previous years. In 2003-2004 the committee allocated $42,278 in travel and programs for faculty teaching improvement and in 2004-2005 44 faculty members were awarded $34,818. There is an additional $10,000 available for special activities associated with the improvement of teaching that is available for committee disbursement.

A survey of 112 faculty indicates that faculty meet about 29% of the costs of their professional travel and development with their own money. The rest is provided by the department, the college/school, or the university.

The Center for Teaching Excellence, Writing Across the Curriculum, and the Service Learning Program each maintain a small library of scholarly teaching materials, and the university library system’s journals and databases provide access to scholarship in teaching and learning. Almost all the national workshop presenters who are brought to the campus through the CTE, through WAC, and through SLP base their presentations on the latest scholarship and theory in teaching and learning.

Faculty members also keep abreast of the latest research and technological developments through grant writing and grant administration. The university provides matching funds for all externally funded grants, and grants may focus on teaching and learning. The College of Education and Human Services has several ongoing grants that focus on innovative and research-based teaching methods – the Statistical Analysis System in School Educational Curriculum program, the IBM Reinventing Education project, and the National Board Certification program of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

For a number of years Marshall University has been committed to distance learning and to the application of technology in traditional classrooms. The university uses WebCT Vista as the delivery system. It is the mission of the Center for Instructional Technology (CIT) to provide training and support for Marshall University’s faculty and staff in the areas of instructional
technology by providing the hardware, software and networking necessary to create video, audio, and integrated instructional media applications and to support the university’s instructional technology commitments to higher education, K-12 and the world. Since 1999, CIT has offered over 300 hands-on workshops to address the professional development activities needed to promote and support the use of instructional technologies in and out of the classroom. These workshops consist of face-to-face lectures by instructional technology experts; video conferences dealing with copyright and other online education issues; and hands-on workshops to educate faculty on use of software applications and university-supported course management systems.

The South Charleston campus of Marshall University has encouraged the application of technology because its mission is to provide graduate education in distant sites around the state of West Virginia. For example, a faculty users group was established in order to advance knowledge of online teaching. Attendance at monthly meetings has averaged 21 for the past four years. The users group features presentations by faculty of best practices and presentations by CIT staff; it also serves as a review for online courses prior to delivery. The South Charleston faculty was able to get wireless capability installed in all classrooms in South Charleston. A website has been created which provides students with current online course information and guidelines for online success. Laptop computers are loaned by the semester to doctoral students for data collection and analysis, and PDA’s are available for classroom instructional purposes.

The Marshall University Graduate College has a state-wide mandate to provide master’s level graduate education for working professionals, and in the past most of these courses were taught in weekend formats with faculty traveling to sites across the state. Currently, many of these courses are partially or fully delivered electronically. Both the Huntington and the South Charleston campuses have classrooms equipped for interactive video courses where students participate in the same course at distant sites. In addition to the six rooms on campus, there are at least six sites in other West Virginia communities where students can take these interactive classes. The School of Nursing, the Lewis College of Business, the Graduate School of Education and Professional Development, and the College of Information Technology and Engineering are the most frequent users of this instruction delivery system.
Training on using the rooms and the equipment is provided for any instructor who will be teaching distance classes. Being able to include single students at distant PCs will tremendously expand the ability to reach students wherever they reside.

5. **Qualified faculty determine curricular content and strategies for instruction.**

Faculty qualifications are determined at the time of hiring, and each Faculty Annual Report identifies whether faculty members are teaching in their field of specialization. In 2004-05, there were 456 non-medical full-time faculty, of whom only 49 were not tenure track. 352 of these faculty had a doctoral degree or the highest professional degree. Based on a survey of 112 respondents, faculty members participate in an average of 3-4 professional organizations relevant to the disciplines they teach. All tenured_tenure track faculty must submit an annual report of their accomplishments in all areas of faculty responsibility. These reports are evaluated by the Chair and academic Dean, and they ultimately go to the Office of Academic Affairs. In addition to an annual review of faculty qualifications and current activity, since 2004 these annual reviews are factored into the allocation of merit salary increases.

There are 265 part-time, adjunct faculty teaching in the baccalaureate programs; 10% of these part-time faculty have doctorates and another 85% have master’s degrees. A few departments use graduate Teaching Assistants (TA’s) to handle complete course responsibility (e.g. Psychology, Communication Studies, English). Because Marshall University does not have many doctoral degrees, most TA’s are students in their first or second year of graduate study for the M.A. In the fall of 2003, there were 63 TAs with complete course responsibility, and some had two sections of the class they were assigned to teach.

The Marshall University Graduate Council confers graduate faculty status. This allows faculty to teach graduate level courses and to supervise graduate student research and clinical experiences. The application for graduate faculty status proceeds from the program Chairperson, to the Academic Dean, who recommends appropriate status to the Graduate Council. The Graduate Council actually confers the status. Credentials for varying levels of graduate faculty are based on degree(s) earned and research productivity. Teaching ability is

Chapter 6 – **Criterion Three (3b)**
considered in making Graduate faculty appointments. Graduate faculty members are listed both in the graduate catalog and in the so-called Redbook.

The Faculty Senate Constitution provides the structure and process for undergraduate curricular decisions. Course and program changes, deletions, and additions usually are initiated at the department or program level, and progress through college curriculum committees to the Faculty Senate’s Curriculum Committee. Final approval rests with the full Faculty Senate. Graduate courses follow the same process but end with the Graduate Council’s approval rather than the Faculty Senate’s.

Major curriculum changes, like general education requirements, or college “distribution” requirements, are created by ad hoc committees of faculty, or by the college curriculum committees, with final approval by the Faculty Senate. While the curriculum approval sheet requires administrator signatures, the approval by the Senate or Graduate Council is considered of paramount importance. Only fulltime, tenure-track or tenured faculty may serve on the Faculty Senate and its committees.

The strategies appropriate for each course/content are determined by the instructor. The oversight of instructional strategies occurs with course and teaching evaluations. While curriculum changes are rigorously reviewed and approved, and course evaluations are mandated by university policy, historically Marshall University has allowed almost complete faculty autonomy in all classroom/course teaching decisions. Therefore, some faculty do not see the importance of peer evaluation or standardized assessments of teaching effectiveness. Some faculty perceive this as an infringement of their academic freedom, or as a criticism of their expertise. Overcoming such resistance is one difficulty in motivating faculty to participate in both assessment and faculty development activities.

6. Faculty development in the Joan C. Edwards School of Medicine.

The Joan C. Edwards School of Medicine (JCESOM) takes its institutional responsibility seriously to provide a learning environment that is both conducive to high quality medical student education and promotive of student well being. The faculty in the Basic Sciences
provide the courses for the first two years of the medical degree. As in other schools, teaching by postgraduate trainees (residents and fellows) is the traditional and most immediate means by which clinical teaching in the final two years and beyond is carried out. Fulltime and clinical faculty typically function in supervisory, expert, didactic, consultative, attending and administrative roles. In support of these varied teaching methods, JCESOM plans, develops, implements, and monitors programs/activities which are concurrent and complementary.

In the spring of 2005, the Dean of the School of Medicine announced the appointment of a new position – Assistant Dean for Professional Development in Medical Education – in recognition of the importance of providing faculty development and support for teaching faculty in the medical school. The new Assistant Dean has been energetically focused on organizing professional development activities to improve the teaching of School of Medicine faculty.

**Discipline-Specific Initiatives**

The following ongoing activities are summarized on a program-by-program basis:

1. The [Department of Pediatrics](#) has developed a mini-course of three one-hour workshops to train faculty and residents to be excellent teachers based on a model designed by the [American Academy of Pediatrics](#). The department implements these programs at the beginning of each academic year in order to prepare residents for this role. Topics include Leadership and Organization, Teaching, and Feedback; sessions are conducted by faculty in small groups involving a brief preamble followed by role-playing of illustrative teaching scenarios and group discussion. Pre and post-tests are given to evaluate the program’s effectiveness and the workshops are well received.

2. [Family Medicine](#) has inaugurated an 8-hour “Teaching Residents How to Teach” program by including workshops in each of three years of training: 2 ½ hours in Post-Graduate Year 1 (PGY-1); 3.5 hours in PGY-2; and 2 hours in PGY-3. Topics covered include: Teaching as a Tool for Learning; Adult-Learning Skills Applied to Clinical Teaching; Feedback Skills – Managing Hospital Rounds; and Multimedia.
Technologies for Teaching. Resources cited elsewhere serve as additional materials to improve residents’ ability to teach.

