MARSHALL UNIVERSITY

University Assessment Report: Academic Year 2023-2024

Annual Program Assessment: 2022-2023

Assessment Committee members and the Assessment Office reviewed a total of 62 assessment reports. Thirty-three (out of 58; 57%) undergraduate degree programs (in some cases majors within a degree program) submitted reports for review. Twenty-three graduate degree programs (out of 57; 40%), ten graduate and post-master's certificate programs (out of 23; 43%) submitted reports. The Assessment Office sent evaluation letters to each of the programs reviewed, which included comments from de-identified reviewers when these were available. Additionally, each program received a rubric outlining performance in the following areas – *Student Learning Outcomes*; *Assessment Measures*; *Findings*; *Action Plan*; *Status Report*. Scoring statistics are provided in the charts below.

Undergraduate Degree Program Report Findings

Trait/Level	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 2.5	Level 3	Total
Learning Outcomes			1 (3%)		32 (97%)	**33**
Assessment Measures			5 (15%)	2 (6%)	26 (79%)	**33**
Findings	2 (6%)		7 (21%)		24 (43%)	**33**

Trait/Level	Not Present	Present	Total
Action Plans	7 (21%)	26 (79%)	**33**

Trait/Level	Not Present	Present for Some	Present for All	Total
Status Reports	13 (39%)	1 (13%)	19 (58%)	**33**

Graduate and Post-Master's Certificate Program Report Findings

Trait/Level	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 2.5	Level 3	Total
Learning Outcomes					10 (100%)	**10**
Assessment Measures			4 (40%)		6 (60%)	**10**
Findings				1 (17%)	5 (83%)	**6**

** No students were enrolled in one program.

Trait/Level	Not Present	Present	Total
Action Plans		2 (100%)	**2**

Trait/Level	Not Present	Present for Some	Present for All	Total
Status Reports			2 (100%)	**2**

University Assessment Report: Academic Year 2023-2024

Graduate Degree Program Report Findings

Trait/Level	Level 0	Level 1	Level 2	Level 2.5	Level 3	Total
Learning Outcomes					23 (100%)	**23**
Assessment Measures			3 (13%)	1 (4%)	19 (83%)	**23**
Findings	2 (10%)		3 (14%)	2 (10%)	14 (67%)	**21**

Trait/Level	Not Present	Present or Not Needed	Total
Action Plans		15 (100%)	**15**

Trait/Level	Not Present	Present for Some	Present for All	Total
Status Reports	2 (13%)	3 (20%)	10 (67%)	**15**

General Education Assessment: 2023-2024

The Summer Assessment Team completed three assessments in May/June 2023. These included evaluation of a random sample of baseline assessments completed as part of UNI 100 in conjunction with fall 2023 Week of Welcome, followed by an evaluation of final assessments completed by the baseline sample at the end of FYS during fall 2023 and spring 2024. Second, the team conducted an evaluation of random samples of student artifacts aligned to Marshall's Baccalaureate Degree Profile (BDP) outcomes *Creative Thinking*, *Inquiry-Based Thinking*, and *Quantitative Thinking*. Third, the team evaluated a sample of capstone artifacts using the AAC&U Value rubric for *Written Communication* and an adapted AAC&U Value rubric for *Critical Thinking*. Additionally, faculty from the English Department assess written communication abilities of students in composition classes and faculty from the Communication Studies Department assess oral communication abilities of students in the basic public speaking courses. 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: Comparison-of-Freshman-Baseline-with-First-Year-Seminar-Assessment-Results-2023-2024-optimized10.pdf (marshall.edu)

Baccalaureate Degree Profile Outcomes Assessment: BDP-Outcomes-Assessment-2024-updated-6-8-2024-optimized80.pdf (marshall.edu)

Capstone Artifact Assessment: Senior-Capstone-Assessment-2024-optimized98.pdf (marshall.edu)

Written Communication Assessment: Preview (taskstream.com)

Oral Communication Assessment (2022-2023): CMM-103-Assessment-2022-2023-Final61.pdf

