

Marshall University - WV

HLC ID 1665

OPEN PATHWAY: Reaffirmation Review

Visit Date: 10/12/2015

Gary White
President

Andrew Lootens-White
HLC Liaison

Charles Hannah
Team Member

H. Bart Merkle
Team Member

Sue Darby
Review Team Chair

Christine Imbra
Team Member

David Moon
Team Member

Janna Oakes
Federal Compliance Reviewer

Wendy Lucas
Team Member

Josie Welsh
Team Member

Context and Nature of Review

Visit Date

10/12/2015

Mid-Cycle Reviews include:

- The Year 4 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Biennial Review for Applying institutions

Reaffirmation Reviews include:

- The Year 10 Review in the Open and Standard Pathways
- The Review for Initial Candidacy for Applying institutions
- The Review for Initial Accreditation for Applying institutions
- The Year 4 Review for Standard Pathway institutions that are in their first accreditation cycle after attaining initial accreditation

Scope of Review

- Reaffirmation Review
- Federal Compliance
- On-site Visit
- Multi-Campus Visit (if applicable)

There are no forms assigned.

Institutional Context

Marshall traces its origin to 1837 when residents of the community of Guyandotte, then part of Virginia, and the farming region nearby turned their attention to providing better educational facilities for their sons and daughters. Local lawyer, John Laidley, hosted the interested families and suggested it be named Marshall Academy in honor of a friend of Laidley's, the late Chief Justice of the United States John Marshall.

Marshall has enjoyed continuous accreditation with the Higher Learning Commission since 1928. The most recent accreditation visit occurred in 2006. The current visit is the first year 10 review in the Open Pathways process.

Interactions with Constituencies

President and President's Cabinet (11)

Interim President

Senior VP for Development, CEO Marshall University Foundation

General Counsel, Senior VP for Executive Affairs

Senior VP for Information Technology

Director of Athletics

Senior VP for Finance, CFO

Senior VP for Operations, Chief of Staff

VP for Research, Executive Director Marshall Research Corporation

Provost and Senior VP for Academic Affairs, CAO

Dean of the Joan C. Edwards School of Medicine

Senior VP for Institutional Research and Planning

Criterion Team Leaders and Assurance Argument writer (6)

Associate Professor of English, Chief Assurance Argument Writer

Professor and Director of Graduate Program in Humanities

Carter G Woodson Professor of Journalism and Member of Faculty Senate

Professor of English

Associate VP for Assessment and Quality Initiatives

Senior VP for Institutional Research and Planning

(Area of Focus) Assessment (29)

Meeting with Board of Governors

One faculty, one staff representative, MU legal council (10)

BOG members

(Open Forum) Areas of Strength and Weakness in Criteria (23)

(Area of Focus) Retention (29)

Drop-in Session Students (11)

Graduate Students (35)

(Open Forum) Criteria 1 & 2 (30)

(Open Forum) Criteria 3 & 4 (44)

(Open Forum) Criterion 5 (17)

Federal Compliance (11)

SVP Institutional Research and Planning

Provost

Associate General Counsel

Director of Admissions and Instructional Student Services

Registrar

AVP for IT Online Learning and Libraries

Director of Student Conduct

Interim Dean, Student Affairs

Assistant Dean, Student Affairs

Director of Student Financial Assistance

Finance

Drop-in Session: Faculty (9)

Associate Dean of College of Arts & Media, Professor of Advertising

Chair of History Department

Associate Professor of Reference Department

Professor of Music

Clinical faculty in Communication Disorders

Associate Professor of Communication Disorders

Clinical Assistant Professor of Communication Disorders

Associate Professor of Communication Studies; Associate Dean of Honors College

Academic English Coordinator for INTO Marshall

Drop-in Session: Staff (27)

Deans of Marshall University Colleges (10)

College of Business

College of Liberal Arts

College of Education and Professional Development

College of Science

College of Arts and Media

School of Pharmacy

Academic Affairs

Student Affairs

Academic Affairs/Undergraduate Studies

College of Information Technology and Engineering

Meeting with President's Cabinet (8)

VP of Research

Dean, School of Medicine

Provost

Legal Counsel

Senior VP of Development

Senior VP/CIO

Interim President

Director of Athletics

(Area of Focus) Underrepresented and Diversity (17)

Additional Documents

NSSE data for 2015

Brochure Marshall University Office of Intercultural Affairs

Physical Activity, Eating Habits, and Health in Western West Virginia: Results of the 2013 Marshall University Econometrics Survey, July 2013.

Economic and Socio-demographic Trends Affecting Cabell County and West Virginia, July 2014.

Marshall University Music Program response to NASM (no date)

Marshall University Office of IR, Graduation Rates of First-Time, Full-Time Freshmen, Cohort Group: 2008

Letter from President Kopp to Charleston Area Medical Center re: HLC approval of DMPNA degree program

State of WV Corrective Action Plan for the Fiscal Year Ended June 30, 2014

July 21, 2015 Letter from (email) CAATE accepting Progress Report for athletic training

July 8, 2015 NASM Commission Action Report

Draft of Documentation to support Change Request for the DMPNA

Syllabi for Marshall's courses with Critical Thinking (CT) Designations from fall 2015

Syllabi for Marshall's courses with International (INT) Designations from fall 2015

Syllabi for Marshall's courses with Multicultural (MC) Designations from fall 2015

Faculty data sheets (from Digital Measures) for instructors of CT, INT, and MC courses during fall 2015

Excel Spreadsheet with CT, INT, and MC course lists from fall 2015 showing instructor and whether or not the syllabus was included in the syllabi submitted

Same Excel Spreadsheet with a tab listing instructors and whether or not their data sheets were included

Syllabi for Marshall's Dual Credit Courses

Dual Credit Course Instructor CVs

Dual Credit Course Approval Templates

Explanation of Dual Credit Course and Instructor Approval Policy

Excel Spreadsheet listing dual credit courses, enrollments, locations, instructors, CV, and syllabi (whether or not latter two were provided) for fall 2014 and spring 2015.

Word Document outlining where in the Assurance Argument evidence requested could be found.

Word Document listing all evidence requested.

Excel Spreadsheet listing all Dual Credit Courses taught Fall 2014 and Spring 2015 with instructor name, location, and enrollment.

Excel Sheet with listing of all graduate faculty

Library Overview PDF

Library Holdings PDF

Library Database List PDF

Library IPEDS ALS Data PDF

Library 2015 Information Literacy Assessment Report PDF

Student Athlete Handbook PDF

Word Document listing Marshall University Standing Committees

Marshall University FY2015-2016 Budget PDF

Word Document listing members of Marshall University's Budget Workgroup

Excel File documenting online course review and faculty certification status

Faculty Development Fund Information in PDF format

Excel sheet detailing funds spent on faculty development

Graduate Council minutes for academic year 2014-2015 PDF

Excel File showing Graduate Faculty Credentialing Audits

Graduate Faculty Redbook in both Excel and PDF formats

1 - Mission

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

1.A - Core Component 1.A

The institution's mission is broadly understood within the institution and guides its operations.

1. The mission statement is developed through a process suited to the nature and culture of the institution and is adopted by the governing board.
2. The institution's academic programs, student support services, and enrollment profile are consistent with its stated mission.
3. The institution's planning and budgeting priorities align with and support the mission. (This sub-component may be addressed by reference to the response to Criterion 5.C.1.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

The current mission of the university focuses on facilitating learning through the preservation, discovery, synthesis, and dissemination of knowledge. A committee representing faculty, students, staff and administrators studied the viability of the mission statement. Finding it still appropriate, it was forwarded and approved by the Faculty Senate and the Board of Governors. The March 25, 2004 and the May 12, 2004 minutes of these respective bodies reveal these actions. During conversations with the team, students, faculty, staff, and board members indicated an understanding of the mission.

The West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHEPC) requires all WV educational institutions to review academic programs once every five (5) years to ensure a program's continued alignment with the mission of an individual college and the university. Additionally, MU has initiated an Academic Portfolio Review process so that each academic unit also develops a Niche Statement providing a rationale for sustaining the program at current or reduced resources statements which includes ways the program supports the strategic plan and mission of the university. For example, a review of the program review template, the Portfolio Review template, and departmental niche statements for the English department and for the School of Art and Design revealed how these academic programs demonstrate alignment with the university's mission. Conversations with faculty and administrators confirmed program alignment with university mission is reviewed regularly reviewed. The university's enrollment is consistent with its mission to provide quality undergraduate and graduate education for students in the state and the region. Enrollment data reviewed by the team revealed that 86 percent of students are from West Virginia or the surrounding counties in Kentucky and Ohio.

The team found that the university's planning and budgeting priorities support the mission. Evidence

of this alignment is addressed in detail in Criterion 5.C.1.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.B - Core Component 1.B

The mission is articulated publicly.

1. The institution clearly articulates its mission through one or more public documents, such as statements of purpose, vision, values, goals, plans, or institutional priorities.
2. The mission document or documents are current and explain the extent of the institution's emphasis on the various aspects of its mission, such as instruction, scholarship, research, application of research, creative works, clinical service, public service, economic development, and religious or cultural purpose.
3. The mission document or documents identify the nature, scope, and intended constituents of the higher education programs and services the institution provides.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The university's mission is evident in numerous documents and publications such as the university website, undergraduate and graduate catalogs, faculty handbook. Additionally, the Marshall Creed, which reflects the values embedded in the mission, is accessible via the website, catalogs, and Student Handbook. A review of these documents verified that the mission and creed are published in these resources.

MU recently reviewed the mission statement through a multi-level inclusive process. With this input the BOG concluded the mission is still relevant and current. There are numerous ways that the university operates to emphasize aspects of its mission. Conversations with faculty, administrators, and board members revealed the following examples:

- Faculty are viewed as caring, effective teachers;
- Counseling and tutoring services contribute to student success;
- Marshall Medical Outreach program provides services to homeless in the local community;
- Robert C. Byrd Center for Advanced and Flexible Manufacturing provides assistance to small and medium-sized businesses;
- Center for Business and Economic Research provides economic, policy, and financial research for governmental agencies, non-profits, and private firms in the state and surrounding regions;
- Visual Arts Center contributes to making the community a better place through the artistic and cultural offerings.