- **Ob/Gyn** provides Council on Resident Education in Obstetrics and Gynecology courses on teaching and leadership; conducts seminars on improving communication and teaching skills; and uses a clinical outpatient teaching module developed by Southern Illinois University School of Medicine, among other initiatives.

- **Internal Medicine** is utilizing the Instructor’s Guide for Teaching Residents to Teach and has supplemented this with both student evaluation of their residents as teachers and by improving bedside observation and teaching of students by residents.

- **Surgery** utilizes the Association for Surgical Education’s Instructor’s Guide to improve the quality of resident teaching. Skill topics are included in the new surgical basic science/clinical series and four lectures per year are planned based on the ASE modules. Additionally, residents are evaluated by medical students for the quality of their teaching at the conclusion of each clerkship rotation. The program also currently utilizes two other resources: **Surgical Teaching: Practice Makes Perfect** by Whitman and Lawrence and **Residents as Teachers: A Guide to Educational Practice** by Schwenk and Whitman.

**Centralized faculty development:**  **Academy of Medical Educators/Teaching Scholars**

The academy has been developed, as a matter of priority, by the JCESOM to foster faculty development in the area of teaching strategies, knowledge, skills and evaluation of educational outcomes. These activities are ongoing and are further identified as they are relevant to other parts of this narrative.

The educational conferences, seminars and presentations are components of the newly inaugurated Academy of Medical Educators program. The academy’s purpose is to foster the development of a select number of faculty and residents nominated (by self or peers) for their special interest and promise in achieving notable careers as teachers and academicians. The program provides an intensive one-year, hands-on experience in pedagogical theory,
application and evaluation such that academy “graduates” will in turn apply what they have learned to raise the level of quality education throughout the institution. Each year a new group of candidates enters the program. The topics offered through the academy range from 1.5 – 3 hours in duration and draw upon intramural as well as extramural expertise, e.g., Harvard, Pennsylvania State University, University of Arkansas Medical School, the AAMC, etc.

**Core Component 3c**

*The organization creates effective learning environments.*

Marshall University’s Mission Statement commits the university to providing “services and resources to promote student learning, retention and academic success.” Like other institutions of higher education, we recognize that students come from different backgrounds, have different goals and objectives, learn differently, and require different resources to facilitate their learning. The University Creed embraces the differences within the Marshall population in the commitment to the creation of a civil community, “treating all individuals and groups with consideration, decency, respect, and expressing disagreements in rational ways;” a pluralistic community, “celebrating and learning from our diversity;” and a judicious community, “remaining alert to the threats posed by hatred, intolerance and other injustices . . .”

To meet our Mission Statement and live up to our creed, we provide a wide variety of resources that enhance the academic and personal growth of our students. On the academic side, we offer programs that meet the needs of those with learning disabilities, physical disabilities, inadequate academic preparation, and superior achievement and ability. On the personal side, we offer programming and activities that allow students to understand themselves and others more fully, discover other cultures, make healthy lifestyle choices, and enjoy being part of the university and larger communities.

1. **Assessment results inform improvements in curriculum, pedagogy, instructional resources and student services.**
The University Assessment Committee (UAC) oversees the academic assessment activities and provides feedback that promotes program improvement and accountability. The UAC reviews annual assessment reports, provides an analysis of each program’s assessment plan, and prepares the annual assessment report of the university. In addition, each program undergoes a 5-year program review that includes scrutiny at the college, university and Board of Governors levels. Data are also gathered from graduating senior surveys, course evaluations, and alumni surveys.

A. Student Services and Learning Resources

Data on student satisfaction and perceptions of importance of student services and learning resources were obtained from an annual Graduating Seniors Survey. In the 2003 survey, students expressed satisfaction with the following services that were also perceived to be of importance: Academic Support Center/Tutoring/Writing Centers; Campus Computing Services; Counseling Services; Disabled Student Services; Financial Aid Services; Library Services; New Student Orientation; the Honors Program; and Web Presence.

The same survey revealed other areas of importance for which students expressed some degree of dissatisfaction. They are: Academic Advising; Career Planning and Placement Services; Classroom Facilities; Residence Hall Services; Student Center Recreation; Student Health Services; Student Parking; Tuition and Fee Payment Process; and University Bookstore.

The UAC conveyed these findings to the appropriate departments or units. Past surveys have led to changes that are reflected in higher levels of satisfaction with certain services. For example, the Academic Support Center/Tutoring/Writing Centers expanded their hours in order to provide service later in the evening and on weekends. The Library has also altered the hours of operation to meet student needs. The Office of Enrollment Management implemented Web registration to combat long lines during peak registration periods. We have also seen changes in almost every area in which students expressed a consistent level of dissatisfaction. For example, University College has begun a series of workshops for faculty and staff advisors, and
the undergraduate colleges have begun to use connective advising techniques, especially for students on academic probation. Another example is the current initiative under way to update classroom furniture for comfort and efficiency. Recent building projects have produced 1,000 new parking spaces and four new residence halls to try to address these perennial areas of student concern. A student recreation center has been approved and funding is being sought. A tuition and fee payment process allows students to pay in installments and to pay by credit card. The one area of dissatisfaction in the above list that has not been resolved is the location of Student Health Services at an off-campus site. A committee of health care professionals, students and staff met for months to try to find a workable solution but were not successful. (By default, Student Health Services remains at our School of Medicine site.)

B. Curriculum and Pedagogy

The assessment of pedagogy and curriculum at Marshall has been enhanced by the creation of the Center for Teaching Excellence (CTE) in 1999 which houses the Office of Program Review and Assessment. The Director of the CTE and the Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment work together in a collaborative way to provide faculty development opportunities related to pedagogy and curriculum development and assessment.

Feedback on the curriculum is incorporated into the department assessment plan process and the program review process. Each department’s assessment plan must include details of the program and course assessments. When the department submits its annual assessment report to the Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment, it must include specific information on how the data from assessment are used to make improvements in the curriculum. The University Assessment Committee and the Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment analyze this information and the Coordinator sends a response back to the department with recommendations.

In a recent example of this process, a department was told that its feedback loop from data collection, analysis, and interpretation was incomplete. The Coordinator
commented that “specific changes in the courses, program, requirements, etc. should be well documented.” This program applied for a grant from the CTE and has involved all program faculty in an intensive effort to develop and implement a learning outcomes assessment program that originates with individual lesson outcomes, continues through course outcomes, and culminates with exit outcomes. This process involves an intensive faculty review of assessment outcomes so that courses and the program will be scrutinized in terms of the level of student achievement of desired results. This resulted in a new remedial process to target specific areas of concern on an individual student basis, helping each student to attain the necessary knowledge and skills to succeed in the field.

The implementation of the annual assessment reports has had a positive impact in other ways, as well. Colleges and departments have organized assessment committees and are now devoting time and attention to the details of their student learning outcomes. The Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment works directly with these committees, when requested, and includes departmental and college assessment liaisons on the University Assessment Committee and in learning opportunities such as a recent Assessment Conference at the University of Charleston. In order to help department Chairs with the feedback process, the Coordinator of Program Review and Assessment conducts periodic workshops on this topic. A recent workshop, in spring 2005, was attended by four Deans, sixteen department Chairs, six department faculty and one department staff person.

The level of interest in the feedback loop on curriculum has been further enhanced by the inclusion of this information in the program review process. The program review, conducted every five years, contains five years’ worth of assessment reports and an assessment section. When the new program review process began three years ago, the Deans and Chairs assumed a new role. They now appear before a committee of the Board of Governors to answer questions and give additional information about their programs. One area that frequently arises is the extent to which the departments are reviewing and updating their curriculum. In recent sessions, departments have been
asked to give follow-up reports on this process. This has added a degree of immediacy and significance to the assessment culture at Marshall University.