University Assessment Report: Academic Year 2023-2024

Program Review

We conducted comprehensive five-year reviews for nine (9) undergraduate programs, eight (8) graduate programs, and five (5) graduate certificate programs. Programs, in conjunction with the Offices of Academic Affairs and Institutional Research and Planning, completed these reports using Taskstream by Watermark. The University's Academic Planning Committee reviewed all undergraduate programs and the Graduate Council reviewed all graduate programs. All programs that did not have programmatic accreditation also underwent peer review. Following these reviews, Marshall's provost and president reviewed each report. The following recommendations were approved by the Board of Governors on April 10, 2024.

Undergraduate Degree Programs	Recommendations
Foreign Languages-BA	Improve the program through advancements in efficiency, quality, productivity, and focus. We make the following specific recommendations: • The program needs a viable and workable assessment implementation plan. Faculty need a reliable and dependable strategy to collect, analyze, and report assessment results annually. Using those results, the program should develop an appropriate action plan to improve students' attainment of the program's expected learning outcomes. • Communication between specific language programs (e.g., Spanish, French, Japanese, etc.) needs to be improved. Independently operating silos, grouped by language, have formed and are preventing efficient sharing of resources and collaboration where needed. • A detailed and realistic plan for improvement is needed. This should be accompanied by redoubled efforts in marketing and recruitment for the foreign languages majors. Beyond the intrinsic value of language learning, earning a degree in another language opens doors to a range of career opportunities in international relations, business, diplomacy, and more.
History-BA	Continue at current level
Humanities-BA	Continue at current level
Sociology-BA (includes Anthropology major)	Continue at current level
Bachelor of Fine Arts (BFA)	Continue at current level
Bachelor of Arts (BA) in the Arts	Continue at current level
Regents' Bachelor of Arts (RBA)	Continue at current level
Biological Sciences-BS	Continue at current level
Health Sciences-BA	Continue at current level

University Assessment Report: Academic Year 2023-2024

Graduate Degree Programs	Recommendations
History-MA	Continue at current level
Humanities-MA	Continue at current level
Sociology-MA	Consolidate the program with another existing program. We make the following specific recommendation: • Explore combining this program with a related Marshall MA program. We will provide the BOG an update regarding this action during academic year 2024-2025.
Music-MA	Continue at current level
Biological Sciences-MS/MA	Continue at current level
Pharmaceutical Sciences0MS/MA	Continue at current level
Pharmacy-PharmD	Continue at current level
Physical Therapy-DPT	Continue at current level

Graduate Certificate Programs	Recommendations
Appalachian Studies	Continue at current level
Latin	Continue at current level
Public History	Continue at current level
Women's Studies	Continue at current level
Bioinformatics	Discontinue the program after all enrolled students have completed it. This recommendation is made due to minimal past enrollment, no completers during the review period, and lack of qualified instructors at the present time.

Assessment Day

Results for campus-wide surveys have been sent to originating offices and have been posted to the Assessment website. More information about Assessment Day activities is available at Assessment Day Activity Details – Office of Assessment & Quality Initiatives (marshall.edu) and at Assessment Day Survey Results – Office of Assessment & Quality Initiatives (marshall.edu).

Please go to the next page for the appended Syllabus Evaluation Report.

Marshall University
Syllabus Evaluation
Spring 2024

A total of 144 course syllabi were reviewed in spring 2024. The main purpose of this review was to evaluate whether (or not) syllabi from sections of the same course offered in different modalities reflected the same student learning outcomes.

Of the 144 course syllabi reviewed, three did not have syllabi available for a second section taught using a different modality. Additionally, rather than reviewing only two sections per course, we reviewed three sections for three unique courses (two of one modality and one of another). In the final pairing, we eliminated the three redundant sections, reducing the number of unique courses in each modality to 138, resulting in 69 unique course pairs. Two of the remaining course syllabus pairs were eliminated from this analysis because one section of each of these pairs included **no student learning outcomes on their syllabi!** This reduced our number of usable pairs to 67.