Each of these examples shared with the team illustrate ways that the university's actions are consistent with the university mission which emphasizes: quality, accessible education appropriate for the state and region; fostering faculty, staff, and student outreach through service activities; enhancement of economic development and health care in the region; and furthering the intellectual, artistic, and cultural life of the community and region.

The university has articulated goals and strategies for implementing the mission of the university

through the Marshall Strategic Initiative and the Marshall 20/20 Plan. A review of these documents and conversations with faculty and administrators reveal there is an understanding about who the constituencies of the university are and what the university is doing to achieve its mission. For example, BOG members stated MU would take southwest West Virginia from the coal fields, manufacturing, rail, river, and steel to service technology, health, and education. Another BOG member said that the salvation for West Virginia is education, and MU is instrumental. Conversations with students, faculty, and staff reveal there are ongoing efforts to update the community regarding progress through presidential updates (i.e., 2008, 2010, and 2013) and information available through the university's website (i.e., Marshall 20/20). This web page provides a link to "latest updates" from the president and invites members of the community to attend a monthly administrator's informal Open House for refreshments and conversation about current issues at the university.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.C - Core Component 1.C

The institution understands the relationship between its mission and the diversity of society.

1. The institution addresses its role in a multicultural society.
2. The institution's processes and activities reflect attention to human diversity as appropriate within its mission and for the constituencies it serves.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The university's commitment to preparing students to live in a diverse, pluralistic society is evident in various ways. First is Marshall's mission, vision, and creed statements and second, the university's efforts to recruit diverse students and faculty as exhibited in the Intercultural Students' Weekend recruitment event and Chancellor's Scholars Program for minority doctoral students. Other examples are found in curricular offerings such as multicultural/international courses in the general education program.

Conversations with students, faculty, and staff confirmed the university values diversity and is acting upon this articulated commitment to prepare students for a diverse, changing world. Some examples shared with the team include: the varied program offerings and support services provided by the Office of Intercultural Affairs; a faculty member's description of a strategy used to discuss the difficult issue of "white privilege" in the classroom; the intentional hiring of diverse students to serve as tutors; activities sponsored by the International Office, the LGBT Office, and the Center for African American Students; and the Faculty-In-Residence program through Residence Life.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.D - Core Component 1.D

The institution's mission demonstrates commitment to the public good.

1. Actions and decisions reflect an understanding that in its educational role the institution serves the public, not solely the institution, and thus entails a public obligation.
2. The institution's educational responsibilities take primacy over other purposes, such as generating financial returns for investors, contributing to a related or parent organization, or supporting external interests.
3. The institution engages with its identified external constituencies and communities of interest and responds to their needs as its mission and capacity allow.

Rating

Met

Evidence

In 2005, Marshall invited input from the community. Members of the BOG and various administrators reported when the university developed its Vision Statement, a dedicated portal was established to solicit ideas and feedback from members of the university community, alumni and friends, and interested parties in the external community. The feedback was extensive and assisted the university to develop strategic themes and areas of planning which have guided the development of the university's strategic initiatives. Presidential updates in 2008, 2010, and 2013 affirmed the mission was current and contributed to the public good. In 2014 the president appointed a Vision Statement Team involving students, faculty, staff, and administrators to review the university's mission. At the time of the team visit, the process was not completed.

Administrators reported several examples of ways the university supports the educational primacy over other purposes by reducing the credit hour graduation requirement to 120 hours in several academic programs; providing employees with an undergraduate tuition assistance program for dependents; and having BOG individual and university conflict of interest policies that ensure ethical behavior in research, financial, and partnership endeavors.

A review of numerous documents reveal a myriad of ways the university connects and collaborates with the community. Further, discussions with students, faculty, and staff revealed many examples of these involvements: service learning designated courses engaging over 1,800 students in community projects over the past five years; a wide variety of internships and clinical placements; four TRiO programs that assist first generation, low income, and underrepresented students; providing medical care for the uninsured; providing economic development assistance to businesses and other agencies; and an array of athletic, artistic, musical, and theater events open to the local community. These endeavors reinforce the university claim that MU enjoys a close, collaborative relationship with the Huntington community.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

1.S - Criterion 1 - Summary

The institution's mission is clear and articulated publicly; it guides the institution's operations.

Evidence

Criterion 1 focuses on the mission of the institution that guides its operations. The Assurance Argument developed by the university addressed how their mission is articulated publicly, whether constituents understand the mission, the connection between their mission and diversity in society, and how their mission supports the public good.

The team read the Assurance Argument, examined an array of documents cited in the argument and made available on campus, and interacted with multiple constituencies.

Following an analysis of these data and of conversations held during the campus visit, the team concludes that Marshall University meets Criterion 1.

2 - Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

2.A - Core Component 2.A

The institution operates with integrity in its financial, academic, personnel, and auxiliary functions; it establishes and follows policies and processes for fair and ethical behavior on the part of its governing board, administration, faculty, and staff.

Rating

Met

Evidence

A significant number of documents reviewed by the team provided ample evidence the university acts with integrity. Standards and policies are in place, through multiple entities and governing bodies, including the BOG, HEPC, and State of WV. These policies, rules, codes of ethics, accountability systems, procedures, and guidelines insure MU is transparent in regard to employees, students, academics, fiscal matters, and investments. MU policies are easily accessible by way of the BOG policies, MU Greenbook, Classified Staff Handbook, Student Handbook, Student-Athlete Handbook, Foundation policies, HEPC policies and accountability system, and the State of WV policies associated to higher education. A majority of information and documents reviewed were found on MU's website.

While at MU, the team met with a variety of constituents including the Board of Governors, the president, cabinet members, academic deans, department chairs, faculty members, students, and staff. Conversations in these meetings reinforce that important information and documents are shared with the campus, and that constituents have adequate access to information and policies, which are linked to their respective roles at MU. The MU website, a SharePoint portal, college list-serves, college deans, and department chairs appear to provide employees and students with multiple ways to stay connected and current. For example, various ethical codes and policies reviewed by the team guide employees and students in regard to academic integrity, computer use, copyright, and sexual harassment.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.B - Core Component 2.B

The institution presents itself clearly and completely to its students and to the public with regard to its programs, requirements, faculty and staff, costs to students, control, and accreditation relationships.

Rating

Met

Evidence

MU documents reviewed by the team provide employees, students, and the Huntington community with important information regarding program offerings, program requirements, faculty credentials, and student costs. For example, the MU website includes handbooks that are user-friendly, clear, current, and inclusive of policies and pertinent information. In addition, the MU website includes a "Consumer Information and Disclosures" page that serves an important role in giving current and prospective students and parents clear and thorough information about MU. For example, this site includes information about general university services, student financial assistance, health and safety information, student outcomes, intercollegiate athletics, and voter registration.

Finally, program, unit, and university accreditations are listed on the "Accreditation" page of the MU website, including the HLC Mark of Affiliation which is prominently visible.

The undergraduate and graduate catalogs are comprehensive and allow students to view a program of interest in its entirety. There is information about college-level and program-level requirements for both undergraduate and graduate students. Alumni are kept apprised of MU activities and initiatives via the "Marshall Magazine," and there are many MU employees who are graduates of the university, including the interim president. In conversations with dozens of students, staff, faculty, and administrators, the review team concluded the MU campus community is given clear and updated information and kept apprised about changes and transitions through of variety of vehicles.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.C - Core Component 2.C

The governing board of the institution is sufficiently autonomous to make decisions in the best interest of the institution and to assure its integrity.

1. The governing board's deliberations reflect priorities to preserve and enhance the institution.
2. The governing board reviews and considers the reasonable and relevant interests of the institution's internal and external constituencies during its decision-making deliberations.
3. The governing board preserves its independence from undue influence on the part of donors, elected officials, ownership interests or other external parties when such influence would not be in the best interest of the institution.
4. The governing board delegates day-to-day management of the institution to the administration and expects the faculty to oversee academic matters.

Rating

Met

Evidence

The review team met with the MU BOG and determined members are committed to the university and work diligently to support the president and move the university's initiatives forward. As granted by the West Virginia State Code, the BOG has fiduciary responsibility for the university and develops policies regarding academic affairs, financial affairs, general administration, etc. The BOG is required to meet six times/year, approve policies, oversee program review, provide minutes to meetings, and approve search processes. In 2009, the BOG streamlined its organizational structure to "reflect more accurately its actual practices and to meet the needs of its constituents" by forming four sub-committees: Executive; Academic and Student Affairs; Financial, Audit, and Faculty Planning; and Evaluation and Nominating which includes a Compensation sub-committee. Two of the committees meet ad hoc and two meet regularly.

The BOG delegates power and control of day-to-day operations to the MU president. When asked how the BOG requests or receives feedback from external and internal constituents, members stated this typically occurs on a one-to-one basis, or the faculty, staff, or student board representative brings feedback from their respective constituencies. In addition, a variety of campus constituents, through their representatives, are given a 30-day comment period pertaining to Board action.

The BOG acts independently from the influence of donors, elected officials, and other constituents. The BOG upholds a "conflict of interest" policy, must hold open public meetings, and must publish meeting minutes. All of these documents were reviewed by the visiting team. In addition, the Governor of WV appoints all BOG members for the express purpose of insuring BOG independence from undue influence.

A 2002 BOG resolution states day-to-day responsibility and management of MU is delegated to the president. The resolution then states the president has the authority to further delegate to campus designees. Evidence provided in documents and in meeting with the faculty confirmed this body

oversees day-to-day activities such as curriculum, assessment, and instruction.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.D - Core Component 2.D

The institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning.

Rating

Met

Evidence

MU provides a variety of opportunities to inform and provide evidence to campus constituents that it honors and supports freedom of expression. For example, the MU Creed states that the university is steadfast in "uncompromisingly protecting freedom of thought..." Various activities are held throughout the year to create awareness and educate the campus community about free expression, including Banned Book Week and an annual Amicus Curiae Lecture Series, supported by grant funds, that tackles a variety of topics. The BOG also has a policy on Student Rights that includes freedom of expression.

The pursuit of truth in teaching and learning is also rooted in the MU Creed and states in part that members of the educational community "work together to promote and strengthen teaching and learning." In addition, teaching and learning is also embedded a variety of other documents, including the MU and HEPC policies, and the faculty Constitution. Conversations with individuals and groups on campus provided evidence to the review team that members of MU feel free to express themselves on issues important to the campus community.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.E - Core Component 2.E

The institution's policies and procedures call for responsible acquisition, discovery and application of knowledge by its faculty, students and staff.