2. The organization provides an environment that supports all learners and respects the diversity they bring.

Although the Marshall student body of 13,000+ students (four year and graduate/professional) is predominantly white (80%) and Appalachian (81%), there are other groups represented including African Americans (4.1%), Hispanics (0.7%), Asians (0.9%), American Indians (0.3%), and foreign/international students (1.4%). This ethnic and racial composition reflects the homogeneous nature of the population of West Virginia. In addition, Marshall’s students are more likely to be female (57%) and older than the traditional-age student (average age is 26). The faculty members, both fulltime and adjuncts, are also predominantly white (90%), with diversity provided by African Americans (3%), Hispanics (1%), and Asians (5%); they are more likely to be male than female (56% to 44%).

Because of the presence of a nationally-recognized program for students with learning disabilities — the Higher Education for Learning Problems (H.E.L.P.) Program — and an active Disabled Student Services Office, Marshall has a large number of students with diagnosed learning and physical disabilities. The H.E.L.P. Program has an enrollment of 315 students, and the Disabled Students Office served over 700 students in 2003-04.

The Honors Program at Marshall encompasses all four-year undergraduate students with scholarships earned with ACT scores of 25 and higher who also had high school GPAs of 3.3 and higher (about 900 students in 2003-04). These students may be loosely affiliated with the Center for Academic Excellence or they may be enrolled in the University Honors coursework. The Center for International Programs in 2004-05 served a total of 337 students from 64 countries. Finally, the Center for African American Students’ Programs (CAASP), discussed in detail in the Criterion 5 section, provides mentoring, programming and events planning services for 275 students.

The university, fully aware of the diversity each group brings, recognizes, encourages, and supports them by providing programs and programming which facilitates their success and
their connection to campus. In addition to the programs mentioned above, the university also houses the Buck Harless Student Athlete Program (BHSAP), the Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Student Office (LBGTO), the Women’s Center, and the Carter G. Woodson Faculty Initiative.

All of these programs provide an environment which promotes the achievement of individual and group objectives while contributing to the diversity of the Marshall community. One way this is achieved is through the sponsorship of special events throughout the year that add academic breadth as well as cultural and social variety. The Center for Academic Excellence sponsors career programs such as “What’s It Like?” that are open to all students, an annual Honors Convocation that includes a national speaker (Richard Leakey, Susan Sontag, David Halberstam, Jane Alexander, Noah Wylie) on a topic of interest to the whole Marshall community, and an annual Yeager Symposium that is built around a week-long series of speakers on a theme developed by the Yeager Scholars. CAASP hosts a Soul Food Feast as well as an annual Diversity Breakfast with an invited speaker on a diversity topic, to which all students are invited. The Center for International Programs hosts the annual International Festival to highlight the culture and food of different countries represented on campus.

The Carter G. Woodson Initiative is a joint project of the Office of Multicultural Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs. It funds the doctoral study of a minority graduate student who then returns to campus in a faculty position. The Lesbian Gay Bisexual Transgender Office provides a safe space for students. It supplies educational programs to all faculty, staff, and students, houses a library of information, and provides referral services to accepting churches, organizations, and people in the community. The Women’s Center is a centralized resource for meeting the needs of women faculty, staff, and students. The center provides an opportunity and location where women’s concerns can be voiced, dealt with directly, and referred to other resources. The center also sponsors programming all year with special emphasis on Women’s History Month.

In addition to embracing the diversity of race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation and disability, the university recognizes that not all students are the typical 17-19 years of age when they begin their college career. For non-traditional students the university provides
special services including **New Student Orientation** (typically an evening or a weekend); counseling and advising sessions to give the students direction on how to begin the process for admission and degree completion; a list of referrals for such services as daycare; evening advising hours in the University College **Advising Center**; and evening and weekend tutoring. Advising and tutoring are available both on campus and online.

Academically, the curriculum has been revised to provide more opportunities for students to acquire a multicultural and global perspective. Many colleges already require students to take foreign language as part of the general education core. The Marshall Plan, adopted in fall 1995, requires all students to complete six hours of courses designated as international and three hours of multicultural studies. (See “Marshall Plan” in Core Component 3a.) In addition, the curriculum for UNI 101: **New Student Seminar**, has a unit on understanding and valuing diversity. Academic Departments and the Center for International Programs encourage study abroad and Marshall has joined the International Student Exchange Program to provide more and lower-cost opportunities.

Finally, because different students learn in different ways, the Center for Teaching Excellence emphasizes pedagogies other than lecture to appeal to students, such as group activities, computer instruction, writing as a teaching tool, conducting research as a way of engaging students, among numerous other strategies.

### 3. Advising systems focus on student learning, including mastery of skills required for academic success.

At its core, advising is a dialogue between the advisor and the advisee. The advisee identifies his or her goals and objectives—academic, career, personal—and the advisor guides the advisee in identifying the skills required to achieve these goals and provides direction to the programs, practices and services that will ensure these skills are gained. The fundamental advising relationship at the collegiate level is between the faculty and the students. The faculty advisor is the person with the best insight into the academic plan and the career possibilities in a student’s chosen field. However, well-trained professional staff also offer
quality advising services, including those in financial aid counseling, study skills, career services counseling, and academic planning.

At Marshall, academic advising is assigned at the college level. Some colleges (Health Professions, Liberal Arts, Science, and Journalism) have mandatory advising required prior to registration for all or some categories of students. In some colleges, (Liberal Arts, Science, Fine Arts, Health Professions) students are assigned to faculty advisors for the duration of their undergraduate tenure so long as they remain in the same major. In other colleges (Business, Education, Information Technology and Engineering), professional staff may do all or part of the advising for some portion of the student’s tenure. Many colleges have mandatory freshman and sophomore advising; these include the Colleges of Business, Information Technology and Engineering, Science, and Health Professions. The College of Education & Human Services and the College of Liberal Arts have mandatory advising for all undecided students.

Recognizing the needs of students without declared majors, the university established an Advising Center in University College for undecided students in the College of Liberal Arts (the largest number in this category) and for University College students. The center is staffed by four full-time professional advisors who counsel students on major selection and course registration. The Director of University College maintains an advisor listserv for all faculty and staff advisors and sends information and announcements on a regular basis. In addition, the Associate Dean of Enrollment Management conducts advisor training for faculty advisors, usually about one per month. Topics have included “financial aid,” “student development,” “D/F repeats,” “tutoring services,” “students with learning disabilities,” and “career services.” Attendance is 20-25 per workshop.

In all colleges, students on academic probation must also consult with the Assistant or Associate Dean of the college several times during the semester and prior to any registration. In fall 2003, the faculty adopted a new probation and suspension policy on the recommendation of the Associate Deans Council and the Deans. The new policy is more stringent in that it requires students on probation to make a 2.0 GPA every semester while they are on probation and sets the suspension “trigger” at different levels for each class rank.
This new policy was designed to prevent students from lingering on probation for years, while making no progress towards graduation.

To make the policy have a positive outcome, the Associate Deans Council approved a common Academic Improvement Plan form for students who are on academic probation. The Associate Dean and the probationary student agree to a set of academic standards that will be accomplished in the upcoming semester which may include participating in advising sessions, attending academic workshops, requesting and using tutoring services and/or academic accommodations, in order to improve their academic standing. In addition, the University College staff utilizes intrusive advising practices for its students. Advisors contact students on a regular basis to discuss topics such as study skills, financial aid, career services and university deadlines. Should the need arise from conversations with students, the advisor also refers students to other university programs and offices, such as counseling, financial aid or student health.

The success of academic advising services may be measured directly through retention and graduation rates, jobs obtained, and entry to graduate schools. The freshman retention rate indicates that the undergraduate advising relationships are strongest at the freshman level. This is not surprising, given that some UNI 101 instructors are also the advisors to the students in their section. This is true in Science and Journalism, which are also piloting learning communities that pair one or more courses in the major with UNI 101 and a faculty advisor. We will continue to address retention and advising practices so that we can raise our sophomore, junior, and senior retention rates to the same level as freshman retention. This effort will require additional data gathering, including the efficacy of the academic improvement plans.

4. Student development programs support learning throughout the student’s experience regardless of location of the student.

The university’s student development programs provide a vast array of services including counseling services, services for students with disabilities, women’s programs and student health education programs. Twenty-four hours a day, the counseling staff of three full time
and five emergency counselors provides services to all students, whether full or part time. In addition to one-on-one counseling, the counselors facilitate programs in the residence halls, classrooms and fraternity and sorority houses which may include stress management, healthy relationship, homesickness, preparing to go home and self esteem.

