



University Assessment Report: Academic Year 2018-2019

Annual Program Assessment: 2017-2018

Seventy-six (76) programs submitted annual assessment reports for academic year 2017-2018. The breakdown for these reports was one report for an undergraduate certificate program 41 reports for undergraduate degree programs, 25 reports for graduate degree programs, and nine (9) reports for graduate certificate programs. This year, the Assessment Committee used an updated rubric that added a fourth column to assess continuous improvement. This column specifically rated the program's implementation of planned actions from the previous year (**please refer to Appendix A**). The Assessment Committee completed reviews of all reports in fall 2018. The Office of Assessment/Quality Initiatives shared evaluations with the programs in August 2019. The results (on a scale of 0 to 3) were: *Learning Outcomes* ($M = 2.91$; $SD = 0.43$; $n = 76$); *Assessment Measures* ($M = 2.72$; $SD = 0.59$; $n = 76$); and *Feedback Loop* ($M = 2.58$; $SD = 0.65$; $n = 73$); and *Continuous Improvement* ($M = 2.08$; $SD = 1.15$; $n = 72$). These results are consistent with those from previous years.

General Education Assessment: 2018-2019

The Summer Assessment Team completed three assessments in May/June 2019. These included evaluation of a random sample of baseline assessments completed as part of UNI 100 in conjunction with fall 2018 Week of Welcome, followed by an evaluation of final assessments completed by the baseline sample at the end of FYS during fall 2018 and spring 2019. Second, the team conducted an evaluation of random samples of student artifacts aligned to Marshall's Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP) outcomes *Intercultural Thinking*, *Ethical and Civic Thinking*, and *Communication Fluency*. Third, the team evaluated a sample of capstone artifacts using AAC&U Value rubrics for *Critical Thinking* and *Written Communication*. Comprehensive reports are available at this link:

<https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/general-education-assessment/>. Specific reports for each assessment are found at these links:

Baseline/FYS assessment: <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2019/08/Comparison-of-Freshman-Baseline-with-First-Year-Seminar-Assessment-Results-2018-2019.pdf>

Baccalaureate Degree Profile Outcomes Assessment: <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2019/08/BDP-Outcomes-Assessment-2019.pdf>

Capstone Artifact Assessment: <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2019/08/Senior-Capstone-Assessment-2019.pdf>

The English Department also assessed its general education composition courses. Findings of this assessment can be found at <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2020/04/English-Composition-Assessment-2018-2019.pdf>

The Communication Studies Department assessed its general education public speaking courses. Findings of this assessment can be found at <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2020/04/CMM-103-Assessment-2018-2019.pdf>

Program Review (2018-2019)

We conducted comprehensive five-year reviews for eleven (11) undergraduate degree programs, nine (9) graduate degree programs, four (4) undergraduate certificate programs, and four (4) graduate certificate programs. Programs, in conjunction with the Offices of Assessment/Quality Initiatives and Institutional Research/Planning, completed these reports. All reports were reviewed by the University’s Academic Planning Committee (undergraduate) and Graduate Council (graduate). Following these reviews, Marshall’s provost and president reviewed each report. Following these reviews, members of Marshall University’s Board of Governors reviewed each report. The following recommendations were approved by the Board of Governors on April 25, 2019.

Undergraduate Degree Programs	Recommendations
Foreign Languages-BA	Continue at current level
Humanities-BA	Continue at current level
History-BA	Continue at current level
Communication Studies-BA	Continue at current level
Sociology/Anthropology-BA	Continue at current level
Regents’ Bachelor of Arts (RBA)	Continue at current level
Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA)	Continue at current level
Arts-BA	Continue at current level
Health Science-BS	Continue at current level
Biological Science-BS	Continue with Resource Development: The Provost has approved the addition of an Associate chair with a nine-month appointment.
Public Health-BS	Discontinue when all currently enrolled students have completed this program.
Graduate Degree Programs	
History-MA	Continue at current level
Communication Studies-MA	Continue at current level
Humanities-MA	Continue at current level
Sociology-MA	Continue at current level
Music-MA	Continue at current level
Biological Sciences-MS/MA	Continue at current level
Special Education-MA	Continue at current level
Physical Therapy-DPT	Continue at current level
Pharmacy-PharmD	Continue at current level
Undergraduate Certificate Programs	
Appalachian Studies	Discontinue
Asian Studies	Discontinue
Public Health	Discontinue
Worksite Wellness	Discontinue