1. The institution provides effective oversight and support services to ensure the integrity of research and scholarly practice conducted by its faculty, staff, and students.
2. Students are offered guidance in the ethical use of information resources.
3. The institution has and enforces policies on academic honesty and integrity.

Rating

Met

Evidence

MU is thorough in disseminating information, policies, and protocols related to the acquisition, discovery, and application of knowledge. Their creed, ethics, and conflict of interest statements are transparent and contained in a variety of resources and in various sections of the website. For example, MU has a well-established Office of Research Integrity (ORI) that oversees the university Review Board (IRB), and the BOG has individual, university, and general conflict of interest policies. In addition, MU posts this information on a variety of pages of the MU website, including Human Resources and ORI. Finally, MU policies cover everything from scientific research, to animal welfare, to bio-safety, and includes the National Institute of Health (NIH) guidelines and policies regarding research.

Students are given a variety of opportunities to learn about ethics and research at MU. For example, the MU degree profiles include rubrics pertaining to ethics and civic thinking, and other aspects of "reflective critical, creative, and ethical thinking." In addition, the library instructs students in Information Literacy. The MU Writing Center offers research assistance to students as well. Finally, two general education English courses include instruction on the "ethics of research and writing."

The BOG policy on academic dishonesty specifically addresses the ethical behavior of students, and all MU handbooks reviewed contained statements on academic dishonesty. In addition, faculty members are encouraged to report student academic dishonesty and to provide a link to the academic integrity policy on every course syllabus. Finally, the *Greenbook* and Student Athlete Handbook address academic integrity in regard to coaches and athletes, who are also covered under NCAA guidelines.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

2.S - Criterion 2 - Summary

The institution acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Evidence

Marshall University provided significant evidence, regarding Criterion 2, that it operates with integrity, establishes and follows fair and ethical practices, and presents itself clearly and completely to students and the public. The university is transparent in that policies are made available to constituents on the MU website, and all faculty, staff, and student handbooks contain sections that include MU policies and practices.

In addition, the Board of Governors is sufficiently autonomous, and the institution is committed to freedom of expression and the pursuit of truth in teaching and learning. The MU Creed and several university documents clearly and publicly state that freedom of expression is embraced and valued. Finally, the institution insures faculty, students, and staff acquire, discover, and apply knowledge responsibly by having a variety of checks and balances in place, in multiple offices on campus, and by making available instruction and training on a variety of research-related topics.

Given this, the review team, after reading the Assurance Argument, examining an array of documents cited in the argument and those made available on-site, and interacting with multiple constituencies, concludes that Marshall University acts with integrity; its conduct is ethical and responsible.

Criterion Two is met.

3 - Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

3.A - Core Component 3.A

The institution's degree programs are appropriate to higher education.

1. Courses and programs are current and require levels of performance by students appropriate to the degree or certificate awarded.
2. The institution articulates and differentiates learning goals for undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.
3. The institution's program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery and all locations (on the main campus, at additional locations, by distance delivery, as dual credit, through contractual or consortial arrangements, or any other modality).

Rating

Met

Evidence

Currency and centrality of programs are monitored by Academic Affairs through professional accreditation status, five-year program reviews, and niche statements submitted by departments every five years. A review of templates for these reports provides evidence program learning outcomes have been recently updated to align with the university's degree profile. Marshall's degree profile ensures performance expected at each degree level reflects increased expectations, rigor, and complexity. Further evidence of currency is provided through the "curricular conditions" section of the niche template which requires programs to articulate current curricular conditions that promote sustainability of the program. For example, metrics for this section include enrollment, market, Student Credit Hour (SCH) production, opportunities for service learning, and opportunities for interdisciplinary study. Interviews with program directors provided evidence that recommendations by outside reviewers are taken seriously by the departments. For example, the music department responded to concerns raised by its accrediting body, National Association of Schools of Music (NASM), about acoustic issues in the fine arts building. Students are now encouraged to wear protective earphones in the practice rooms, all of which are being retrofitted to meet professional standards.

A core of 24 Marshall faculty led the HLC's Pathways Demonstration Project, through which 92 percent of all programs examined and modified their learning outcomes at each degree level according to the Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP). Marshall's resulting degree profile provides evidence that learning outcomes are differentiated at the undergraduate, graduate, post-baccalaureate, post-graduate, and certificate programs.

Program quality and learning goals are consistent across all modes of delivery. For example, dual credit courses taught in the high school are expected to mirror the college course. A review of the dual credit manual provides evidence instructors must be appropriately qualified, use the same university textbooks as used on campus, and follow standardized syllabi. On-site interviews with departments offering dual credit courses confirmed appropriate training for high school instructors is provided; common assessments are used; grading is compared; faculty are visited on site. A review of curriculum vitas indicate high school faculty are properly credentialed.

Online courses are vetted through the Quality Matters criteria and are reviewed every three years for use of best practices. Marshall recently purchased assessment management software for course-level assessment through Blackboard. Implementation of the outcomes module will allow for increased monitoring and assessment of courses and programs.

Programs offered through consortial arrangements were reviewed through Marshall's assessment website. A health care program offered through a partnership with St. Mary's follows the same syllabus template as used by programs delivered on campus. Quality of these programs is further monitored by outside professional accrediting bodies.

Evaluation of program quality occurs at every level of academic administration. For example, the Program Review Committee, which includes board members, mandates presentation of five-year program reviews, including assessment by both internal constituencies and outside evaluators, to the Board of Governors at regular meetings.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.B - Core Component 3.B

The institution demonstrates that the exercise of intellectual inquiry and the acquisition, application, and integration of broad learning and skills are integral to its educational programs.

1. The general education program is appropriate to the mission, educational offerings, and degree levels of the institution.
2. The institution articulates the purposes, content, and intended learning outcomes of its undergraduate general education requirements. The program of general education is grounded in a philosophy or framework developed by the institution or adopted from an established framework. It imparts broad knowledge and intellectual concepts to students and develops skills and attitudes that the institution believes every college-educated person should possess.
3. Every degree program offered by the institution engages students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments.
4. The education offered by the institution recognizes the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work.
5. The faculty and students contribute to scholarship, creative work, and the discovery of knowledge to the extent appropriate to their programs and the institution's mission.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Extensive involvement by Faculty Senate in the redesign of the general education core curriculum transitioned Marshall University's general education program from a distributive model of coursework to a set of core domains focused on critical and integrative thinking, diversity, and civic engagement. These domains align with the university's mission to nurture students' critical thinking skills, to increase knowledge and creativity, and to enlarge their sense of community and civic responsibility.

Every degree program requires students to complete the core curriculum. The course catalog, Registrar's webpage, and General Education webpage explain the general education curriculum is designed to promote critical thinking skills and basic domains of thinking linking the very first classes a student takes to the capstone experience within each major. The learning outcomes of the general education program promote communication fluency, creative thinking, and quantitative thinking the university believes are essential for the lifelong learning of all students, regardless of academic major.

Three university-wide learning outcomes developed through the DQP are linked to all degree programs. These outcomes, Ethical and Civic Thinking, Quantitative Thinking, and Intercultural Thinking, ensure all degree programs engage students in collecting, analyzing, and communicating information; in mastering modes of inquiry or creative work; and in developing skills adaptable to changing environments. These general education outcomes also form the core of the first-year

experience course in which every student enrolls.

Recognizing the human and cultural diversity of the world in which students live and work, Marshall requires all students to complete a course with the intercultural competence designation. Across academic majors, students report that classroom discussions and assignments require them to consider diverse perspectives with significantly higher frequency than those of their peers (NSSE 2015). Education provided by co-curricular units also recognizes human and cultural diversity. For example, assessment of the multicultural office suggests a lack of diversity in office staff was deterring international students from using support services. In response, the director changed the name to the intercultural office and hired a diverse, international leadership team. Inquiries and usage of the office have grown significantly since new staff were hired. Additionally, a "World Council" has been convened to educate staff and students as they seek to create an intercultural, inclusive university. Representatives from the LGBT community serve on this council. Finally it is important to note, *Pride Magazine* recently ranked Marshall the most friendly LGBT campus in West Virginia.

Units often seen simply as support centers have intentionally adopted student learning outcomes and operated at the co-curricular level. For example, staff from Disability Services conduct workshops to educate members of the Greek community about social interaction with students with disabilities. Staff also conduct faculty workshops on effective teaching strategies for engaging students with disabilities. For faculty who teach online, the faculty center has encouraged participation in the Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) community through which domestic and international faculty team-teach online courses.

Marshall faculty decide yearly how to structure their time regarding scholarship, teaching, and service. Within a designated range, the chair and dean use the individual formulas to evaluate faculty performance. Faculty productivity is reported through Digital Measures. According to NSSE 2015 data, 38 percent of seniors conduct research with a faculty member. The newly instituted Marshall University Research Corporation assists faculty in securing and managing research grants. For example, a chemistry professor recently secured a three-year, \$65,000 grant to do petroleum research with the assistance of undergraduate students. College of Arts and Media faculty earmark funding support study abroad opportunities for students to study studio art and art history in Florence, Italy.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.C - Core Component 3.C

The institution has the faculty and staff needed for effective, high-quality programs and student services.

1. The institution has sufficient numbers and continuity of faculty members to carry out both the classroom and the non-classroom roles of faculty, including oversight of the curriculum and expectations for student performance; establishment of academic credentials for instructional staff; involvement in assessment of student learning.
2. All instructors are appropriately qualified, including those in dual credit, contractual, and consortial programs.
3. Instructors are evaluated regularly in accordance with established institutional policies and procedures.
4. The institution has processes and resources for assuring that instructors are current in their disciplines and adept in their teaching roles; it supports their professional development.
5. Instructors are accessible for student inquiry.
6. Staff members providing student support services, such as tutoring, financial aid advising, academic advising, and co-curricular activities, are appropriately qualified, trained, and supported in their professional development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Review of the Common Data Set indicates MU has sufficient faculty to carry out classroom and non-classroom roles. NSSE 2015 data further testifies to the success of faculty engagement with students, as faculty interaction with students was rated higher than that of similar universities both for first-year and senior students. Processes are in place for vetting of faculty credentials and review of courses. For example, the Faculty Senate curriculum committee approves new courses, and the university Faculty Development Committee for Online and Multimedia Instruction (FDCOMI) evaluates proposals for online courses. On-site meetings with deans provided further assurance faculty credentials are monitored by department chairs when courses are assigned each semester. Review of CVs provides evidence dual credit instructors and instructors in consortial programs are deemed qualified by external respective, professional accrediting bodies.

