University Assessment Committee Meeting Agenda 10-22-07 8:00 – 10:00 SH 263 (Huntington) MUGC 134 (South Charleston)

- 1. Approval of minutes from September 21 (sent as a separate PDF document)
- 2. Discussion of proposed outline for yearly program assessment reports (Old and new forms are included in Appendix I)
- 3. Discussion of proposed rubric to be used by committee to evaluate yearly program assessment reports (Old rubrics are included in Appendix II; proposed new rubric is sent as a separate document)
- 4. Discussion of Proposed Assessment Definitions (Appendix III)
- 5. Discussion of proposed committee timelines (Appendix IV)
- 6. Committee assignments
- 7. Brief discussion of Assessment Day do we want a working subcommittee for Assessment Day planning?
- 8. Discussion of future meeting dates and topics
 - Monday, December 3, 8:00 10:00: CLA and NSSE results and plans; ideas for Assessment Day discussed
 - Monday, January 28, 4:00 10:00: General Education Assessment
 - Monday, February 25, 8:00 10:00: Assessment Day update
 - Monday, March 24, 8:00 10:00: Analysis of survey instruments and data. Revisions of forms/procedures
 - Monday, April 28, 8:00 10:00: Presentation of University Assessment Report for 2007-2008. Discuss plans for needed changes in 2008-2009
- 9. Additional Business

Appendix I: Old Forms

Guidelines for Undergraduate/Graduate Program Assessment Yearly Reports Due by October 1, of each year

The public is uncertain about the value of higher education and wants evidence that college graduates do have the abilities claimed by their degrees. As a result our accrediting agencies, The North Central Association, the State Legislature, and the University System are requiring evidence of student learning (i.e., achievement of intended outcomes) and institutional effectiveness. Assessment at Marshall University has two important roles to fill: program improvement and accountability. MU=s assessment plan addresses both of those roles. In order for us to fulfill our commitment to program excellence, a yearly update of our assessment initiatives is essential.

Organization of the Report

The purpose of this annual report is to document the progress on assessing student outcomes based upon your program assessment plan. The objective is to determine program effectiveness, not evaluation of individual students or individual faculty. The primary focus of this report is to help you improve your program. The report for each program is due in the University Assessment Office by October 1 of each year, for the previous academic year. The University Assessment Committee (UAC) will review the report, provide feedback on each program and prepare the annual assessment report of the University. This assessment information will be essential in preparing the 5-year program reviews required by the BOT. It is imperative that each program be honest in its assessment efforts and in the preparation of this report. Only with careful scrutiny of our programs can we hope to improve.

I. Assessment Activities:

- **A. Program Goals:** Provide a brief description of the program goals and describe any efforts the program has made in revising/improving these goals. Please indicate which goals were changed and nature of the changes.
- B. Learning Outcomes/Data Collection: For each outcome, please indicate the activities in the reporting year the department carried out in relation to the outcome. What did you do? How did you do it? How many and what kinds of data did you examine? For example, the number of students/papers/activities involved in the projects, assessed in relation to the outcome. What evidence do you have of the validity and reliability of your procedures? How useful were the data in determining the validity and reliability of the outcome.
- C. Results: What did you find out? Describe the results. What conclusions did you draw related to your data collection procedures? Relate your data to the outcome. What improvements/revisions in the program/outcome have you made or are considering making based on what you learned? The results may be displayed in chart/table form in addition to a brief narrative.

[A Chart should accompany the narrative. The Chart should summarize the assessment efforts.]

- **II.** Plans for the current year: What are your goals/plans for the current year and how do you hope to meet these goals/plans? What things will you do differently? What activities will you add/delete? What changes in your assessment plan are you considering?
- **III. Assistance Needed:** Given your plans for the current year=s activities, what kind of assistance from the UAC do you need? On which topics would you like more information or assistance?