Graduate Certificate Programs	
Latin	Continue at current level
Appalachian Studies	Continue at current level
Public History	Continue at current level
Women’s Studies	Continue at current level

Student Affairs Assessment

The Divisions of Student Affairs and Housing and Residence Life are working collaboratively to create learning outcomes for each unit and to align these learning outcomes with the standards of the National Association of School Personnel Administrators (NASPA) and with the learning outcomes of Marshall’s Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP).

Tasksteam by Watermark

Office of Assessment/Quality Initiatives entered all degree and certificate program assessment plans into Marshall’s new online assessment reporting system, *Taskstream by Watermark*. Degree and certificate programs completed their 2018-2019 assessment reports using this system.

West Virginia Higher Education Assessment Summit

In conjunction with the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission and West Virginia University, Marshall University organized a Higher Education Assessment Summit in fall 2018. This summit, which included a keynote and several guest speakers, was held at the Charleston Marriott Town Center. Representatives from most of the state’s four and two-year higher education institutions attended. **Please refer to Appendix B for the Summit’s agenda.**

West Virginia Higher Education Assessment Council Co-Curricular Meeting:

In May 2019, Marshall University worked with Pierpont Community and Technical College to organize a meeting centered on co-curricular assessment. Representatives from most of West Virginia’s four and two-year institutions attended. The meeting concluded with each institution providing a short report that included the co-curricular activity upon which it planned to focus assessment efforts during academic year 2019-2020. **Please refer to Appendix C for the meeting’s agenda.**

Assessment Day

Results for campus-wide surveys were sent to originating offices and posted to the Assessment website. Assessment Day 2019 survey results are available at <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/survey-results/>

Graduation Surveys

Graduation Survey results are available at <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/undergraduate-graduate-survey/>

Syllabus Evaluations

The University Assessment Committee evaluated syllabi from the College of Arts and Media and from the College of Education and Professional Development in spring 2019. **Please refer to Appendix D for the full report.**

We also note that the staff of the Marshall University Online Design Center are actively working with faculty to convert syllabi into formats that are accessible for students with visual impairments. Marshall's learning management system (Blackboard Learn) has a feature named "Blackboard Ally," that will check syllabi submitted to Blackboard for accessibility.

Additionally, as part of its review of all Marshall policies during academic year 2018-2019, the Marshall University Board of Governors approved several updates to Marshall's syllabus policy. The primary updates were clarifications regarding contact information and office hours for adjunct faculty. The current syllabus policy (with an effective date of August 1, 2019) may be found at <https://www.marshall.edu/board/files/MUBOG-AA-14-Course-Syllabus-Policy-2019-9.pdf>. **It also is included in Appendix E.**

Student Grading Versus Program Assessment

At the request of an Assessment Committee member, the committee developed an official statement concerning the difference between student grading versus program assessment. The statement can be found at <https://www.marshall.edu/assessment/files/2019/02/Student-Grading-Versus-Program-Assessment-updated-2-11-2019.pdf> and **is included in Appendix F of this report.**

Appendix A

Program _____ Reviewer _____ Date _____

To achieve a level, all items must be checked at that level and all preceding levels (except 0).