The Coordinators for Women’s Programs and Student Health Education provide counseling and programs in sexual assault and harassment, women’s rights and leadership, health and wellness, alcohol and drug abuse awareness, etc.

Recognizing the fact that all students do not live on campus or in the immediate Huntington area and cannot come to the main campus for services, the counselors have developed a Resource Referral Book of agencies in WV that may provide counseling and programs. The Referral Book provides information about services in the area in which the student resides and this information is provided to students on request.

However, students with disabilities, whether on the main or at an off campus site, such as Mid Ohio Valley Center, the Teays Valley Regional Center, Southern Mountain Center, or on the South Charleston Campus, whether full or part time, do receive services, such as notetakers, test proctors to read or write exam questions or responses, or extended test time. The Disabled Student Services Coordinator works in conjunction with the student and faculty member to make sure requested reasonable accommodations are provided.

All of the student development staff members provide programs and information for the UNI 101 classes, for students living in the residence halls, and for other classes on request. Topics for these programs include:

- Information about each program in student development
- BASICS (underage and high risk drinking prevention)
- Sexual Health
- Stress Management
- Healthy Relationships
- Sexual Assault Issues
- Diversity Issues
In the 2003-2004 academic year, student health education staff made a total of 96 presentations in UNI 101 classes, serving 1440 students; the Women’s Center staff made 46 presentations, serving 1933 students in residence halls, UNI 101 classes and on request; LGBTQ Office staff made two presentations, serving 28 students; the Disabled Student Services Coordinator made two UNI 101 presentations on program services and 16 presentations on time management and study skills in the residence halls and in classes, plus conducting workshops for new faculty as part of New Faculty Orientation and new Teaching Assistants as part of the TA Training Workshops; and Counselors made a total of 125 presentations/programs to students in classrooms and residence halls. In addition, each member of the Student Development staff teaches one section of UNI 101.

5. The organization employs, when appropriate, new technologies that enhance learning environments for students.

Marshall University has made great strides in introducing technology into all of its learning environments. Evidence of Marshall’s commitment was shown with the hiring of a Vice President for Information Technology in 2000. Over the past six years, the number of electronic courses (e-courses) has more than doubled. We offered 32 E-courses in the fall of 1998; in spring 2005 we offered 78. Our online courses give students the ability to access coursework from anywhere in the world at a time that is convenient for them. We have begun to create appropriate online degree programs. Currently Marshall offers one undergraduate degree online—the Regents Bachelor’s Degree—and two graduate programs—Elementary and Secondary Education. The latter is especially important to student access because the profile of Marshall’s average graduate student – a 38 year old female working in the school system – means this degree will address a need for continued educational development.

Marshall uses the newest version of WebCT software, Vista, for online course delivery. Vista is used not just by online instructors but also by hundreds of faculty teaching traditional classes. They supplement their classroom courses with Vista’s variety of interactive tools such as electronic bulletin boards, chat rooms, and email. In addition, Vista provides the means to meet student needs in creative ways. The College of Science, for example, has begun an online Safety Certification course which all students must complete prior to going
into the lab. Through MyMU, the campus information pipeline, faculty and staff can post targeted announcements to students on various upcoming events and financial aid deadlines. University College reminds conditionally admitted students of upcoming academic deadlines by posting a targeted announcement to this group of students only. For graduate students, a free WebCT class instructs them how to submit their thesis electronically.

Access to computers is important on a campus where not every student can afford a personal computer. To meet this challenge, Marshall has developed computer labs in the Study Center in the Drinko Library (open 24 hours a day, most days), the academic buildings of Gullickson, Harris, Smith and Corbly, in the Center for Academic Excellence, and in each residence hall. These computers are updated every four years. The Study Center in the Drinko Library also houses a room with equipment for visually and hearing impaired students. Moreover, Drinko Library affords student-access to Blackboards, which provide online discussions for students in a particular class, and the Ask a Librarian page on its website. The page gives users the ability to link directly to the MU Libraries ‘Help’ page where many common questions are answered and students with MSN Messenger and AOL Instant Messenger can send a message to a staff member at the reference desk. For more information on the numerous services provided to all students by John Deaver Drinko Library, visit the Libraries Home Page.

In spring 2004 the Writing Center, supervised by the English Department, introduced online writing assistance, in which the students submit papers or questions via email to a Writing Center tutor who answers questions and provides guidance by email. The academic support services in University College will soon be available online. By fall 2005 tutoring services and live academic advising came online during certain hours.

6. The organization’s systems of quality assurance include regular review of whether it’s educational strategies, activities, processes, and technologies enhance student learning.

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) has the primary responsibility for reviewing academic programs on an annual basis and for collecting and disseminating information gleaned from graduating senior and graduate surveys. As mentioned previously, the UAC
takes this charge seriously, annually reading and evaluating hundreds of course syllabi, reading and responding to approximately 95 program assessment reports each year, and looking at the results of short-term and long-term student surveys. In addition, all of the components of general education, including the Marshall Plan, submit annual reports to the committee, and committee members and the Coordinator collectively evaluate the reports. The Coordinator responds to each of them. Included in all of these reports is an assessment of student learning. The Coordinator also works with appropriate department Chairs/division heads to give the Academic Profile exam that seeks to measure the impact of general education.

In addition to these internal measures, each year 20% of Marshall’s academic programs submit a Five Year Review to the Board of Governors and the Higher Education Policy Commission. These programs go through an internal review by either the Faculty Senate or the Graduate Council, by the Provost, and by the President. Then they are scrutinized by the Academic Committee of the Board of Governors and reported to the Higher Education Policy Commission. Marshall’s program review process was praised for its thoroughness by the HEPC staff in a recent audit.

Marshall’s technology-enhanced instruction is reviewed by the Faculty Development Committee for Online and Multimedia Instruction (FDCOMI). The FDCOMI oversees the development of e-courses and t-courses using a three tier quality assurance approach: 1) program area/department Chair, 2) faculty users group, and 3) FDCOMI. In this process, a course that will be offered online (e-courses) or substantially online (t-courses that must be 80% asynchronous) must go through a rigorous review process. First, unless it is an existing course, the course would have to be approved at the department and college curriculum committee level, then go through the regular curricular review process in the Faculty Senate or the Graduate Council. Once a course is approved in this manner, it goes through a review by the FDCOMI which looks at the technology, and the ease of navigation of the course. Courses must be re-approved by the FDCOMI every three years to make sure the technology is current and easy to navigate. The FDCOMI also tracks student satisfaction with online courses through a separate course evaluation that specifically focuses on instruction and
technology. A five year study of student satisfaction of online delivery received a 92% approval rate.

Core Component 3d

*The organization’s learning resources support student learning and effective teaching.*

The diversity of programs offered by the institution necessitates a variety of spaces where teaching and learning occur. The creativity of the faculty in designing effective and varied learning spaces is limited only by the availability of resources. The university is understaffed in all areas of employment – faculty, administration, and staff – and this can affect the development and maintenance of buildings, equipment, and technological resources. The university is well integrated into the community, region, and state, so providing students with external placements for educational experiences is an integral (and cost effective) part of many students’ educational experiences. Further, because of the rural nature of West Virginia and the nontraditional/nonresidential nature of many Marshall students, Marshall University has invested extensively in distance education.