IV. What one most important thing has the department/program learned through this process?

Edited: Feb. 26, 2004; Printed: December 3, 2009 (1:44PM)

K:\ASSESSMENT FORMS\UNDERGRADUATE YEARLY UPDATE REVISED 2004.DOC

Prepared by the Office of Program Review and Assessment

Office of Academic Affairs, Marshall University, Huntington, WV 25755-2003

Marshall University

Assessment of Student Outcomes: Component/Course/Program Level

Component Area/Program/Discipline: _	YEAR:
--------------------------------------	-------

		Component / Cour	se / Program Level		
Student Outcome	Person or Office Responsible	Assessment Tool or Approach	Standards/Benchma rk	Results/Analysis	Action Taken

Instructions: Under student outcomes (Column I) please list the most current student outcomes/competencies to be demonstrated by your graduates. These should be in your assessment plan.

(Column II) Person/office responsible: If someone specific has been designated to collect the various pieces of evidence, please list their names in this column.

(Column III) Assessment Tool or Approach: Here you will need to designate the assessment measures you are using to assess the particular outcome. Measures/tools may include term papers, parts of essay tests, internship results; class projects; objective tests; standardized/normed or other licensure tests, or a variety of other measures that may indicate competence in a particular objective.

(Column IV) Standards/Benchmark: Here you may indicate a particular set of standards you have set for completion or if you are developing benchmarks, please indicate what those are. If you are using a national test, what are the indicators of competence.

(Column V) Results/Analysis: Indicate what the results were utilizing the assessment tool/measure and applying it against the benchmarks set. Please be fairly specific here, provide relevant data and a brief analysis.

(Column VI) Action Taken: Indicate any action taken based on the results/analysis you have completed.

PLEASE REMEMBER: Not all objectives have to be measured every semester or every year. All of your objectives should be measured in a 2 to 3 year cycle. Sometimes it depends on when particular courses are offered as to when objectives can be measured. A helpful tool may be implementation of the courses/objective matrix. Some programs have completed this some have not. If you are interested in completing one for your program, please let me know and this office will supply you with the forms and assist in completing this document.

December 3, 2009 (1:44PM)

C:\Assessment Forms\Assessment of Student Outcomes Chart Revised August 2003.doc

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

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

Appendix I Continued: Proposed New Forms

Guidelines for Undergraduate/Graduate Program Assessment Yearly Reports Due by December 1 of each year

Organization of the Report

The purpose of this annual report is to document your program's progress in assessing student learning outcomes based upon your program's assessment plan. The objective is to determine program effectiveness, not evaluation of individual students or individual faculty. The primary focus of this report is to help you improve your program. The report for each program is due in the University Assessment Office by December 1 of each year. The University Assessment Committee (UAC) will review the report, provide feedback on each program and prepare the annual assessment report of the University. This assessment information also will be essential when you prepare your 5-year program review required by the Board of Governors.

I. Assessment Activities:

- **A. Program Goals:** Provide a list of program goals and describe any efforts the program has made in revising/improving these goals and the reasons for doing so.
- D. Student Learning Outcomes, Learning Activities, Assessment Measures (Tools), Standards/Benchmarks, Results/Analysis, and Action Taken. [Please Insert "The Assessment of Student Outcomes" Chart here.] Following the chart, please add further explanation in narrative form as necessary.
- **II. Assessment plans for the current year:** This section should further explain the "Action Taken" information in your chart. Any additional assessment plans you have for the current year also may be included, with reasons for these plans.
- **III. Assistance Needed with Assessment:** What assistance can the Office of Assessment give you to help improve your assessment program?

Marshall University Assessment of Student Learning Outcomes for the [Insert Name of Program] [Insert Academic Year]

Student Learning	Learning Activities	Assessment	Benchmarks	Results/Analysis	Actions Taken
Outcomes		Measures (Tools)			

Appendix II – Old Rubrics for Program Assessment Report Evaluation Assessment Committee Analysis Yearly Departmental/Program Assessment Reports Academic Year 2005-6

Program:			

Assessment Report Guidelines	Evaluator's Comments
I.a. Program Goals	
b. Learning Outcomes Data Collection	
c. Results	
(Is there a chart which identifies the program objectives/ The appropriate assessment tools/ Standards/results/actions taken?)	Yes; No Comments: How well does the chart identify each category?
II. Plans for the current year	
III. Assistance Needed	
IV. Most important thing learned through this process.	