Student Learning Outcomes	Assessment Measures	Feedback Loop (Benchmarks, Results, Analysis and Planned Action)	Continuous Improvement Feedback Loop
Level 0 ____ No outcomes are provided or Level 1 was not fully achieved.	Level 0 ____ No measures are identified or Level 1 was not fully achieved.	Level 0 ____ Either no benchmarks are given or results are not reported or Level 1 was not achieved.	Level 0 ____ No action plan was imported from the previous year's report.
Level 1 ____ Learning outcomes are identified ____ Learning outcomes are clearly derived from the program's educational mission (which in turn is derived from the university's educational mission).	Level 1 ____ Measures (of which the majority should be direct) are identified for all outcomes. ____ At least two assessment points are identified at appropriate points in the curriculum.	Level 1 ____ Assessment results are presented within the context of specified benchmarks.	Level 1 ____ An action plan was imported from the previous year's report, but this year's report made no mention of how it was implemented.
Level 2 <i>All in Level 1 plus</i> ____ Stated learning outcomes are measurable (either qualitatively or quantitatively; i.e. they state what students will do).	Level 2 <i>All in Level 1 plus</i> ____ Measures are valid in that they afford reasonable inferences regarding outcomes.	Level 2 <i>All in Level 1 plus</i> ____ Reported results are derived from valid assessment measures (of which the majority should be direct).	Level 2 ____ This year's report included general statements regarding how the previous year's action plan was implemented.
Level 3 <i>All in Levels 1 and 2 plus</i> ____ Learning outcomes span multiple learning domains and higher orders of learning, i.e. analysis, synthesis, and evaluation are included.	Level 3 <i>All in Levels 1 and 2 plus</i> ____ Assessment measures allow sufficient detail to inform improvement, e.g. employ analytic rubrics or other methods of analysis.	Level 3 <i>All in Levels 1 and 2 plus</i> ____ Results are aggregated and reported in detail using analytic rubrics or other appropriate tools that allow detailed analysis of students' strengths and weaknesses regarding the outcomes assessed. ____ If data warrant, a specific plan for improving student learning or the assessment process, based on a clear analysis of assessment results, is presented.	Level 3 ____ This year's report included specific details regarding implementation of last year's action plan <u>and</u> the results of that implementation..

Comments:

Appendix B



West Virginia
Higher Education
Policy Commission

West Virginia Higher Education Assessment Council Summit

Sponsored by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission

Google Drive Link: <https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1IOXQ6xJCBlhcPCX5fkdpn55KpRPK9-3y?usp=sharing>

Dates: Thursday, November 8 and Friday, November 9, 2018

Location: Charleston Marriott Town Center, 200 Lee Street East, Charleston, WV 25301

Thursday, November 8, 2018

1:30 – 2:00 PM: Arrival and Check-In ([Table Outside of Salon D](#))

2:00 – 2:15 PM: Welcome: Dr. Chris Treadway, Senior Director for Research and Policy, WV Higher Education Policy Commission ([Salon D](#))

2:15 – 2:30 PM: Introduction to the events of the day and of the panelists: Dr. Mary Beth Reynolds, Associate Vice President for Assessment and Quality Initiatives, Marshall University ([Salone D](#))

2:30 – 4:00 PM: Panel discussion moderated by Dr. Jonathan Keiser, Provost and Vice-President for Academic and Student Affairs, Finger Lakes Community College, Canandaigua, NY. Panel topics (and panelists) include: ([Salone D](#))

- Importance of assessment in the HLC accreditation process (Dr. David Hatfield, Coordinator of Accreditation Processes and Associate Professor of English, Marshall University)
- Program review in context of linking processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting (Dr. Lou Skimak, Director of Academic Excellence and Assessment, West Virginia University).
- Importance of general education that lays the foundation for learning in degree/certificate programs (Dr. Tracey Anderson, Director of Accreditation, West Virginia School of Osteopathic Medicine)
- Importance of assessing learning in co-curricular programs (Dr. Leah Simpson, System Director for Distance Learning, Kentucky Community and Technical College System; and Dr. Timothy Melvin, Assessment Coordinator and Co-Director of the President's Commission on Diversity, Equality, and Inclusion, Marshall University)
- Importance of student learning outcome expectations appropriate to level of degree/certificate and tracking post-graduation outcomes (Dr. Jonathan Keiser)