1. **The organization ensures access to resources (such as research laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, and clinical practice sites).**

The Marshall University [Huntington campus](#) consists of 44 buildings, of which 11 are primarily academic buildings, with classes taught in 4 additional buildings. Students have a range of learning and teaching resources available for classes, research, and applied learning activities. Besides the rooms classified as classrooms, there are laboratories; clinics; practice and performance spaces; library/information technology spaces for creating, practicing, and demonstrating electronic and technological skills; art studios; and computer laboratories; to name just a few. The tables below describe a sample of the many academic units which rely heavily on teaching and learning resources other than traditional classrooms. The tables also provide information on support, staff, assessment of use, and student utilization.
Table 3d-1  Physical Resources for Learning: Their Evaluation, Utilization, and Staffing

<p>| Department          | Learning Resources                                                                 | Assessment and Evaluation                                                                 | Utilization                                                                 | Staff and Support                                                                 |
|---------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                                             |----------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Across Campus       | 40 &quot;wired&quot; classrooms – Internet access, computers and projectors installed        | Often these rooms are assigned to a department which oversees its use.                    | Used by faculty with electronic components to courses and locked at other times. | The equipment may belong to a department, or it may belong to Computing Services. Computing Services provides support and assistance. |
| College of Science  | 31 multi-use labs in 2 buildings; 4 labs are designated exclusively as research labs | Faculty evaluate safety needs, teaching needs, and research requirements for equipment and space. | Typical teaching lab handles about 24 students; smaller labs may accommodate 4-5 people | Regular faculty monitor equipment, safety, and other facilities. Custodial staff do routine cleaning. |
| Art and Design      | 8 studio-classrooms; Birke Art Gallery; an “art warehouse” for sculpture and pottery | Faculty evaluate for equipment needs and utilization, and for safety and hazardous materials and ventilation. The department is beginning to ask students for their evaluation of resources | Enrollments are limited to 15-18 per studio | Regular faculty and custodial staff. Students also monitor use and lock facilities at end of scheduled use. |
| Theatre             | 3 studios and 2 performance spaces                                                 | Faculty and staff do regular monitoring of equipment and spaces for learning and maintenance | 50-60 students per day; students are always supervised in the performance areas | Theatre staff, students and faculty all work at maintenance. Maintenance costs, exclusive of salaries, run about $20,000 yearly. |
| Exercise Science    | Human Performance Lab [HPL] Programs, experiences and research Exercise Physiology Lab [EPL] testing Classroom experiences and research emphasize active problem solving Clinical internship sites | Faculty, staff, patients, and students are involved in ongoing evaluation and updating of HPL clinical programs, curriculum, and facilities. HPL extensively renovated recently, including AV console. | Students utilize HPL and EPL for classes and projects. Clinical programs have 10,000 annual patient contact hours. Program provides unique learning environment. | Academic programs managed by highly trained faculty. Clinical programs are supported by a unique contract with MU Medical Center. Financial support is generated by third party payment and nominal fees. |
| Modern Languages    | One computer lab for language practice and one multi-media lab for audiovisual and electronic projects. | One faculty member is assigned to oversee the lab (for one course reassignment) | 25 seats in the language lab. Reservation requests indicate about 75% usage over a year. | The equipment and upkeep is handled by Computing Services. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Learning Resources</th>
<th>Assessment and Evaluation</th>
<th>Utilization</th>
<th>Staff and Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences</td>
<td>-- Food lab (shared with Dietetics) -- Laboratory preschool -- Textile lab -- Demonstration kitchen and computer teaching lab</td>
<td>There is no regular assessment of the impact of these resources on learning.</td>
<td>100+ students per semester</td>
<td>Teaching faculty monitor room and equipment needs. The pre-school lab has a full time director and staff and is supported with grant money. The dept. has no budget for replacing old appliances and equipment, and must request special money for upgrades. The food lab and its equipment are about 20 years old.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>81 practice rooms, rehearsal rooms, classrooms, Music Library, and performance spaces. The department also uses the MU stadium, the city’s arena, local churches and other large spaces on campus for performances.</td>
<td>Students provide informal evaluation through the course evaluation. Faculty monitor spaces for utilization, upkeep, and adequacy.</td>
<td>Monitored only to determine if space is adequate. Approximately 1000 students use these facilities per year. Approximately 25,000 people attend performances, excluding athletic events.</td>
<td>There is no support staff in the dept. and minimal custodial support. At least one performance center has outsourced and inadequate custodial care. There is one director of auditoria for the university who oversees all music and theatre performance spaces as well as assisting in all major projects. There is no funding for capital maintenance or replacement. The Department has to pay for all small to medium projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology, Communication Disorders, Counseling</td>
<td>Each has at least one training clinic open to students, MU employees, and the public, staffed by students with faculty supervision</td>
<td>Faculty monitor equipment and space utilization and needs.</td>
<td>Enrollment of students is usually limited to fewer than 15 at any given time in clinic-related courses</td>
<td>Nominal fees are charged to clients. Otherwise costs are borne by each department.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Journalism &amp; Mass Communications</td>
<td>Student newspaper newsroom, student radio studio, graphics lab, and digital imaging lab.</td>
<td>Equipment &amp; space needs are monitored by faculty advisors and teaching faculty. Student performance is reviewed in their senior portfolios.</td>
<td>Approximately 200 students per semester.</td>
<td>One faculty position is dedicated to the newspaper as advisor. University student fees pay for the newspaper &amp; radio &amp; equipment, and student lab fees in JMC support the graphics and imaging labs. University “greatest needs” funds are requested for the labs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3d-2  Public Computing Facilities Maintained by University Computing Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Computers in Public Labs</th>
<th>Printers</th>
<th>Scanners</th>
<th>Digital Sender</th>
<th>Projectors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>482</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3d-3  Non-Public Computing Facilities Provided within Departments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Number of Departments</th>
<th>Total Computers</th>
<th>Restricted Student Public Lab or Classroom Use Facilities</th>
<th>Student Public Lab or Classroom Use Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>622</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>463</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The information in these tables is incorporated into the discussion of the following points of evidence examining this core component.

2. **The organization evaluates the use of its learning resources to enhance student learning and effective teaching.**

Marshall University has historically collected information regarding use of its facilities. Currently, scheduling and use of general classrooms is facilitated through the Banner Resource 25 System. Individual discipline-specific laboratories and performance and skill areas are all highly utilized and are scheduled through the Chairpersons’ offices. Clinical practice sites are used extensively throughout the tri-state area and are scheduled out of the Chairpersons’ offices.

Every five year program review, coordinated by the Marshall University Office of Assessment, contains questions regarding unit/discipline satisfaction with resources. Graduating seniors are asked to rate the following resources on a satisfaction scale from 1 to 4, with 4 being highly satisfied. These data are from summer 2003, fall 2003, and spring 2004:
• Services for students with disabilities  \( N = 630, \) rating = 3.0
• Campus computer labs and services  \( N = 1096, \) rating = 3.2
• Tutor/student skills/learning centers and etc.  \( N = 902, \) rating = 3.2
• Classroom facilities  \( N = 1133, \) rating = 2.9
• Libraries/library services  \( N = 1120, \) rating = 3.4

It seems that students in general are pleased with their services although classroom facilities received the lowest rating of the resources questioned. The graduate survey, sent with the diploma to baccalaureate and associate graduates, asks students to rate classroom and lab facilities on a 5 point scale with 5 as the highest rating. The following averages cover 3 recent years of data: 2001 = 3.33, 2002 = 3.74, and 2003 = 3.76. There are no questions on any student evaluation that asked students if these resources enhanced their learning.

The University Computing Services (UCS) recently instituted a thorough monitoring system for all centrally managed computer labs, tracking logon/logoff by machine/user/date and time. Previous tracking recorded filled seats in each lab twice hourly. University Computing Facilities (UCF) are those sites at Marshall University that are centrally managed by UCS to provide safe, secure, high-speed computing labs for students and faculty. Over the last three years there has been a steady increase in UCF usage. This, in part, is due to a more heavily integrated technology curriculum in many courses and the increased enrollment of online or “e-courses.” The marked usage increase is approximately 15% higher over all UCF sites combined, the greatest increase being in Corbly Hall. The late-night hours in the Drinko Study Center are also increasing. Statistics show students are staying later and coming in earlier to take advantage of the UCF environment. In addition to the increased seat-time in UCF sites, there was also an 8% increase in printing in 2004 over the calendar year of 2003.

University Computing Services has also implemented online customer satisfaction surveys. The first two rounds of survey analysis tend to support UCS management’s suspicions that the students want more computers and more 24/7 availability of computers. These surveys indicate a high level of satisfaction among the students with regard to the value of UCF sites to their academic work. The surveys also provide actionable information that UCS management has used, and will continue to use, for continuous quality improvement.
University Computing Services has long desired an infrastructure that would allow collection and analysis of computing use by students in the facilities. In 2004 we made great progress on developing a system using scripts that record logon and logoff information when students authenticate to the Windows Server 2003 domain controllers. This has allowed us to somewhat quantify computing use in each facility. The table below shows login totals for each UCF site during the fall, 2004 semester:

**Table 3d-4**  University Computing Facilities Login Statistics for fall 2004 (by location)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UCF Site</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CH 211</td>
<td>5031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 304</td>
<td>2119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 306</td>
<td>1804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 330</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 332</td>
<td>8873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 353</td>
<td>1896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 408</td>
<td>5711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 434</td>
<td>3722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 436</td>
<td>2696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH 439</td>
<td>2778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 100</td>
<td>122350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 138</td>
<td>2934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 200</td>
<td>20807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 300</td>
<td>37171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DL 349</td>
<td>1822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPOST</td>
<td>11503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GH 211</td>
<td>8870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HH 444</td>
<td>5694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 211</td>
<td>7486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 429</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 532</td>
<td>5783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>266240</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 24-Hour Study Center is located on the first floor of the Drinko Library (DL 100) and is obviously the most heavily used location on campus.
3. The organization regularly assesses the effectiveness of its learning resources to support learning and teaching.