Faculty are evaluated via annual course evaluations and meetings with department chairs. Interviews with department chairs and deans confirmed faculty teaching dual credit courses are evaluated via the same online tool as university faculty. Additionally, university professors conduct on site visits to high school sections of dual credit courses. In fact, one dual credit instructor's contract was not renewed as a result of an on-site visit. Review of minutes from the Graduate Council and the University *Redbook* provides evidence faculty qualifications, particularly those of graduate faculty, are reviewed regularly by the Graduate Council. Interviews with faculty in the College of Liberal Arts revealed not only are syllabi for dual credit courses the same for on campus and high school locations, but also syllabi are created by university professors, distributed to high school instructors of the

course, and linked to a common textbook that must be used by all faculty teaching the course. Course and faculty evaluations are administered electronically and returned to department chairs regardless of whether the instructor teaches on- or off-campus and whether the instructor is full-or part-time, or adjunct.

On site interviews provided evidence ongoing faculty development opportunities are provided on -and off-campus. Department chairs determine how to allocate funding equal to \$1065 per full-time, tenured faculty member. For example, one chair noted the manner in which she prioritizes travel funding for nontenured faculty presenting research. On campus faculty development is provided through the Teaching and Learning Center. For example, faculty teaching in learning communities recently reviewed and discussed literature in the areas of the scholarship of teaching and learning and pedagogy of undergraduate research. Workshop offerings by the Center for Teaching and Learning are data informed; the center receives assessment data from Director of Assessment and uses those data to create faculty professional development.

Review of NSSE 2015 data indicated faculty are available for student inquiry. Findings showed that students discuss both coursework and career opportunities with faculty at significantly higher levels than students at peer institutions. Faculty are required to post office hours on syllabi. Four diverse faculty also serve as mentors-in-residence while living in student residence halls.

Marshall offers professional development opportunities for student success staff units. For example, financial aid, advising, and tutoring require staff to train via modules and manuals. Advising support staff also participate in professional development opportunities through memberships in national agencies such as NACADA.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.D - Core Component 3.D

The institution provides support for student learning and effective teaching.

1. The institution provides student support services suited to the needs of its student populations.
2. The institution provides for learning support and preparatory instruction to address the academic needs of its students. It has a process for directing entering students to courses and programs for which the students are adequately prepared.
3. The institution provides academic advising suited to its programs and the needs of its students.
4. The institution provides to students and instructors the infrastructure and resources necessary to support effective teaching and learning (technological infrastructure, scientific laboratories, libraries, performance spaces, clinical practice sites, museum collections, as appropriate to the institution's offerings).
5. The institution provides to students guidance in the effective use of research and information resources.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Services for students are central to Marshall's mission. Students enrolled in UNIV100 are informed about the wide-range of support available in the Student Handbook and Marshall Family Guide. Services for specific populations are offered through designated offices on campus. For example, the Intercultural Affairs office coordinates problem-solving for diverse populations on campus, particularly African-American, Latino, LGBT, and international students. Services include academic and career planning, academic problems, crisis management, and financial emergencies. The team learned that there is money in the budget for at-need scholarships for emergencies; students may borrow \$250 per semester from the Bursar. The athletic director noted the availability of counselors for crisis management services for athletes.

Marshall University does significant work to ensure student success. Their admission criteria sort conditionally-admitted students into University College where students spend three semesters in co-requisite classes (pairing developmental classes with general education classes). This placement keeps students on track toward degree completion. University College students receive hands-on advising, and other support systems as well, such as scholarships for books/on reserve at library, to assist this population. Additionally, a grant-funded summer bridge program helps approximately fifty students complete developmental math courses before the semester begins. Week of Welcome (WOW) also provides students the opportunity to start experiencing college in the UNIV 100 classes.

Advising was an area of concern in the 2006 HLC team report. Marshall addressed the concern through a decentralized advising structure. Every college has its own system of advising. For example, the College of Liberal Arts (COLA) has mandatory advising the first two years while juniors and seniors check in with faculty advisers annually. The College of Science (COS) has three professional advisers, all of whom participate in NACADA training. The College of Arts & Media

(COAM) requires students to be advised all four years. All colleges reported doing some kind of adviser assessment to determine the level of quality of advising, usually through surveys and focus groups. All students have access to DegreeWorks, which allows students to easily monitor what requirements need to be completed as they move toward graduation. Since 2006, through a university-wide advising audit, considerable progress has been made, and the university continues to monitor adviser effectiveness. The team commends Marshall for its assessment of advising. Results from NSSE 2015, a topical NSSE module, the HLC student survey, and on-site conversations with students confirm the need for continued review of advising practices. For example, the 2015 NSSE topical module indicated that, compared to national comparisons, advisors of first-year students at Marshall are less likely to listen to student concerns, inform students of important deadlines, help students understand academic rules and policies, discuss career interests, and inform students of academic support options such as tutoring and study groups.

Advising at Marshall is poised to undergo dramatic changes. As part of their participation in the HLC Persistence & Completion Academy, Marshall has a cohort of 140 students, all of whom are participating in intensive advising. The students are meeting four times during the year with a faculty mentor. Additionally, advisors have implemented the EDGE (explore, design, graduate, and empower) program to not only help retain students, but also talk to them about career clusters to keep them on track to graduation. Next year, Academy team plan is to increase the cohort to include the 500-600 "murky middle" students. Good advising is low-hanging fruit to increase retention.

Marshall has resources and infrastructure that supports effective teaching and learning. Eighty percent of the campus has WiFi coverage with just under 1,000 access points. The current plan is to increase data points to 2,500 in the next three years. One hundred out of three hundred classrooms are labeled as technology enhanced, although such a designation does not mean that the other 200 classrooms are technology deficient. One faculty member told the team the non-technology classrooms used by his department have more technology than the technology enhanced ones. Through the technology enhanced classroom initiative, one million dollars annually has been earmarked for structural changes to traditional classrooms in an effort to promote collaborative and inquiry-based learning. Likewise, the \$13 million downtown Visual Arts Center recently devoted 2,200 square feet to innovative learning space for student projects and collaborative learning.

Training in information literacy occurs in first-year experience, English 201, individualized library instruction, and librarians assigned to work with students completing research projects for individual courses. Through the university's degree profile, information literacy is now woven throughout the major. Learning outcomes for information literacy align with standards by the American Council for Research Libraries. A locally developed exam now replaces the ETS iSkills assessment. Through this exam, effective use of research and information resources is assessed at the first year as well as the senior level. Assessment findings from this exam at this time are inconclusive because additional data are being collected and yet to be analyzed for use campus wide.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.E - Core Component 3.E

The institution fulfills the claims it makes for an enriched educational environment.

1. Co-curricular programs are suited to the institution's mission and contribute to the educational experience of its students.
2. The institution demonstrates any claims it makes about contributions to its students' educational experience by virtue of aspects of its mission, such as research, community engagement, service learning, religious or spiritual purpose, and economic development.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Marshall offers myriad co-curricular activities, ranging from organized student events by the 100+ Registered Student Organizations to university sponsored events such as the 100+ events hosted by the College of Arts and Media alone. Students can study abroad with partner institutions in countries such as China and India as well as with any ISEP (International Student Exchange Program) institution. The Office of Student Affairs has mapped program goals to learning outcomes. Assessment of co-curricular units, although limited, reflects meaningful, organic, and sustainable assessment of student learning. For example, residence life staff reviewed data from the Educational Benchmarking Survey as well as the course component of the living learning communities. Responding to findings, the Director of Academic Initiatives discontinued the use of "attendance" as a metric for success of residential life programming and replaced a lecture-style course component with a service learning project.

The need for increased attention to co-curricular learning was noted in the HLC 2006 report. In response, units previously viewed simply as support centers have intentionally adopted student learning outcomes at the co-curricular level. For example, staff from Disability Services conduct workshops to educate campus constituencies such as members of the Greek community about social interaction with students with disabilities. Staff also conduct faculty workshops on effective teaching strategies for engaging students with disabilities. For faculty who teach online, the faculty center has encouraged participation in the Collaborative Online International Learning (COIL) community through which domestic and international faculty team teach online courses.

The institution's claims and commitment to high impact practices is evidenced by numerous internship opportunities available to students. For example, new offices in the Honors College and Career Services devote internal as well as external grant funding to intern placement of undergraduate students. The Geography requires an internship as part of its capstone class and works with employers to place and assess the intern and the completed project. At the graduate level, school psychology students have garnered paid internships both in and out of state.

Service learning opportunities at Marshall include both curricular and co-curricular networks. Within degree programs, communications majors write grants for local non-profits, many of which ultimately

receive funding. In other areas, students from the economics program collect and analyze data and apply findings to community problems such as eating habits and lifestyle for the WV Bureau of Public Health. Within fine arts, a ceramics class participates in the Empty Bowls project for the local food bank while music majors provide supplemental instruction to middle and high school students. Outside the classroom, sixty students involved with the Society of Black Scholars are collaborating on research designed to teach GRIT. Research opportunities are plentiful both at the undergraduate and graduate levels (see Criterion 3.B.5.).

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

3.S - Criterion 3 - Summary

The institution provides high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Evidence

Marshall University provided significant evidence, regarding Criterion 3, that it provides a high quality education, wherever and however its offerings are delivered.

Currency and levels of degree performance are demonstrated with the state required five-year cycle of program review and the university Academic Portfolio Review. The undergraduate program was recently examined and redesigned so that there is an emphasis in critical thinking, diversity, and civic engagement. These three areas closely align with MU's mission. All instructors are appropriately qualified, evaluated annually, and are accessible to students. Faculty and staff are supported with many professional development opportunities. MU provides a myriad of support services to address the needs of students.

In addition, Marshall offers co-curricular programs, which again, match with the mission to provide an education that contributes to the "...development of society and the individual."

Given this, the review team, after reading the Assurance Argument, examining an array of documents cited in the argument and those made available on-site, and interacting with multiple constituencies, concludes that Marshall University provides a high-quality education.