Appendix B

4:00 – 4:15: Break

4:15 – 4:45: Break-Out Sessions by Topic Choice with Content Experts, who will help set guidelines that, during remainder of this day and next, each institution should start from where it is, decide on next steps, and end workshop with specific action plan. (Salon D)

4:45 – 5:45: Institutional Meetings: Each institutional team will select a team leader and note-taker as well as begin to develop its action plan. During this time, institutional teams will prepare questions for content experts to answer on Friday morning.

- Bluefield; Glenville; Mountwest CTC; Shepherd (Salon E)
- West Virginia and Potomac State; WVU at Parkersburg; WVU Institute of Technology; WV State (Salon F)
- Fairmont; West Liberty; Blue Ridge and Eastern WV CTC (Salon A)
- BridgeValley CTC; Concord; Marshall; New River CTC (Salon B)
- Pierpont CTC; Southern WV CTC; WV Northern CTC (Hawk's Nest)

5:45 – 6:30: Break before Dinner

6:30 – 8:00: Dinner with Keynote Speaker, Dr. Jonathan Keiser (Salon D)

8:00 – 9:00: Watermark Assessment Nightcap: enjoy your favorite drink and conversation with Monica L. Gallagher, Director of Campus Solutions with Watermark (Salon D)

Friday, November 9, 2018

8:00 – 9:00: Breakfast (Pavilion)

9:00 – 10:30: Content Expert Sessions by Topic Choice: Content experts will answer questions submitted institutions on Thursday. Additional questions may come from the floor. Participants are free to visit multiple sessions during this time period.

- Program Review, Program Assessment, and HLC Issues: Dr. Lou Slimak and Dr. David Hatfield (Allegheny Room)
- General Education and Program Assessment: Dr. Tracey Anderson and Dr. Jonathan Keiser (Kanawha Room)
- Co-Curricular Assessment: Dr. Leah Simpson and Dr. Tim Melvin (Blue Ridge Room)

10:30 – 10:45: Morning break

10:45 – 1:15: Finalization of Institutional Action Plans & working boxed lunch. Content experts will be available as needed.

- Bluefield; Glenville; Mountwest CTC; Shepherd (Kanawha Room)
- West Virginia and Potomac State; WVU at Parkersburg; WVU Institute of Technology; WV State (Blue Ridge Room)
- Pierpont CTC; Southern WV CTC; WV Northern CTC (Allegheny Room)
- Fairmont; West Liberty; Blue Ridge and Eastern WV CTC (Salon A)
- BridgeValley CTC; Concord; Marshall; New River CTC (Salon B)

Appendix B

1:30 – 2:00: Assessment Plan Sharing in an informal perusal of flip charts pasted throughout the ballroom. (Salons A and B)

2:00 - 2:30: Farewell and next steps (Salons A and B)

Appendix C: West Virginia Higher Education Assessment Council

Wednesday, May 1, 2019

1:00 – 4:00 PM

Pierpont CTC's Advanced Technology Center
500 Galliher Drive, Fairmont, WV 26554

Agenda

1. Greetings from Nancy Parks, Executive Director of Institutional Effectiveness & Accreditation; Coordinator/Advisor, Board of Governors AAS Degree Program; Academic Advising, Pierpont Community and Technical College
2. Co-Curricular Activities: What They Are and Best Practices for Assessing Them (40 minutes will be allotted for this activity)
 - We will discuss the differences/similarities between the Mintz and Rutter blog article and HLC's suggested definition and examples of co-curricular activities.
 - We will examine the two HLC core components (3.C and 4.B) that map closely to the co-curriculum.
 - We will entertain additional ideas on types of activities that should be included in co-curricular activities.
 - From there, we will break into three to four person groups, each of which will work on a proposed definition for "co-curricular activities."
 - We will reconvene as a large group to share ideas.