Several units within the university have undertaken comprehensive evaluations of learning resources, but the main emphasis of the institution in assessment has been directed toward programmatic assessment. As time, money, and staff are available, the institution needs to develop and implement the appropriate assessment methods for its resources. Nonetheless, there are several good examples of resource evaluation that we wish to highlight.

A. The Marshall Libraries: The Marshall University library system has conducted utilization and satisfaction surveys in which students, faculty and staff are invited to participate. LibQUAL+© is a suite of services offered by the Association of College and Research Libraries (ACRL) that are used to solicit, track, understand, and act upon users’ opinions of service quality. The program’s centerpiece is a rigorously tested web-based survey bundled with training that helps libraries assess and improve library services, change organizational culture, and market the library. In 2003, a Marshall University Library Assessment Committee was established consisting of librarians, library staff, students and faculty, to review data from the LibQUAL+© study and identify themes and trends in comments from respondents. Follow-up interviews with faculty, and focus group discussions supply additional insights into user expectations and satisfaction.

Project SAILS (Standardized Assessment of Information Literacy Skills) was also developed by the Association of Research Libraries in conjunction with Kent State University. It is an instrument designed to determine programmatic level assessment of information literacy skills. Believing that the ability to locate, access and evaluate information is essential to closing the gap between the information rich and the information poor, libraries across the country have increasingly adopted information literacy as their instructional framework. Information literacy has become the focal point of their mission and a growing source of demand for resources; Marshall University is hoping to emphasize the importance of the library and library faculty in achieving this goal.
Project SAILS uses an instrument based on the ACRL Information Literacy Competencies for Higher Education to measure information literacy ("the ability to recognize when information is needed and the ability to locate, evaluate, and use effectively the needed information"). In the fall semester 2004, freshmen enrolled in UNI/HON 101 at Marshall University participated in Phase III of Project SAILS. There were 233 useable responses gathered, which represents about 10% of the total UNI/HON population. Each student received 35 (out of 155) randomly generated multiple-choice questions. Test items were designed to measure mastery of four of the five ACRL Standards:

1. The information literate student determines the nature and extent of the information needed.

2. The information literate student accesses needed information effectively and efficiently.

3. The information literate student evaluates information and its sources critically and incorporates selected information into his or her knowledge base and value system.

4. The information literate student understands many of the economic, legal, and social issues surrounding the use of information and accesses and uses information ethically and legally.

In addition to a subscale by Standard, results are reported by skill sets that relate to the Standards. These twelve skill sets are:

- Skill Set 1: Developing a Research Strategy
- Skill Set 2: Scholarly Communication/Structure of Disciplines
- Skill Set 3: Identifying and Distinguishing Among Types of Sources
- Skill Set 4: Selecting Finding Tools
- Skill Set 5: Selecting Search Terms
- Skill Set 6: Constructing the Search
- Skill Set 7: Understanding Information Retrieval Systems
- Skill Set 8: Evaluating and Revising Search Results
- Skill Set 9: Retrieving Sources
- Skill Set 10: Evaluating and Selecting Sources
- Skill Set 11: Documenting Sources
- Skill Set 12: Economic, Legal, and Social Issues
Results: Overall, Marshall University freshmen performed on all standards and skill sets at about the same level (.5) as freshmen at all other institutions (combined). These results reflect that, on an average, incoming freshmen at Marshall University and at other colleges and universities enter the institution with an information literacy score of 50%.

Table 3d-5  On all four of the Standards, Marshall University students performed at the average level for all institutions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard</th>
<th>Marshall</th>
<th>Across-Inst. Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3d-6  On the Skill Sets, when compared to other freshmen. Marshall University freshmen performed at the average for Skill Set 6; slightly above average for Skill Sets 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, and 12; and slightly below for Skill Sets 3 and 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill Set</th>
<th>Marshall Freshmen</th>
<th>Freshmen Across-Institutional Avg.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These scores demonstrate that incoming freshmen nationwide arrive at their institutions with information literacy skills below mastery level. For Marshall University to graduate information literate students, information literacy goals need to
be prominent in program and course goals throughout the curriculum. The library faculty has addressed this need by changing the emphasis in their unit of instruction in UNI 101 and English composition classes from information navigation to information literacy.

**B. Assessment of Electronic Courses and Technology Resources:** The assessment of online courses is another obvious goal since the university has invested heavily in this area.

The Graduate School of Education and Professional Development (GSEPD) has analyzed graduate students’ perceptions of electronic (WebCT Vista) courses over a five-year period. Over 800 graduate students in GSEPD were surveyed from 1998 to 2002 regarding student receptivity and overall effectiveness of electronic courses. The response of students was very positive. 25% responded that they had some difficulty with online courses. Student support with technology prior to the course was very positive with 75% of students indicating that live meetings during the course were helpful. On average 90% of the students rated the quality of these online courses as excellent. When asked how the instructional value of these courses compared to regular courses, 80% of the respondents answered favorably, and 95% indicated that they would take another electronic course. The two most positive aspects of the courses according to student responses were that they were readily accessible and that they were “time friendly.”

In 2004 the university joined the *Teaching, Learning, and Technology* (TLT) group and beginning in the fall 2005, online courses will be uniformly evaluated by students using the TLT *Flashlight* product. This will provide the first consistent collection of student ratings from online students. Instructional Technology and Academic Affairs, and the Center for teaching Excellence are investigating other services that the TLT group offers which can be utilized by Marshall faculty.

The Department of Computing Services has developed an annual survey to assess the technology needs of the Marshall University community and to ensure a positive
experience when using the Marshall University Computing Facilities. The UCF sites are Computing Labs/Classrooms available to the Marshall University community with locations on the Huntington Campus in Corbly Hall, Harris Hall, Smith Hall, Smith Communication Building, Gullickson Hall, The Memorial Student Center and The John Deaver Drinko Library.

C. Some academic units ask for feedback about laboratories (e.g. the Department of Biology includes a question about resources on the course evaluation form) or clinical practice sites (School of Nursing and College of Education and Human Services). The information gathered from student feedback is used by the Chair or division head to allocate what limited money is available for maintenance, replacement, and upgrades in equipment and space. Deans and Chairpersons have indicated that, other than through faculty feedback, evaluation of resources to enhance student learning and effective teaching is not done on a regular basis for most learning resources.

The university has not regularly assessed the impact of learning resources like classrooms, laboratories, and performance spaces on learning and teaching. Therefore, survey tools to evaluate the effectiveness of learning resources by students and faculty need to be developed and implemented. Items that might be included on all student course evaluations would need to be approved by the Faculty Senate.

4. The organization supports students, staff, and faculty in using technology effectively.

The university Instructional Technology (IT) division (Library, Distributed Education, CIT) offers extensive professional development to assist faculty and staff in a) creating online course materials and b) performing certain functions within the IT environment (web publishing, library tools, etc.). In addition, many training activities are taking place in the colleges that occur without consultation or collaboration with IT.

Developing a technology professional development program can be a daunting challenge at any size institution. At Marshall University, professional development has been
conceptualized as a “box” in relation to using the university’s Course/Learning Management System. By utilizing the concept of a box, Marshall University has created a scalable program that can be re-created and re-used. Inside the box, the Center for Instructional Technology (CIT) has created a combination of online tutorials, printable hand-outs, reference cards and workshops that are time-friendly to working faculty and staff. “The Box” is a comprehensive set of tools designed to facilitate modular professional development activities like:

- Printable Handouts
- Interactive Movies
- Online self-guided tutorials
- Pre-formatted 1-1.5 hour workshops

This training approach was initiated because day long sessions were not successful and because modular/flexible professional development activities make addressing learning styles easier. The history of technology training for faculty through the CIT is well established at Marshall University, but evidence has resulted in changing presentation formats. In 2001-2002, 99 one-hour sessions in a smart classroom were offered to faculty and staff, but more than 75% of these were cancelled due to low enrollments. This taught us that traditional, in-class training opportunities were not efficient or effective endeavors.