Criterion Three is met.

4 - Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

4.A - Core Component 4.A

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs.

1. The institution maintains a practice of regular program reviews.
2. The institution evaluates all the credit that it transcripts, including what it awards for experiential learning or other forms of prior learning, or relies on the evaluation of responsible third parties.
3. The institution has policies that assure the quality of the credit it accepts in transfer.
4. The institution maintains and exercises authority over the prerequisites for courses, rigor of courses, expectations for student learning, access to learning resources, and faculty qualifications for all its programs, including dual credit programs. It assures that its dual credit courses or programs for high school students are equivalent in learning outcomes and levels of achievement to its higher education curriculum.
5. The institution maintains specialized accreditation for its programs as appropriate to its educational purposes.
6. The institution evaluates the success of its graduates. The institution assures that the degree or certificate programs it represents as preparation for advanced study or employment accomplish these purposes. For all programs, the institution looks to indicators it deems appropriate to its mission, such as employment rates, admission rates to advanced degree programs, and participation rates in fellowships, internships, and special programs (e.g., Peace Corps and Americorps).

Rating

Met

Evidence

As required by the West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHEPC), each of Marshall University's degree programs undergoes a review on a five-year cycle. Program review begins with a comprehensive degree program self-study report using data derived from the Office of Institutional Research, the Office of Assessment and Program Review, and other relevant sources. The self-study report undergoes multiple reviews at the dean's level, the academic planning committee or graduate council as appropriate, the provost, and the president. The president's recommendation then is reviewed by the Board of Governors (BOG). Upon review by the BOG, Marshall submits an annual report to WVHEPC. Discussions with faculty, staff, and administrators confirmed program reviews are extensive and ongoing, including follow-up conversations a year later when requested by

the Board of Governors (BOG).

The team reviewed WVHEPC Policy (Title 133 Procedural Rule, Series 18) which governs the assignment of credit at West Virginia institutions. The rule states, in part, "courses and classes offered for academic credit must be acceptable toward a degree or certificate program(s) as approved by the institution's governing board."

AP credit is evaluated under a separate WVHEPC policy, as is CLEP. Marshall University's undergraduate catalog explains the institution's credit options for AP, CLEP, the International Baccalaureate Program, and Military Experience. Additionally, WV institutions offer the Regents of Bachelor Arts (RBA) as another source of potential college credit. Under this program, Marshall may grant students academic credit for prior experience. Faculty who teach RBA courses evaluate the portfolios and determine whether credit will be awarded. Discussions with faculty and staff confirmed that credit evaluation is appropriately applied and carefully monitored.

WVHEPC policy governs transfer credit between WV two- and four-year colleges. A team review of the 2014-15 HEPC Core Coursework Agreement supports the evidence provided in the Assurance Argument. Additionally, the team reviewed several articulation agreements with two-year institutions. The Marshall Undergraduate catalog was also referenced and outlines further policy details for evaluating transfer credit.

Marshall maintains and exercises authority over curriculum in multiple ways. Processes require review at each level regarding curriculum changes. For example, faculty oversee program curriculum matters including course additions, degree changes, areas of emphasis, etc. Changes work their way through departmental, college, university committees and finally to the president. Minutes of the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council demonstrate adherence to policy and oversight activities. In addition, the university has developed a syllabus template to ensure adherence to policy and to demonstrate student outcomes are identified and met. The Marshall Degree Profile articulates university expectations for student learning.

Marshall's tenure and promotion processes are established by BOG policy while written procedures and performance criteria are maintained by the individual colleges and schools. Reviews are conducted at multiple faculty and administrative levels (Tenure Process Sections 4.2.4 through 4.2.15).

Marshall provided documentation of a well-established and documented hiring and credentialing process. Discussions with faculty and staff confirmed that dual credit courses and programs for high school students are appropriate, carefully-monitored, and equivalent to its own curriculum.

Marshall seeks specialized program accreditation based on faculty review and as part of the five-year program assessment review discussed above in 4.A.1. Marshall offers 44 accreditation eligible programs, 34 (71 percent) of which are accredited. The team reviewed 2015 Update of the Accreditation Table. The ten remaining programs fall into several categories: programs too new to have produced enough graduates to apply for accreditation; programs in the process of getting necessary resources to apply for accreditation; and programs whose faculty are not interested in applying for accreditation. In June, 2011 the School of Medicine was placed on probation by its accrediting body, the Liaison Committee on Medical Education (LCME). The team reviewed the subsequent MU action plan which was accepted June, 2012. In June, 2013, LCME voted to extend accreditation for the balance of the term and lift the probation.

Marshall employs several strategies to evaluate graduates' success. Data from the *College Portrait on*

the Voluntary System Accountability indicate significant majorities of Marshall students intend to pursue graduate study or seek employment upon graduation. Marshall also posts these data and analyses to the Office of Assessment website.

In the 2013-2014 academic year, Marshall contracted with Hepdata Employer Find to obtain outcomes data for graduates from 2009-2013. Results are broken down by college and collectively indicate that students generally both find employment and also go on to additional study (particularly undergraduates). The highest number of students who responded to the survey in one college who did not find work was seven percent.

The Office of Career Services collects data on student post-graduation plans through a student self-assessment and gathers data from Workforce West Virginia, including a detailed analysis of Marshall's 2001-2010 graduates' success. These results found in 2010 that out of 2,034 total graduates, seventy-seven percent found employment within the first six months of graduation and seventy-two percent were still employed at the end of the first quarter of employment. Taken together, these two independent sources of data collection reveal that MU's students generally find employment after graduation.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

4.B - Core Component 4.B

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational achievement and improvement through ongoing assessment of student learning.

1. The institution has clearly stated goals for student learning and effective processes for assessment of student learning and achievement of learning goals.
2. The institution assesses achievement of the learning outcomes that it claims for its curricular and co-curricular programs.
3. The institution uses the information gained from assessment to improve student learning.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies to assess student learning reflect good practice, including the substantial participation of faculty and other instructional staff members.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Marshall participated in the HLC Pathways Demonstration Project, for which the university developed a quality initiative testing the Lumina Foundation's Degree Qualifications Profile. The team reviewed the June 15, 2013 Report of Open Pathways Quality Initiative which indicates the university has clear student learning goals. As a result of the initiative, the university developed its own Degree Profile (See 4.A.4.), which has been approved by the Faculty Senate and identifies learning goals for Marshall graduates. That DQP was then mapped by each program to their curriculum and each class was aligned to overarching university goals. The 2014 HEPC Marshall Compact report, previously reviewed by the team at 4.A.1, details the university's assessment strategies for general education and degree program requirements. The degree programs are in the collection, analysis, and revision if-needed stage. Marshall's plans to conduct a similar revision to the general education program next year.

Marshall assesses curricular achievement of learning outcomes at the general education and degree program levels. For example, to facilitate general education assessment, Marshall developed the General Education Assessment Repository (GEAR). The Spring 2014 Analysis of Artifacts of GEAR provides a full explanation of GEAR assessment, results, and analysis.

Marshall administers two instruments, the Collegiate Learning Assessment (CLA) and an in-house version to incoming freshmen and graduating seniors. The team reviewed MU's 2012-2013 CLA report and the 2014 in-house assessment report. This exam is being used to create a baseline for subsequent comparative analysis. Freshmen in FYS courses are incentivized by linking this assessment to a portion of their course grade. Upon first implementation, a sufficient number of seniors did not take the exam. Seniors are now being asked to take the exam in their capstone classes without incentivization. Data collection for seniors is ongoing; the team suggests a review of incentives could strengthen the comparison between freshmen and senior scores. Without attention to incentivization, results may be inconclusive.

Marshall assesses achievement of learning outcomes at the program level. As part of the Open Pathways effort, Marshall developed reports for each program, including the following:

- Connections between program, college, and institutional missions.
- Program Assessment Plan to include:
 - Learning Outcomes
 - Courses or other learning experiences to be assessed
 - Specific assessments that address outcome for each assessment point.
 - Benchmarks for performance levels
- Program-specific assessment rubrics
- Analysis and planned action
- Summary

The team reviewed samples of these program assessment reports and discussed them extensively with faculty and administrators. Discussions confirmed these reports are used at the department, college, and university, and board levels and are a key component of Marshall's assessment efforts.

In 2006, the HLC team suggested the university assess certificates. Thus, this team reviewed a chart of the current status of certificate assessment. Although Marshall reported the progress on certificate assessment as slow, the team does not believe assessment of these certificates is necessary as most are composed of courses embedded in programs already being assessed.

The university Assessment Committee assesses and reports on course syllabi. In 2012-13, seventy-five percent of total syllabi had been posted to the assessment portal. Not only did they conform to the assigned MU template, but fifty-two percent had clear learning outcomes (SLOs) and how each would be practiced and assessed in the course (six percent had partially present SLOs). MU hopes this assessment will not only ensure faculty include relevant bog policies, but that clear SLOs will “help 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.”

Marshall assesses co-curricular learning through surveys and focus groups. Marshall also administers the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE). Although widespread assessment of co-curricular events is in its infancy at mu, several areas have been consistently assessing these events. For example, The Office of Housing and Residence Life assesses student perception of its activities and their alignment with the degree profile. The Office of Student Life assesses co-curricular learning by mapping events/activities to core domains and university outcomes. On Assessment Day in 2011, 2012, 2013, Marshall conducted student focus group sessions to assess student participation in co-curricular events.

The 2013-2014 Office of Assessment program review report evidences the integration of assessment into the university's program review and improvement activities (see 4.A.1.). For example, in response to assessment data, Speech/Communications made changes by recording student speeches and having faculty review them at the end of the semester. Results of those data were used to encourage faculty to coach students in speech preparation during office hours, which has resulted in better quality speeches.

The University Assessment Committee uses the GEAR database, discussed above, to gather student artifacts for assessment and review. This process seeks to ensure good practice in two ways:

1. The process tracks and assesses artifacts at different points in the curriculum.

2. At the university level, the process requires that each artifact be independently assessed by two faculty readers.

The majority of Marshall faculty participated in the Quality Initiative. As of June 2013, 94 programs had participated. The Open Pathways Quality Initiative report detailed faculty involvement at the program level and campus level through committees and work groups.