3. Student Services Offices: We should have a goal of assessing the effectiveness of all of our offices on campus, especially those that provide direct services to students. The list below includes some offices on campus that provide services to students. We will discuss the extent to which some of the offices listed below fulfill this definition of "co-curricular." If not, we will talk about how best to assess them: (30 minutes general discussion)

Housing and Residence Life	Counseling Center	Academic Support Services (Tutoring, Writing Center, etc.)
Registrar	Admissions and Recruiting	Disability Services
Bursar	University Libraries	Offices of Diversity and Inclusion
Career Services/Education	Student Leadership	Women's Centers
Financial Assistance	Student-Led Media	Others???
Academic and Career Advising	Student Employment	

4. Small group work (40 minutes for small group work)
 - In small groups we will do the following:
 - Identify a student service office or other co-curricular activity on our campuses.
 - Identify at least one goal of the office or activity, e.g. The Office of _____ will
 - How will we measure achievement of this goal?
 - Identify at least one student learning outcome (i.e. one thing students will learn from participating in the activity or through services from the office), e.g. Student will
 - See if this learning outcome maps to the learning outcomes of your institution, the CAS Learning and Development outcomes, or selected engagement indicators from the *National Survey of Student Engagement*.
 - Identify at least one direct and one indirect measure for the student learning outcome.
 - IMPORTANT: Make sure the measures will be able to be easily implemented and collected.
 - Identify a timeline for data analysis and improvement plan implementation.
5. Demonstrations of assessment systems used for assessment reporting (40 minutes will be devoted to this activity).
 - Laura Renninger (Shepherd University) will demonstrate WEAVE
 - Mary Beth Reynolds (Marshall University) will demonstrate Taskstream by Watermark
6. We will conclude this meeting by asking a designated speaker from each institution (or small group) report their plan to assess one student learning outcome developed for a co-curricular activity. (30 minutes will be devoted to our wrap-up)

Appendix D

Syllabus Assessment

Spring 2019



Syllabus Sample: Spring 2019

- There were 165 syllabi assigned for evaluation in the spring of 2019; 80 were from the College of Arts and Media and 85 were from the College of Education and Professional Development.
- Of these, 35 (21%) were not uploaded to MU-BERT, leaving 130 syllabi (55 from the College of Arts and Media and 75 from the College of Education and Professional Development) in the sample.
- Sixty-one (47%) of the 130 syllabi included all elements required by BOG Policy AA-14.

Areas of Concern Identified in 2014

% (below 90%) in 2014 with results from 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019

Syllabus Element	% of Syllabi - 2014	% of Syllabi – 2015	% of Syllabi – 2016	% of Syllabi – 2017	% of Syllabi-2018	% of syllabi-2019
Assessment Grid	58% - slightly improved from 52% in spring 2013	60%	72% - steady improvement, but not where we want to be.	58% - however, only evaluated syllabi that had been problematic in past.	78%	72%
Link to University Policies	76%	75%	92%	92%	90%	90%
Course Description from Catalog	82%	72%	87%	77%	90%	85%
Schedule	84%	91%	90%	90%	89%	87%
Location of Course	85%	82%	92%	92%	93%	87%
Days and Times Course Meets	87%	85%	95%	94%	94%	91%
Due Dates	87%	90%	92%	92%	91%	88%

Planned Actions from Spring 2014

(with updates)