On the other hand, targeted sessions for specific audience requests and needs have resulted in higher attendance. Faculty members in similar disciplines began seeking like-minded pedagogical solutions available within WebCT. The following departments have participated in this "road show" professional development format during 2004-2005.

1. Art Department
2. Communication Studies
3. Journalism
4. LCOB (2)
5. Modern Languages
6. Nursing
7. Psychology (2)

Support calls decreased because shorter, targeted sessions helped faculty members develop relationships within departments and colleges. An additional three other colleges/departments
of like disciplines have committed to creating and facilitating user groups on campus, including the School of Medicine.

Every Friday, IT offers training sessions on WebCT Vista. Starting in the fall 2006, there will be an online course for Vista training, and there have been “Faculty Showcases” of exemplary online courses for the College of Liberal Arts and the Lewis College of Business. The College of Science will present its showcase in February 2006.

In addition to the training provided by Instructional Technology, the Faculty Development Committee for Online and Multimedia Instruction (FDCOMI) works closely with the technical staff to ensure that faculty course developers receive a high level of training and support. The FDCOMI handles all online course development proposals from faculty. The committee works closely with the CIT, reviews new course proposals, conducts the review process for new courses, generally serves as the academic/administrative unit for online instruction, and works closely with the technical support staff to ensure that students and faculty get the help they need. The committee consists of faculty representatives from every college as well as two technical support staff.

Through the FDCOMI, faculty developing online courses, or courses with technological components, have access to one-on-one consultations, workshops on campus and online, a Faculty Resource Center Drop-In Clinic every Friday afternoon, a “Users Group” that meets once a month, as well as a wealth of online materials available to read, download, or print. MU has employed a new fulltime Instructional Designer whose duties are to provide direct support for the creation of online classes and to organize professional development opportunities for faculty interested in teaching online. Hands-on training is available at both the Huntington and the South Charleston campus, as well as a full online WebCT Vista Course for faculty. Marshall University Information Technology offers a full range of just-in-time online training in all the productivity and administrative suites of applications. Over the years this has evolved from products like ElementK and Microsoft Step-by-Step to Microsoft E-Learning. Training on SCT/Sunguard Banner system is accomplished via instructor-led classes, online virtual classrooms, and self-paced Computer Based Training CD's (CBT’s).
Together with the Center for Instructional Technology, FDCOMI employs a full-time instructional designer as well as a team of experienced student assistants, both undergraduate and graduate. They work closely with faculty to develop new online courses and continue to work with them, as needed, as faculty teach their courses. The CIT staff serves the need of online instructors who are developing new courses, re-designing existing courses, or who are teaching courses.

Most colleges employ their own Instructional Technologist who is available to provide faculty support in using technology.

**Student Support**
Computing Services maintains a “Help Desk” available by email or toll free number most hours of the day. Before each semester begins every first time online course student receives a postcard from Marshall University which contains specific information about how to get started and where to obtain information on preparing for an online course. Our newly designed MUOnline website is specifically targeted to students and contains detailed information on technology-related issues/questions. Every online course has a link on the course homepage to a set of online tutorials for Vista users.

UNI 101, the New Student Seminar, encourages a computer training component that should prepare freshmen for using technology throughout their college career.

Use of computers and technology is one of the general education components of the Marshall Plan for all students. There are computer labs in every academic building. Numerous courses and information sessions are held for faculty, students, and staff to upgrade their knowledge of technology. The Center for Teaching Excellence, the Center for Instructional Technology, and individual educational units sponsor these technology-driven sessions. Training sessions for WebCT and Web Vista are done by CIT. Individual workshops for academic units are held, and support staff is available to assist faculty. Anyone who is having technical difficulty can call the Help Desk and can speak to a computer expert immediately.
5. The organization provides effective staffing and support for its learning resources.

Marshall University is a leader in educational technology in West Virginia. Many courses and complete programs are taught via E-courses, CD-ROM, or two-way audiovisual techniques. The Drinko Library is a state-of-the-art wired electronic 118,000 square-foot facility that blends traditional with modern architecture. It houses 200,000 volumes, over 300 workstations, and electronic notebooks for patron use that are supported by an ultra fast telecommunications backbone. In addition to a wireless network throughout the building, the library provides hundreds of network ports for students to plug in their laptops. Students can also borrow laptops from the Study Center and stroll through the networked training rooms, distance multimedia presentation rooms, auditoria, individual and group study rooms, comfortable reading areas, and faculty development rooms.

While the university is a leader in technology in other areas, we lag behind our peers in the percentage of wired classrooms. Nearly 100 percent of the 240 classrooms/learning spaces on the Huntington campus have been wired for a gigabit wired-connection at the front of the room (instructor podium) and a wireless access point to provide WiFi 802.11a/b/g service in the room but many are not as yet equipped with active ports. The 80 rooms on the Huntington campus that are currently scheduled by the Registrar are scheduled to be updated with campus network and Internet access before the end of spring break 2006. This constitutes about 20% of all classrooms. As funds allow we will be upgrading these rooms with various projection and instructional technologies.

Budget constraints do affect the frequency with which technology can be upgraded and replaced, affect the quality of custodial maintenance, affect the number of support staff available in every area of operation, and affect the number of wired classrooms that can be created. Distance electronic classes are far more common than technologically enhanced classes on campus because of the limited number of enhanced classrooms.

Table 3d-1 at the beginning of section 3d identifies a sample of learning resources on campus and summarizes staffing and support issues. As the table shows, most of the staff support for these teaching spaces consists of faculty, technicians, building custodians, and sometimes students. Equipment needs can be extensive. The lack of financial resources for
hiring additional staff and faculty and for equipment upgrades and replacement is a problem. There is the expectation that increasing grant activity can provide needed funds for equipment intensive programs.

6. The organization’s systems and structures enable partnerships and innovation that embrace student learning and strengthen teaching effectiveness.

The university outreach programs partner with numerous businesses, schools, and health care agencies for student education and professional development. **Service Learning courses** are based upon partnerships with agencies and organizations in education, human services, business, and government (e.g. YWCA, domestic violence shelters, child care programs, senior citizen programs, the City of Huntington, Goodwill, early education and development programs, and local businesses). The School of Nursing and the College of Health Professions utilize labs, clinics, and equipment in over 200 local and regional facilities, including all the regional hospitals, the regional VA hospital, a Rehabilitation Center, child care and elder care agencies, the local state mental facility, medical clinics in rural and impoverished locations, etc. All programs in health care education and human services (Medicine, Nursing, Psychology, Counseling, Communication Disorders, Dietetics, Clinical Lab Science, etc.) have undergraduate and/or graduate practica and internships in almost every local and regional health care facility and with private practitioners. Students are placed in these agencies both as students and practicing trainees. Medical and other personnel in these facilities have teaching and supervisory responsibilities. All education majors participate in clinical experiences in educational settings as well as student teaching, and there are clinical experiences in local autism services centers, programs for the developmentally delayed, the blind, etc. The College of Education and Human Services has contacts and connections with almost every school system in the state.

In addition to these obvious partnerships in health care and education, many other programs utilize local and regional expertise and equipment for teaching students through practica and internships, such as Industrial/Organizational Psychology, Management, Marketing, Management Information Systems, Theatre, History, Family and Consumer Sciences, Adult and Technical Education, Art/Design, and Chemistry. In these programs students work and
learn in settings such as archives and museums, pharmacies, crime labs, summer theatre, and businesses and industry. The W. Page Pitt School of Journalism and Mass Communication places students with regional newspapers as well as national organizations like CNN, The Washington Post, and the Chicago Tribune. Students gain experience in regional and national PR and ad firms, and students regularly are placed in state legislative and congressional internships.