Direct assessment of student learning in degree programs is conducted by faculty at the course level. The syllabus template requires faculty to incorporate the connections between course activities, assessments, and specified learning outcomes into the course design. For example, an English faculty member reported she has outcomes on her assignments link to the course outcomes, which link to program and university goals. Marshall has just purchased the Outcomes Assessment module for Blackboard which will facilitate ease in faculty assessment data collection.

Marshall University participated in the *Faculty Survey of Assessment Culture*. The team reviewed the results of the 2014 survey. Eighty percent or more of respondents said that assessment is vital for Marshall's future, that they highly value assessment, are actively engaged in assessment efforts, and they believe faculty leadership is necessary for Marshall's assessment efforts. Over eighty percent of respondents perceived administrators focus on assessment primarily because of compliance and accreditation issues.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.C - Core Component 4.C

The institution demonstrates a commitment to educational improvement through ongoing attention to retention, persistence, and completion rates in its degree and certificate programs.

1. The institution has defined goals for student retention, persistence, and completion that are ambitious but attainable and appropriate to its mission, student populations, and educational offerings.
2. The institution collects and analyzes information on student retention, persistence, and completion of its programs.
3. The institution uses information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs to make improvements as warranted by the data.
4. The institution's processes and methodologies for collecting and analyzing information on student retention, persistence, and completion of programs reflect good practice. (Institutions are not required to use IPEDS definitions in their determination of persistence or completion rates. Institutions are encouraged to choose measures that are suitable to their student populations, but institutions are accountable for the validity of their measures.)

Rating

Met

Evidence

Marshall University defines targets for retention, persistence, and completion in its West Virginia Higher Education Policy Commission (WVHEPC) Institutional Compact. The team reviewed the 2013 report with targets for 2018. The targets are approved by the president, BOG, and the WVHEPC.

Marshall's focus is exclusively on first-time freshmen matriculating with a high school grade point average lower than 3.25, less any conditional admits (who currently receive other services including intrusive advising). This population constitutes approximately thirty-two percent of Marshall's incoming class of first time freshmen.

Marshall's targets for 2018 are:

- Increase retention from average of 58 percent to 68 percent.
- Increase four-year degree completion rate from 21 percent to 24 percent.
- Increase six-year degree completion rate from 30 percent to 34 percent.

The team considers these targets to be attainable and appropriate.

The compact is updated annually. The team reviewed updates for 2008-2013. Through the Office of Institutional Research and the Office of Academic Affairs, Marshall tracks and analyzes data and sets target numbers to achieve by 2018 for:

- First-Time Freshmen (2,100)

- Low-Income First-Time Freshmen (4,000)
- Returning Adult Students (2,100)
- Underrepresented, Disadvantaged, and Racial/Ethnic Students (1,005)

The team reviewed a 2015 report on retention in academic majors, four-and six-year graduation rates, and a Fall 2011-2015 report on enrollment by college of major and degree program. The data provided a foundation for setting the following 2018 targets, 77 percent for full-time, first-time freshmen, 72 percent for low-income, first-time freshmen, and 65 percent for underrepresented racial/ethnic, first-time freshmen.

The team reviewed Marshall's report on the HLC Academy for Student Persistence and Completion Plan for June 2015 through October, 2017. Within this academy, deliberate attention to a pilot cohort (140 students) in the intrusive advising and EDGE program illustrates Marshall is being conscientious about using data to inform ongoing efforts of persistence.

MU is using data to make informed decisions about retention, persistence, and completion. For example, all first-time students are required to take UNIV 101 during Week of Welcome. Initially, students finished completing this course online, however, MU was not getting the desired results and created a different course, UNIV 100, which is currently taught by staff across campus giving students a personal, small group connection. Early results indicate this change has positively affected their retention and persistence. MU's enrollment in the HLC Persistence and Completion Academy has encouraged the university to make holistic use of data for planning of additional retention programs. The team reviewed the 2014 WVHEPC Compact Update for Marshall which provides a summary of five comprehensive plans and student success metric strategies as follows:

1. Collaborative Access
2. Student Financial Assistance
3. Academic Quality
4. Career Pathways
5. Critical Regional Issues - Access and Success of Underrepresented Students

In 2012, Marshall adopted *DegreeWorks* and the EAB's *Student Success Collaborative* as technological platforms for tracking at-risk students and ensuring timely completion to graduation. Discussions with faculty indicate Marshall is continuing to develop and perfect the use of these platforms, and use data collected (particularly with *Student Success Collaborative*) to inform where to devote resources toward retention.

Marshall uses IPEDS methodology and definitions when tracking and reporting retention, persistence, and program completion. The team reviewed Marshall's Student Right to Know Data which corresponds and is sourced from the University's IPEDS submissions and supporting data.

Marshall submits data to the WVHEPC which tracks data across West Virginia public higher education. In turn, the WVHEPC provides data to the Southern Regional Education Board.

Marshall also submits graduation rates and retention rate data to third-party surveys for various purposes. The team reviewed Marshall's responses to survey questions for Fall 2014.

Marshall's enrollment in the HLC Persistence and Completion Academy illustrates their commitment to improve their retention and graduation rates. This four-year process requires fiscal and personnel resources and a sustained campus commitment to take risks while they seek to find which best practices have the most efficacy. For example, MU now uses intrusive advising and EDGE, which

urges students to consider careers as belonging in a cluster. For example, nursing is part of a larger group of health science professions that would even include administrative positions. MU hopes that if students can not complete a required gateway course, they can find ways to stay on track to graduation while finding a different track to their career goals.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

4.S - Criterion 4 - Summary

The institution demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services, and it evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Evidence

Through its Assurance Argument and supporting documentation, Marshall demonstrates responsibility for the quality of its educational programs, learning environments, and support services. Marshall evaluates their effectiveness for student learning through processes designed to gather data and promote continuous improvement in these areas. Discussions with faculty, staff, students, administrators, and the board of governors confirmed an awareness of, appreciation for, and commitment to this responsibility.

The team read the Assurance Argument, examined an array of documents cited in the argument and made available on campus, and interacted with multiple constituencies.

Following an analysis of these data, the team concludes that Marshall University meets Criterion 4.

5 - Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

5.A - Core Component 5.A

The institution's resource base supports its current educational programs and its plans for maintaining and strengthening their quality in the future.

1. The institution has the fiscal and human resources and physical and technological infrastructure sufficient to support its operations wherever and however programs are delivered.
2. The institution's resource allocation process ensures that its educational purposes are not adversely affected by elective resource allocations to other areas or disbursement of revenue to a superordinate entity.
3. The goals incorporated into mission statements or elaborations of mission statements are realistic in light of the institution's organization, resources, and opportunities.
4. The institution's staff in all areas are appropriately qualified and trained.
5. The institution has a well-developed process in place for budgeting and for monitoring expense.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Marshall is in good fiscal health, with Composite Index Scores over several years in the 'Very Good' to 'Excellent' range, clean audits, and relatively high Primary Reserve Ratios. However, MU has experienced budget reductions over the past several years, primarily driven by state funding reductions and flat enrollments. As a result of trends that culminated in a clear need to grow revenues and restrict expenses, MU undertook an extensive process, Marshall 20/20, that included a program prioritization exercise and comprehensive investigations of cost-cutting and revenue enhancement strategies. This process allowed MU to achieve a projected \$3 million cost savings from efficiencies, including \$900,000 already implemented for FY 2016, as stated by the president and confirmed by the CFO. These efficiencies, together with projected revenue enhancements, will help to preserve and expand core elements of institutional quality, but MU will have to continue to be diligent regarding cost structures, and tuition, and other self-generated revenues. Because of the constituencies it serves, as argued by both institutional leadership and members of the BOG, Marshall is hesitant to raise tuition too rapidly, placing an even heavier emphasis on the outcomes of Marshall 20/20.

One important initiative for revenue enhancement will be MU's success in attracting international students. In addition to ongoing efforts on its own behalf, Marshall has contracted with INTO to bring additional international students to campus. So far, more of these students have been graduate

students than anticipated and their distribution among colleges has been different than expected, but the overall numbers are in line with projections. International students the team spoke with expressed a high level of satisfaction with support services and cultural activities on campus.

Marshall has 472 full-time instructional faculty, along with 268 part-time faculty, giving the institution a student to faculty ratio of 19 to 1. The institution's 387 classified staff and 443 executive, professional, administrative and managerial staff suggest faculty and students are adequately supported.

Supported by Office of Human Resource Services, MU has well-developed processes to determine staffing needs, recruit and hire suitable staff, and evaluate them appropriately. This office also provides training in campus management systems, commonly used productivity software, personnel and financial processes, information technology, and supervisory duties, as well as online and face-to-face professional development in its Leadership Academy. MU also offers tuition assistance to employees pursuing a Marshall degree.

The team identified concern expressed by the faculty senate in 2013 that faculty salaries were substantially below comparable institutions at all ranks. In conversations with the BOG, the team determined the institution has taken concrete steps to address this issue. They altered an existing distribution formula, with formal (if divided) support from the faculty senate, to include faculty merit evaluation data in the equation. The interim president indicated that a mid-year increase of five percent, distributed according to revised formula, is expected.

As documented in the assurance argument, MU has worked hard to maintain and improve its physical and technological infrastructure, devoting considerable resources to controlled maintenance, improving sustainability and information technology upgrades. Its current \$40M capital campaign to provide improved facilities for athletics, engineering, and visual arts is in final stages. Since the previous visit when controlled maintenance was cited as a concern, MU has received \$18 million for deferred maintenance through a state program that distributes lottery funds to higher education institutions for this purpose. In addition to ongoing investment in technology infrastructure, MU has developed an IT strategic plan to address equipment replacement needs.

Much of MU's creative energy in the past several years has been devoted to reacting in a systematic and constructive fashion to financial challenges beginning with the 2013 action plan and continuing through Marshall 20/20. Nevertheless, there is ample evidence elements of the 2005 Strategic Vision continue to animate initiatives such as the Quality Initiative project using the Lumina DQP and the resulting restructuring of assessment, the ongoing creation of new academic programs, and concerted efforts to improve retention and completion.

MU's relatively flat enrollments over the past decade provide a context for recent academic portfolio review (a form of program prioritization) process. It appears this difficult exercise will need to provide a basis upon which to reduce or eliminate some programs. MU has identified approximately 20 additional programs and collaborations it is investigating for potential launch in the next several years. To do so, Marshall recognizes it will need to eliminate or reduce some programs, which currently it anticipates being disproportionately at the master's level.