- **Immediate**

- Send general feedback providing information about the syllabus elements most commonly not included to all faculty whose syllabi were assessed. **In the fall of 2014, this information was sent to all faculty whose syllabi has been evaluated in spring 2014. This process has occurred each year since 2014.**
- Send electronic copies of BOG Syllabus Policy and Marshall's Syllabus Template with current links to important university policies. **This information was sent to all faculty in the fall of 2014. Directions for finding current syllabus templates is sent each year.**
- Send individual feedback to all faculty whose syllabi were assessed using the syllabus check sheet. **– In the fall of 2014 this information was sent to faculty whose syllabi were assessed. This process has continued each year.**
- Consult with Faculty as needed. **– This occurred at the request of faculty. Ongoing.**

- **Ongoing**

- University Assessment Committee will continue to review syllabi in the spring semester of each academic year. **– Due to timing issues, academic year 2014-2015 syllabi were reviewed by the Assessment Coordinator and the Associate VP for Assessment. The Assessment Committee has reviewed syllabi in subsequent years.**
- If needed, the Center for Teaching and Learning may provide faculty development concerning syllabus construction. Emphasis will be placed on helping faculty design learning experiences within the course that will allow students to *practice* each course learning outcome. Then, faculty will determine how to authentically *assess* student achievement of each outcome *following* sufficient practice. **– The CTL includes this information in all pedagogical faculty development. Ongoing.**

Planned Actions Based on Spring 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019 Reviews

• Immediate

- Target feedback regarding the following syllabus elements to faculty whose syllabi did not contain these:
 - Assessment Grid (i.e. alignment of outcomes, practice, and assessment) - % of syllabi that include all elements of the grid has steadily increased (with the exception of 2017), but is still not where it should be.
 - Link to University Policies: www.marshall.edu/academic-affairs/policies/ - presence of link increased from 75% in spring 2015 to 90% or above.
 - Reason for requesting course description from catalog – inclusion of course description from catalog increased from 72% in spring 2015 to 85% in spring 2019.
 - Reasons for requesting course location and days/times courses meet
- Send electronic copies of BOG Syllabus Policy and Marshall’s Syllabus Template with current links to important university policies to all faculty.
- Send individual feedback to all faculty whose syllabi were assessed using the syllabus check sheet.
- Consult with Faculty as needed.

• Ongoing

- University Assessment Committee will continue to review syllabi in the spring semester of each academic year.
- University Assessment Committee also will review syllabi for dual credit courses in spring 2017. This was accomplished.
- If needed, the Center for Teaching and Learning may provide faculty development concerning syllabus construction. Emphasis will be placed on helping faculty design learning experiences within the course that will allow students to *practice* each course learning outcome. Then, faculty will determine how to authentically *assess* student achievement of each outcome following sufficient practice. – Inclusion of the assessment grid continues to improve each year. Only syllabi that had had issues in the past were assessed in spring 2017. We began a fresh assessment cycle in spring 2018 and concluded the cycle in spring 2019.

Appendix E

MARSHALL UNIVERSITY BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Policy No. AA-14

COURSE SYLLABUS

1 General Information.

- 1.1 Scope: Academic policy regarding content and distribution of course syllabus
- 1.2 Authority: W. Va. Code §18B-1-6
- 1.3 Passage Date: June 27, 2019
- 1.4 Effective Date: August 1, 2019
- 1.5 Controlling over: Marshall University
- 1.6 History: Amends previous version approved on 10/7/14 to reflect varying course delivery methods. This policy amends a previous version of AA-14 approved by the Board on March 8, 2006.