The university library system participates in several consortia designed to provide faculty and students with greater access to library collections in both print and electronic formats. The library has enjoyed a long-time partnership with PALINET, a multi-type library network-buying consortium that provides access to deep discounts on materials, interlibrary loan, and cataloging services. In addition to several state-wide agreements and collaborations with other state institutions that provide economies of scale for electronic journal and book buying, Marshall recently joined the Pennsylvania Academic Library Consortium (PALCI).

Beginning in January of 2005, the library began to implement a patron-initiated book borrowing system that allows faculty and students to gain access to over 26 million new titles. Directly from the library’s web page, MU students, faculty and staff have the ability to search the library collections of PALCI members which include over twenty institutions such as the University of Pittsburgh, Carnegie Mellon University, Duquesne University, and Drexel University. Within a 3-day turn-around time, UPS delivers requested books directly to university library patrons’ homes. Research at all levels has been greatly enhanced to support the curriculum needs of the local scholarly community.

7. **Budgeting priorities reflect that improvement in teaching and learning is a core value of the organization.**

Despite severe budget constraints, the university has funded professional development for faculty, upgraded computers on a regular basis, and provided electronic web-based resources for the delivery of instruction and student learning. New programs housed in the Office of Academic Affairs and initiated within the past 10 years – the Center for Teaching Excellence and the Service Learning Program – reflect the priorities of Academic Affairs to improve
teaching and learning. Budget priorities at the college level are seen in financial support for faculty travel to conferences; all colleges provide some funds that are in addition to department allocation. For example, the College of Education and Human Services (COEHS) provides 10 stipend waivers for college faculty to attend the annual Ashland Community College National Teaching and Learning Conference. COEHS also provides ongoing faculty development series every year. An example includes the diversity in teaching series that provides workshops that educate and sensitize teachers to the effects of race, ethnicity, poverty, gender, etc. on teaching and learning. All college sponsored faculty development programs are open to all university faculty.

The university libraries have an adequate budget to support the educational mission of the institution. Forced publisher inflation does impact the library budget annually as publishers arbitrarily increase prices anywhere from 1% to 300% depending on the item and format. To mitigate serious budget issues, the library participates in consortia, takes part in cooperative pricing agreements, provides pay-per-view services, supports reciprocal borrowing agreements, works with departments and faculty to regularly review materials that can be discontinued and/or replaced, and takes advantage of deep discounts available for bundling collections. Academic Affairs and Information Technology work closely with the university libraries to provide funding for materials, services, equipment, and staff to meet research and curriculum support needs.

During the past 10 years, a number of new academic facilities have been (and are currently) under construction. These include the Drinko Library, a second academic building on the South Charleston campus, major renovations and expansion of the Forensic Science facility, a Jazz performance center, major renovations of the old Morrow Library building, and current construction of a Biotechnology Science Center and a medical Clinical Education and Patient Outreach Center. The buildings reflect an investment of about $100,000,000 in academic priorities. Meanwhile, money continues to be invested in renovations on almost all older academic facilities.

When personnel reductions were necessary because of reduced state funding, the university preserved the number of tenure/tenure track faculty positions while reducing only temporary
faculty and non-faculty positions. Most of these positions have since been restored. One of the greatest needs in continuing to provide adequate learning resources for students is additional funds. The university has no line item in the budget for space and equipment replacement and upgrades, and most programs with atypical equipment do not have additional money in their department budgets for these expenses. The university has started the process of redesigning and replacing old furniture in two classrooms per year, but ongoing equipment needs for appliances and equipment other than computers are not regularly addressed in any formal or systematic way. Partnerships with community agencies and organizations cannot completely replace the value of on-campus learning opportunities in special laboratories and spaces.

Additional budget priorities at the university level are reflected in the university match for grants with external funding. These matching grants have helped to offset the loss of state funds and somewhat mitigate the effect of reduced state funding.

**Strengths**

- In the areas of assessment of student learning, the institution has made significant improvement since our last accreditation visit, and the rate of improvement is accelerating. All programs now submit annual assessment reports, and all programs are reviewed every 5 years. The quality of these reports has increased dramatically. The university has a system in place for providing feedback to programs and faculty on the strengths of their assessment of student learning—as well as the areas that need improvement.

- Student surveys are providing increasingly useful data which is now being fed back to all academic programs and to all appropriate student services. More students are participating in assessment activities, and first year students were surveyed for the first time in 2003. Pre-post graduation comparisons are planned. The newest academic calendars, approved by the faculty, incorporate an annual Assessment Day, with classes cancelled, to allow all university programs an opportunity to meet with focus groups, and conduct tests and other activities.
• The assessment of general education competencies has improved, and useful information is being collected in the areas of written and verbal communication, information literacy, writing-intensive classes, and in mathematical and multicultural competencies. Feedback is being provided to faculty and programs involved in the General Education component areas. The most recent development in this area is the appointment of a Core Curriculum Task Force to study the feasibility of implementing a core curriculum. This task force began its work in fall 2005 and expects to complete its study by the end of spring 2006.

• Since our last accreditation visit the university has invested a great deal of time, money, and human resources in the development of the teaching capabilities of the faculty. The financial investment in the technology infrastructure, staff, and training has been enormous for an institution of our size and financial base. Inducements for faculty to incorporate technology in their teaching and to develop distance teaching have resulted in a technologically enhanced education for our students. New academic buildings have been constructed, and increasingly students are being educated in community partnerships. The development of a Service Learning Program exemplifies the union of teaching, learning, and community engagement in its highest educational form. Curricular changes in general education and the initiation of the first interdisciplinary minor (in women’s studies) reflect faculty engagement in broadening the educational experience of all our students.

• Since 1999, when the Center for Teaching Excellence was established, over 400 faculty a year have participated in university-wide teaching/learning activities, affecting a possible 40,000 student learning experiences (assuming each faculty member teaches a minimum of 200 students a year and assuming a 50% repeat participation by faculty). We believe the activities of the center have increased the centrality of the institution’s focus on teaching and learning and have raised the value of teaching in the faculty role. Likewise, the addition of the Service Learning Program to the center shows how an emphasis on teaching and the relationship between teacher, student, and community can develop from the renewed discussions
and value of teaching and learning. We believe that we have enhanced a culture of interest in changing and developing the effectiveness of teaching in the past five years. Faculty are discussing their teaching, focusing more on student learning outcomes, and trying innovative methods more than ever before.

- Marshall University offers a multitude of opportunities for faculty development in technology and in all other aspects of teaching and learning. Marshall University’s greatest strength is the dedication of the faculty, who are heavily invested in their teaching and who are willing to learn and change their methods as students continue to change. The creativity of the faculty -- and their willingness to develop and/or implement teaching related activities, or to share their teaching skills with other faculty (either as workshop leaders or as mentors) -- is faculty development’s biggest asset. Faculty members routinely volunteer to offer programs, and numerous important faculty development programs are staffed entirely by faculty with small amounts of reassigned time. The university also has a major strength in the vigorous commitment to, and encouragement of, faculty development by the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs.

- The establishment of University College has also become a strength. Combining all tutoring and general advising in one place has allowed for more efficient use of resources, both financial and personnel. One advantage is that we are now reaching out to faculty advisors with training opportunities. University College also allows us to offer conditional admission to some students who might not otherwise be able to pursue a four-year degree but does so in a way that provides these students careful guidance and assistance.

Opportunities

- We need to use assessment information to shape the nature of faculty development programs.
• We need to create an institution that values, supports, and rewards teaching, service, and research, while not overwhelming employees with numerous job demands.

• We need to allow for differentiated workload so as to preserve the functions of teaching, research, and service at the university level while allowing individual faculty to emphasize selected areas of responsibility.

• We need to assess advising activities that will allow the institution to make the wisest use of resources.

• We need to make data more readily available to those involved in assessment at all levels so they will be able to plan and act from a vantage of solid information.

• We need to assess the international studies component and the computer competency component of the general education requirement more effectively.

• The Coordinator position in the University Assessment Office needs to be upgraded to full-time.

• We need to better assess the impact of such learning resources as classrooms, laboratories, and performance spaces on teaching and the caliber of learning and improved thinking (i.e. critical thinking) that results.

• We need to better assess the effectiveness of faculty development activities.

• We need to develop strategies for improving the freshman writing proficiency rate of 65%.

• We need to add certificate programs to the Program Review 5-year evaluation cycle.