As part of Marshall 20/20, MU has undertaken an overhaul of the budget allocation process. It is not yet clear what the full implications of moving towards such a new model will be, but there is ample evidence that the Budget Working Group has pursued its goal with transparency, inclusiveness, and deliberation. Working closely with MU's budget and finance office, this effort appears to be appropriate to both the circumstances and culture of MU.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.B - Core Component 5.B

The institution's governance and administrative structures promote effective leadership and support collaborative processes that enable the institution to fulfill its mission.

1. The governing board is knowledgeable about the institution; it provides oversight of the institution's financial and academic policies and practices and meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.
2. The institution has and employs policies and procedures to engage its internal constituencies—including its governing board, administration, faculty, staff, and students—in the institution's governance.
3. Administration, faculty, staff, and students are involved in setting academic requirements, policy, and processes through effective structures for contribution and collaborative effort.

Rating

Met

Evidence

MU's BOG is organized in accordance with state policy and includes appointees from outside the institution and internal representatives. The board is organized into appropriate committees, and the team reviewed numerous documents that provided ample evidence the Board exercises appropriate oversight of the institution's finance and policies. For example, the April 23, 2014, BOG Meeting Minutes, record the board approved five action items brought forward by the Academic and Student Affairs Committee creating or revising policies governing faculty promotion, tenure, and salary increases. It was apparent from the records provided that the board meets its legal and fiduciary responsibilities.

In the public comments received before the visit, there was concern raised that the appointment of the interim president by the board compromised the appropriate independence between the board and the interim president. This echoed concerns raised in the previous visit under similar circumstances. As team members probed this situation, they found that the Board had followed established procedures for appointing an interim president. In direct conversation with board members, there was clear indication of the independence of the current Board and the current interim president. Board members also shared independence of the board from external influences in general was improved after a review by the consulting arm of the Association of Governing Boards (AGB).

MU maintains formal governance structures representing students, faculty, and classified staff, including seats on the board for elected representatives of each group. Non-classified staff are represented on the board by the classified staff representative. Members of this group voiced satisfaction with their role in governance to team members. The assurance argument presents compelling examples, documented in meeting minutes, of how this structure functions effectively to authorize new and revised academic requirements, policies, and processes. These same constituencies, including staff not in the state classified system, are also well-represented on task forces and ad hoc committees engaged in helping to plan for MU's future.

During the visit, some concerns were raised that the numerous task forces and ad hoc committees were effectively by-passing these governance structures, but other constituents argued persuasively the links between the various initiatives and standing committees on campus in terms of both communication and appropriate control over policy were robust enough to ensure actual changes under those standing committees' respective jurisdictions could be reviewed and approved in accordance with existing policy.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.C - Core Component 5.C

The institution engages in systematic and integrated planning.

1. The institution allocates its resources in alignment with its mission and priorities.
2. The institution links its processes for assessment of student learning, evaluation of operations, planning, and budgeting.
3. The planning process encompasses the institution as a whole and considers the perspectives of internal and external constituent groups.
4. The institution plans on the basis of a sound understanding of its current capacity. Institutional plans anticipate the possible impact of fluctuations in the institution's sources of revenue, such as enrollment, the economy, and state support.
5. Institutional planning anticipates emerging factors, such as technology, demographic shifts, and globalization.

Rating

Met

Evidence

MU demonstrates an ongoing commitment to linking its mission to planning processes as evidenced by the 2005 strategic plan and the updates presented in 2008, 2010, and 2013. As chronicled on a dedicated webpage, the Marshall 20/20 exercise focuses on aligning numerous processes, including formal budget allocation, with priorities that largely carry over from the earlier strategic plan. There are clear and explicit links between these planning processes and revision of assessment, evaluation of operations and academic programs, and allocation of resources. Marshall 20/20 represents a broadly inclusive effort to grapple with the realities MU faces in terms of enrollment, costs, self-generated revenues, and state support. The university has been especially proactive in seeking to align revenue sources with technology and student support services, for example, by tying expenditures to revenues received from specific fees. More generally, MU is seeking to understand and appropriately reduce costs in both academic programs and non-academic support services through the Academic Portfolio and Service Portfolio reviews. Thus, resources are allocated appropriately.

These efforts appear to have positioned Marshall well to respond to emerging circumstances. During the visit, the team observed widespread understanding of both the reasons for and implications of Marshall 20/20. Campus constituents were informed of an additional four percent reduction in state funding the week before the team's visit. There are sufficient reserves available to allow the institution to avoid current year cuts, but because of the processes established through Marshall 20/20, the interim president and CFO expressed confidence MU would be able to make permanent reductions in expenditures and enhancements in revenue in the current year without negatively affecting operations. For example, the president asserted growth in engineering programs should bring in additional tuition, and changes in class size, hiring practices, and release time should reduce expenditures.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.D - Core Component 5.D

The institution works systematically to improve its performance.

1. The institution develops and documents evidence of performance in its operations.
2. The institution learns from its operational experience and applies that learning to improve its institutional effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability, overall and in its component parts.

Rating

Met

Evidence

Beginning with the 2013 Action Plan that became the Marshall 20/20 effort, MU has substantially increased its attention to using evidence to improve operations. The Academic Portfolio and Services Portfolio reviews represent a considerable investment in understanding Marshall's effectiveness, capabilities, and sustainability. In addition, the Marshall 20/20 process has produced a set of Key Performance Indicators the institution proposes to use in an ongoing improvement process. Like many things at Marshall, the team found these efforts worthy and highly encouraging, even as we sought to confirm that they are likely to be successfully implemented. The team's visit identified multiple efforts to better employ available evidence to improve effectiveness. For example, student feedback and survey data, including NSSE findings, strongly suggested to MU that advising was a significant barrier to student success. In response, MU ordered the topical module for NSSE for its next administration. Acting on that data, the university has launched a pilot program to explore new models of advising that may be more effective. Similarly, the pass rate in the introductory chemistry course for majors was below 50 percent. IR and the department worked together to analyze data on the students in that course, finding those scoring below 22 on the math portion of the ACT did considerably worse than those above. By requiring a pre-requisite course for those below that score, the department was able to raise the pass rate to 70 percent.

Interim Monitoring (if applicable)

No Interim Monitoring Recommended.

5.S - Criterion 5 - Summary

The institution's resources, structures, and processes are sufficient to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of its educational offerings, and respond to future challenges and opportunities. The institution plans for the future.

Evidence

The team read the Assurance Argument, examined an array of documents cited in the argument and made available on campus, and interacted with multiple constituencies. Marshall University has been a good steward of the resources entrusted to it by the citizens of West Virginia, students, faculty and staff. It has kept costs to students low, but has also undertaken multiple efforts, particularly Marshall 20/20, to allocate those resources to fulfill its mission, improve the quality of educational offerings and prepare itself for the emerging challenges and opportunities of the 21st Century. It has done so within the context of robust and effective governance that appropriately recognizes the different roles of the Board of Governors, the faculty, students and staff in authorizing policies and procedures that support the institution in achieving its mission. These efforts have positioned the university to move forward into the future with realism and optimism.

Following an analysis of these data, the team concludes that Marshall University meets Criterion 5.

Review Dashboard

Number	Title	Rating
1	Mission	
1.A	Core Component 1.A	Met
1.B	Core Component 1.B	Met
1.C	Core Component 1.C	Met
1.D	Core Component 1.D	Met
1.S	Criterion 1 - Summary	Met
2	Integrity: Ethical and Responsible Conduct	
2.A	Core Component 2.A	Met
2.B	Core Component 2.B	Met
2.C	Core Component 2.C	Met
2.D	Core Component 2.D	Met
2.E	Core Component 2.E	Met
2.S	Criterion 2 - Summary	Met
3	Teaching and Learning: Quality, Resources, and Support	
3.A	Core Component 3.A	Met
3.B	Core Component 3.B	Met
3.C	Core Component 3.C	Met
3.D	Core Component 3.D	Met
3.E	Core Component 3.E	Met
3.S	Criterion 3 - Summary	Met
4	Teaching and Learning: Evaluation and Improvement	
4.A	Core Component 4.A	Met
4.B	Core Component 4.B	Met
4.C	Core Component 4.C	Met
4.S	Criterion 4 - Summary	Met
5	Resources, Planning, and Institutional Effectiveness	
5.A	Core Component 5.A	Met
5.B	Core Component 5.B	Met
5.C	Core Component 5.C	Met
5.D	Core Component 5.D	Met
5.S	Criterion 5 - Summary	Met

Review Summary

Interim Report(s) Required

Due Date

Not Set.

Report Focus

Review Team's Findings in response to HLC Panel Review of federal compliance

The federal compliance review panel found that Institutional Records of Student Complaints does not meet the Commission's requirements. The team concurs that MU's lack of a campus level system for identifying and tracking student complaints about the institution, faculty or staff violates instruction 3 under this area: "the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this into its review and planning processes." The team recommends a interim report verifying that Marshall follows up on its stated intention to pull together centralized reporting of complaints and their resolution in a centralized campus-wide system.

The team also investigated the other concerns noted in the panel's report and concluded in each case that evidence of compliance was ultimately supplied by the institution, to wit:

- MU submitted a complete and accurate record of student status to the National Student Clearinghouse, as verified by the registrar. It is unclear why the data was missing, and therefore not transferred to the National Student Loan Data System.
- A review of the Public Safety website confirmed that there is, in fact, a link to current crime statistics.
- Access to Banner issues at the state level were in fact resolved in the WV Corrective Action Plan on pp. 84-5.
- MU has not yet been notified that referral to AAASG has been adjudicated.
- MU provided a public report from IPEDS data that showed retention for Pell grant recipients.
- The withdrawal process is delineated in the catalog (online).
- MU demonstrated gainful employment information for (eligible) certificates is available online.
- Specifically, with regard to Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies, MU provided documentation that MU's response to NASM was accepted in June 2015 and the progress report to CAATE was accepted July 21, 2015.

Therefore, the team recommends that Marshall University provides an interim report demonstrating that it has adopted a student complaint policy that identifies how all varieties of complaints, including those about the institution, faculty or staff, that enables the institution to identify relevant findings in the patterns of those complaints and integrate them into its review and planning processes. The team recommends this interim report be submitted no later than May 16, 2016.