2 Policy

- 2.1 On the first day of each course (See 2.2 for Exceptions), the instructor must provide each student with access to a syllabus that provides the following information:
 - 2.1.1 Course name and number.
 - 2.1.2 Instructor's name, office location, phone, Marshall e-mail address (it is permissible to indicate a preference for students to use the internal e-mail within Marshall's learning management system) and office hours. In cases where the instructor does not have an office at Marshall, the departmental location and phone may be listed. Instructors may indicate the method by which they prefer students to contact them. All full-time instructors should list specific office hours; adjunct instructors and others whose contracts do not require office hours may list that their office hours are by appointment.
 - 2.1.3 List of all required texts.
 - 2.1.4 Attendance policy.
 - 2.1.5 Grading policy.
 - 2.1.6 Due dates for major projects and exams.
 - 2.1.7 Course description from most recent catalog.
 - 2.1.8 Course student learning outcomes
 - 2.1.9 Schedule of class sessions and assignments with the amount of detail appropriate to the discipline and course type.
 - 2.1.10 Grid showing the following relationships: how each course student learning outcome will be practiced, and assessed, in the course.
 - 2.1.11 Link to Official University Policies and Resources located on Academic Affairs' website.
 - 2.1.12 Semester course meets, e.g. spring 2012.
 - 2.1.13 Time course meets, e.g. M/W/F 1:00 – 1:50 (except in the case of asynchronous online courses).
 - 2.1.14 Course location (except in the case of asynchronous online courses).

2.2 Exceptions

2.2.1 This policy may not apply to the following types of courses: thesis, seminar, problem report, independent study, field work, internships, practicum, and medical clerkships.

2.2.2 Exceptions to Section 2.1 will be approved by the Department Chair in cases where an instructor appointment is made late for a course. Backdated course withdrawals and additions resulting from late syllabi distribution will be handled by the Department Chair granting exception to Section 2.1.

2.3 Colleges and academic units may develop more detailed requirements concerning the content of the syllabus.

Appendix F

Student Grading Versus Program Assessment

At Marshall University, it is our practice to use student performance on classroom projects and other assignments to assess student learning in our degree and certificate programs. Because of this, we are often asked if it is appropriate to use student grades on these projects for program assessment reporting. To answer this question, it is important to differentiate between the purpose of assessment of student learning in degree/certificate programs and the assessment of the learning of each student in specific courses.

Each degree program has specified a set of learning outcomes. These outcomes should articulate the knowledge and skills that students should achieve by the end of their programs of study. To achieve these outcomes, students complete a prescribed curriculum, consisting of a sequence of academic coursework (and perhaps co-curricular experiences as well). Courses should be designed intentionally so that each learning outcome the program's faculty feel is important for students to achieve is initially *introduced* in lower-division courses, progressively *practiced* or *applied* in succeeding coursework, and finally *achieved* by the final coursework or capstone experience.

Students receive grades from their instructors for each course in the sequence. The first thing to keep in mind is that most courses have more than one learning outcome and so the course grade is a holistic assessment of student performance on all course outcomes plus other factors such as attendance and participation. However, if we want to isolate a single outcome within a course (that perhaps aligns to an embedded program assessment), also keep in mind that the level of performance an instructor expects correlates with the level of the course. In lower division courses, where an outcome is simply introduced, an instructor would likely not assign the same complexity of assignment that s/he would assign in a mid-level or in the capstone course. Therefore, while a student in an introductory course may earn a grade of "A" on a project, that project should not reflect the complexity of the final outcome faculty wish to see in students during the program's capstone experience. Assessment rubrics should show that progression of complexity with each level (Introductory, Milestone, Capstone, and Advanced). Currently, we expect *milestone* level performance for artifacts from mid-level courses, where outcomes are *applied* or *practiced*. We expect *capstone* level performance for artifacts from capstone-level courses, where outcomes are *achieved*. And, on your assessment rubrics *capstone* level performance descriptions should describe what you think students pursuing baccalaureate degrees should *achieve* by graduation.

The next important question for program assessment purposes, even for a capstone project is, "What shows that a student has achieved *capstone* level performance?" Is it only the student who achieves a grade of "A" on the capstone project? If we say that we want all students who receive degrees from Marshall University to achieve its outcomes, then the benchmark of *capstone* at the end of the program must apply to students who receive a grade of "C" or better. If it is important for us to differentiate between performance that just barely meets the expected level "C" and performance that goes beyond this, we need additional levels of our rubric.

Also, please note students in graduate programs should be expected to achieve higher level outcomes than students in baccalaureate programs.