Date Created: 5/6/2002; Revised: 12/3/2009; 1:44:20 PM

Office of Program Review and Assessment

Office of Academic Affairs

Marshall University, Huntington, WV

D	
Program:	
- 108141111	

Marshall University

Efficacy of Assessment at the Program Level: Primary Traits Analysis NCA Levels of Implementation 2003-2004

DATE: Academic Year 2005-2006

Two checks in any level indicate performance in that level, with the exception of level 0.

1. Learning Objectives	2. Assessment Measures
Level 0	Level 0
No objectives were provided.	No measures were identified.
Level 1	Level 1
Learning objectives were identified	Measures were identified.
They describe student behaviors.	They relate to the learning objectives.
Level 2	Level 2
All in Level 1 plus:	All in Level 1 plus:
They are program, not class or course, objectives.	They include direct and indirect measures of student
They are clear.	learning.
They are appropriate in number.	They are multiple.
	They are integrated in the curriculum.
Level 3	Level 3
All in Level 1 and Level 2 plus:	All in Level 1 and Level 2 plus:
They are comprehensive.	They emphasize direct measures of student learning.
They are measurable.	They focus on real-world tasks.
They support Marshall's educational goals.	They stress higher order learning.
They span multiple learning domains.	They allow performance to be gauged over time.
3.Feedba	ck Loop
Level 0	Level 1
The feedback loop was not described	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not used.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have
The feedback loop was not described	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been established.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been established.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair.	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learning.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learning.	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been established.	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performance.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been establishedData are occasionally considered in departmental	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performanceData are an integral part of departmental planning and
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been establishedData are occasionally considered in departmental planning and budgeting processes.	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performanceData are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting process.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been establishedData are occasionally considered in departmental planning and budgeting processesAssessment findings about the state of student learning	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performanceData are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting processData are routinely shared with other appropriate
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been establishedData are occasionally considered in departmental planning and budgeting processesAssessment findings about the state of student learning are beginning to be incorporated into reviews of the	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performanceData are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting processData are routinely shared with other appropriate constituents in program reviews and the like.
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been establishedData are occasionally considered in departmental planning and budgeting processesAssessment findings about the state of student learning	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performanceData are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting processData are routinely shared with other appropriate constituents in program reviews and the likeThe improvement of student learning is central to the
The feedback loop was not describedAssessment is largely the responsibility of the department chair. Level 2Data are being collected, but the program does not sufficiently show that it is using this information to improve the quality of student learningMinimal performance expectations/standards have been establishedData are occasionally considered in departmental planning and budgeting processesAssessment findings about the state of student learning are beginning to be incorporated into reviews of the	Data are being collected but not interpreted or not usedFew or no performance expectations/standards have been establishedThere is minimal evidence that the assessment program is stable and will be sustainable. Level 3Data are routinely collected, interpreted, and used by faculty to improve the quality of student learningClear performance expectations/standards are in effect for all measures and are being used to assess the quality of student performanceData are an integral part of departmental planning and budgeting processData are routinely shared with other appropriate constituents in program reviews and the like.

Appendix II – Proposed New Rubric (Sent as a separate attachment)

Assessment Definitions

- 1. Program Goal a goal your program wants to achieve, which should flow from Marshall University's mission (http://www.marshall.edu/www/mission.asp). While program goals should stress student learning, they may also be related to faculty development, curricular development, program outreach to the community, etc. In stating program goals, it is helpful to being with, "The Program will"....."
- 2. Student Learning Outcomes what you want students to be able to <u>do</u> as they progress through and complete your program. Student learning outcomes should
 - Be related to program goals and therefore, to Marshall's mission.
 - Be program, not course, specific
 - Be appropriate in number (6-8)
 - Be measurable (Use active verbs to state what students will "do" to demonstrate mastery of the learning outcome)
 - Cover multiple learning domains, e.g. knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation
- 3. Learning Activities the specific activities that will give students opportunities to do whatever is stated in the learning outcomes and eventually allow students to demonstrate mastery of the outcomes. Examples of learning activities include
 - Writing papers
 - Participating in discussions
 - Researching, preparing, and delivering oral presentations
 - Researching and writing original research papers
 - Designing, conducting, analyzing, reporting, and presenting the results of original research
 - Writing reflective essays
 - Reading books, articles, poems, essays
 - Listening to music
 - Listening to lectures
 - Observing a teacher (or someone else) demonstrate an activity, then doing the activity oneself
 - Designing something
 - Comparing and contrasting two theories
 - Given a problem, deciding what information is needed to solve the problem
 - After finding information that might help solve a problem, evaluating the strength of each piece of data, and arriving at a final solution
 - Finding evidence to support (or refute) an argument
 - Practicum experiences
 - Assembling a portfolio
 - Capstone experiences
 - Role-playing
 - Case Studies
 - Simulations
 - Debating
 - Service Learning
 - Projects completed in authentic (real world) situations