As shown in the chart below, 60 syllabus pairs had one face-to-face (F2F) section and an asynchronous online section. Two pairs had one F2F section and a section taught off-campus. Five pairs compared one asynchronous online section with an off-campus section. We found that student learning outcomes in 24 (36%) of the 67 course section pairs evaluated did not match. All of these pairs were F2F and Online sections of the same course.

Modality * Outcomes Crosstabulation
Count

		Outcomes		
		Match	Do not match	Total
Modality	F2F-Online	36	24	60
	F2F-Off Campus	2	0	2
	Online-Off Campus	5	0	5
Total		43	24	67

Please see the breakdown below for each academic college with syllabi reviewed.

Marshall University Syllabus Evaluation-Spring 2024

College

College	Number of Course Pairs with Matching Outcomes	Number of Course Pairs with Outcomes that did not Match	Total (% of Courses with Matching Outcomes)
Academic Affairs	1	0	**1 (100%)**
Arts and Media	1	0	**1 (100%)**
Business	9	8	**17 (53%)**
Education & PD	4	0	**4 (100%)**
Health Professions	9	3	**12 (75%)**
Liberal Arts	12	6	**18 (67%)**
Science	4	6	**10 (40%)**
Engineering & CS	3	1	**4 (75%)**
Total	43	24	**67 (64%)**

We reviewed seventeen courses (seven course pairs and one course with three sections) with Critical Thinking (CT) designations. Thirteen of the seventeen course syllabi included the Baccalaureate Degree Profile's (BDP) Integrative Thinking outcome and four additional BDP outcomes. It was not clear why the other four syllabi did not include the BDP outcomes required for CT courses.

We reviewed four courses (two pairs) with international designations. One section of one of the courses included the appropriate sections of the BDP's Intercultural outcome on their f2f syllabus, but not on their online syllabus. The other course included outcomes that aligned to global issues, but these were worded quite differently than the BDP's Intercultural outcome. Finally, there was one course pair, where neither the f2f nor the online syllabus made any mention of its being a course with Multicultural credit.

Of the total syllabi (144) reviewed we found the following number of syllabi with required items missing:

Due Dates	Course Meeting Schedule	Days and Times of Classes	Class Location	Course Description from Catalog
6 (4%)	4 (3%)	5 (3%)	8 (6%)	20 (14%)

Assessment Grid	Semester Course Offered	Office Hours	Attendance Policy	Office Location
14 + 6 partial (14%)	6 (4%)	6 (4%)	10 (7%)	3 (2%)

Office Phone	Student Learning Outcomes	Course Name	Link to University Policies	Grading Policy
13 (9%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)	5 (3%)	1 (1%)

Of the required syllabus elements, all but two were present on 90% or more of the syllabi reviewed. The two that fell below the 90% threshold were **course description from the most recent catalog** and **an assessment grid** that shows **student learning outcomes** and **1) opportunities students will have to *practice* these outcomes** and **2) how student performance on each of these outcomes will be assessed.**

Marshall University Syllabus Evaluation-Spring 2024

The university believes that it is important that each syllabus include the catalog description. This ensures that course instructors are aware of the university's official description of the course content. If instructors believe this description does not adequately explain the course, they should work with their department to officially change the course description through the university's shared governance process.

Student learning outcomes represent statements of what students are expected to know (knowledge) and be able to do (skills) at the conclusion of the course. It is important that students have multiple opportunities within the course to achieve the knowledge and practice the skills. Finally, it is imperative that the course instructor design assessments to determine whether (or not) students demonstrate adequate performance on these expected outcomes by the course's conclusion. If the instructor finds that this is not the case, the appropriate action is to determine what changes they might make in the course to ensure that students demonstrate adequate performance on these outcomes by the course's conclusion.

Finally, although we acknowledge that different teaching methods can lead to the same outcomes for students, we stress that a single course, with the same catalog description, should have the same learning outcomes regardless of the course instructor or modality in which the course is delivered. Our finding that, of the 67 course pairs evaluated, only 43 (64%) had the same outcomes across sections, is concerning.