Dramatizations

- 4. Assessment Methods (Tools)
 - Direct Measures Methods used to determine whether the student has mastered the learning outcome. Since program, rather than course specific, student learning outcomes are being assessed, direct assessments used should be developed by the entire faculty, not just by individual course instructors. Also, when there are multiple sections of a course in which learning activities that address student learning outcomes are being presented, assessments should be blind scored by more than one faculty member. In large programs, it is acceptable to assess a sample of students. Examples of appropriate direct assessment methods include:
 - o Test questions specifically designed to measure the learning outcome
 - Rubrics designed to evaluate outcomes achieved through specific learning activities.
 Examples might include writing papers, delivering oral presentations, practicum experiences, portfolios, participation in discussions, capstone experiences, etc.
 - Standardized tests such as licensure exams
 - Essay Exams designed to measure specific learning outcomes these should be blind scored by more than one faculty member using an agreed-upon rubric
 - Indirect Measures Methods used to assess opinions about or satisfaction with the program. Indirect measures can provide the program with valuable information, but they do not directly assess student learning outcomes. Examples of appropriate indirect assessment measure include:
 - o Graduating Senior Exit Interviews
 - Assessment Day Focus Groups
 - Graduate Satisfaction Surveys
 - Employer Surveys
 - o Alumni Surveys
 - The following are NOT measures of student learning outcomes!
 - o GPA while GPA can be used as a program outcome for Program Review, it is not an appropriate measure of individual student learning outcomes.
 - o ACT/SAT scores these are incomes, not outcomes. They can, however, show a "value added" in terms of program effectiveness for Program Review, especially if students with low incoming scores do well in the program.
 - Employment Rates while these suggest something about the necessity and viability of your program (Program Review), they say more about the current job market than they do about student learning.
- 5. Benchmarks criterion you have set for mastery of the student learning outcome as measured by the assessment tool you've chosen. For example, a student may have to answer 80% of the critical thinking questions correctly on an exam, may have to achieve ratings of at least "satisfactory" on all parts of an evaluation rubric for a practicum experience.
- 6. Results what were your program's results? What percentage of students assessed achieved the benchmarks set?
- 7. Analysis were the results acceptable? Why or why not?
- 8. Action Taken based on your results, what did you/will you do? If students are meeting the outcomes, your action taken might be to continue current practice. If students are not meeting the outcomes, the faculty need to evaluate the learning activities and the assessment measures to see if either or both can be improved.

Appendix IV – Proposed Committee Timelines

Suggested timelines for University Assessment Committee 2007-2008

- 1. Fall Syllabus Reviews
 - Faculty submit syllabi by September 1
 - Committee Members review Syllabi by December 1
 - MBR sends syllabus evaluation reports to faculty by December 10
- 2. Program Yearly Assessment Report Evaluations
 - Program Yearly Assessment Reports are due to the OAPR by December 1
 - Committee Members review Program Yearly Assessment Reports by March 1
 - MBR sends feedback letters to Chairs/Program Directors by April 15
- 3. Spring Syllabus Reviews
 - Faculty submit syllabi by February 1
 - Committee Members review Syllabi by April 15
 - MBR sends syllabus evaluation reports to faculty by May 1
- 4. Duties not yet included in timeline to be discussed and refined this year
 - Survey analysis
 - General Education Assessment
 - Assessment Day