Conclusion

Overall Recommendations

Criteria For Accreditation

Met

Pathways Recommendation

Eligible to choose



Federal Compliance Worksheet for Evaluation Teams

Evaluation of Federal Compliance Components

The team reviews each item identified in the Federal Compliance Guide and documents its findings in the appropriate spaces below. Teams should expect institutions to address these requirements with brief narrative responses and provide supporting documentation, where necessary. Generally, if the team finds in the course of this review that there are substantive issues related to the institution's ability to fulfill the Criteria for Accreditation, such issues should be raised in appropriate sections of the Assurance Section of the Team Report or highlighted as such in the appropriate AQIP Quality Checkup Report.

This worksheet outlines the information the team should review in relation to the federal requirements and provides spaces for the team's conclusions in relation to each requirement. The team should refer to the Federal Compliance Guide for Institutions and Evaluation Teams in completing this worksheet. The Guide identifies applicable Commission policies and an explanation of each requirement. **The worksheet becomes an appendix to the team's report. If the team recommends monitoring on a Federal Compliance requirement in the form of a report or focused visit, it should be included in the Federal Compliance monitoring sections below and added to the appropriate section in the team report template.**

Institution under review: **MARSHALL UNIVERSITY** _____

Assignment of Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

Address this requirement by completing the "Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours" in the Appendix at the end of this document.

Institutional Records of Student Complaints

The institution has documented a process in place for addressing student complaints and appears to be systematically processing such complaints as evidenced by the data on student complaints since the last comprehensive evaluation.

1. Review the process that the institution uses to manage complaints as well as the history of complaints received and processed with a particular focus in that history on the past three or four years.
2. Determine whether the institution has a process to review and resolve complaints in a timely manner.
3. Verify that the evidence shows that the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this process into its review and planning processes.
4. Advise the institution of any improvements that might be appropriate.

5. Consider whether the record of student complaints indicates any pattern of complaints or otherwise raises concerns about the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation or Assumed Practices.
6. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The federal compliance review panel found that Institutional Records of Student Complaints does not meet the Commission's requirements. The team concurs that MU's lack of a campus level system for identifying and tracking student complaints about the institution, faculty or staff violates instruction 3 under this area: "the institution can, and does, follow this process and that it is able to integrate any relevant findings from this into its review and planning processes." The team recommends a interim report verifying that Marshall follows up on its stated intention to pull together centralized reporting of complaints and their resolution in a centralized campus-wide system.

Additional monitoring, if any: Therefore, the team recommends that Marshall University provides an interim report demonstrating that it has adopted a student complaint policy that identifies how all varieties of complaints, including those about the institution, faculty or staff, that enables the institution to identify relevant findings in the patterns of those complaints and integrate them into its review and planning processes. The team recommends this interim report be submitted no later than May 16, 2016

Publication of Transfer Policies

The institution has demonstrated it is appropriately disclosing its transfer policies to students and to the public. Policies contain information about the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions.

1. Review the institution's transfer policies.
2. Review any articulation agreements the institution has in place, including articulation agreements at the institution level and program-specific articulation agreements.
3. Consider where the institution discloses these policies (e.g., in its catalog, on its web site) and how easily current and prospective students can access that information.

Determine whether the disclosed information clearly explains the criteria the institution uses to make transfer decisions and any articulation arrangements the institution has with other institutions. Note whether the institution appropriately lists its articulation agreements with other institutions on its website or elsewhere. The information the institution provides should include any program-specific articulation

agreements in place and should clearly identify program-specific articulation agreements as such. Also, the information the institution provides should include whether the articulation agreement anticipates that the institution under Commission review: 1) accepts credit from the other institution(s) in the articulation agreement; 2) sends credits to the other institution(s) in the articulation agreements that it accepts; or 3) both offers and accepts credits with the other institution(s).

4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team concurs with the panel's comments

Additional monitoring, if any:

Practices for Verification of Student Identity

The institution has demonstrated that it verifies the identity of students who participate in courses or programs provided to the student through distance or correspondence education and appropriately discloses additional fees related to verification to students and to protect their privacy.

1. Determine how the institution verifies that the student who enrolls in a course is the same student who submits assignments, takes exams, and earns a final grade. The team should ensure that the institution's approach respects student privacy.
2. Check that any fees related to verification and not included in tuition are explained to the students prior to enrollment in distance courses (e.g., a proctoring fee paid by students on the day of the proctored exam).
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team concurs with the panel's comments

Additional monitoring, if any:

Title IV Program Responsibilities

The institution has presented evidence on the required components of the Title IV Program.

This requirement has several components the institution and team must address:

- **General Program Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the fulfillment of its Title IV program responsibilities, particularly findings from any review activities by the Department of Education. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area.*
- **Financial Responsibility Requirements.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about the Department's review of composite ratios and financial audits. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion Five if an institution has significant issues with financial responsibility as demonstrated through ratios that are below acceptable levels or other financial responsibility findings by its auditor.)*
- **Default Rates.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its three year default rate. It has a responsible program to work with students to minimize default rates. It has, as necessary, addressed any issues the Department raised regarding the institution's fulfillment of its responsibilities in this area. Note for 2012 and thereafter institutions and teams should be using the three-year default rate based on revised default rate data published by the Department in September 2012; if the institution does not provide the default rate for three years leading up to the comprehensive evaluation visit, the team should contact Commission staff.*
- **Campus Crime Information, Athletic Participation and Financial Aid, and Related Disclosures.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations.*
- **Student Right to Know.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about its disclosures. It has demonstrated, and the team has reviewed, the institution's policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The disclosures are accurate and provide appropriate information to students. (Note that the team should also be commenting under Criterion One if the team determines that disclosures are not accurate or appropriate.)*
- **Satisfactory Academic Progress and Attendance.** *The institution has provided the Commission with information about policies and practices for ensuring compliance with these regulations. The institution has demonstrated that the policies and practices meet state or federal requirements and that the institution is appropriately applying these policies and practices to students. In most cases, teams should verify that these policies exist and are available to students, typically in the course catalog or student handbook. Note that the Commission does not necessarily require that the institution take attendance but does anticipate that institutional attendance policies will provide information to students about attendance at the institution.*
- **Contractual Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its contractual relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for contractual relationships (If the team learns that the institution has a*

contractual relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the change request form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Contractual Change Application on the Commission’s web site for more information.)

- **Consortial Relationships.** *The institution has presented a list of its consortial relationships related to its academic program and evidence of its compliance with Commission policies requiring notification or approval for consortial relationships. (If the team learns that the institution has a consortial relationship that may require Commission approval and has not received Commission approval the team must require that the institution complete and file the form as soon as possible. The team should direct the institution to review the Consortial Change Application on the Commission’s web site for more information.)*

1. Review all of the information that the institution discloses having to do with its Title IV program responsibilities.
2. Determine whether the Department has raised any issues related to the institution’s compliance or whether the institution’s auditor in the A-133 has raised any issues about the institution’s compliance as well as look to see how carefully and effectively the institution handles its Title IV responsibilities.
3. If an institution has been cited or is not handling these responsibilities effectively, indicate that finding within the federal compliance portion of the team report and whether the institution appears to be moving forward with corrective action that the Department has determined to be appropriate.
4. If issues have been raised with the institution’s compliance, decide whether these issues relate to the institution’s ability to satisfy the Criteria for Accreditation, particularly with regard to whether its disclosures to students are candid and complete and demonstrate appropriate integrity (*Core Component 2.A and 2.B*).

5. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team’s conclusions:

- X The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission’s requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission’s requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution’s compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team investigated concerns noted in the panel’s report and concluded in each case that evidence of compliance was ultimately supplied to the institution, to wit:

- MU submitted a complete and accurate record of student status to the National Student Clearinghouse, as verified by the registrar. It is unclear why the data was missing, and therefore not transferred to the National Student Loan Data System.
- A review of the Public Safety website confirmed that there is, in fact, a link to current crime statistics.
- Access to Banner issues at the state level were in fact resolved in the WV Corrective Action Plan on pp. 84-5.
- MU has not yet been notified that its referral to AAASG has been adjudicated.

- MU provided a public report from IPEDS data that showed retention for Pell grant recipients.
- The withdrawal process is delineated in the catalog (online).
- MU demonstrated that gainful employment information for (eligible) certificates is available online.
- Specifically, with regard to Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies, MU provided documentation that its response to NASM was accepted in June 2015 and the progress report to CAATE was accepted July 21, 2015.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Required Information for Students and the Public

1. Verify that the institution publishes fair, accurate, and complete information on the following topics: the calendar, grading, admissions, academic program requirements, tuition and fees, and refund policies.

2. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team concurs with the panel's comments

Additional monitoring, if any:

Advertising and Recruitment Materials and Other Public Information

The institution has documented that it provides accurate, timely and appropriately detailed information to current and prospective students and the public about its accreditation status with the Commission and other agencies as well as about its programs, locations and policies.

1. Review the institution's disclosure about its accreditation status with the Commission to determine whether the information it provides is accurate and complete, appropriately formatted and contains the Commission's web address.
2. Review institutional disclosures about its relationship with other accrediting agencies for accuracy and for appropriate consumer information, particularly regarding the link between specialized/professional accreditation and the licensure necessary for employment in many professional or specialized areas.

3. Review the institution's catalog, brochures, recruiting materials, and information provided by the institution's advisors or counselors to determine whether the institution provides accurate information to current and prospective students about its accreditation, placement or licensure, program requirements, etc.
4. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team concurs with the panel's comments

Additional monitoring, if any:

Review of Student Outcome Data

1. Review the student outcome data the institution collects to determine whether it is appropriate and sufficient based on the kinds of academic programs it offers and the students it serves.
2. Determine whether the institution uses this information effectively to make decisions about academic programs and requirements and to determine its effectiveness in achieving its educational objectives.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
 - The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The panel asked the team to consider several issues with regard to Core Component. The team found nothing in the panel's comments to change its evaluation of Core Component 4.B.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Standing with State and Other Accrediting Agencies

The institution has documented that it discloses accurately to the public and the Commission its relationship with any other specialized, professional or institutional accreditor and with all governing or coordinating bodies in states in which the institution may have a presence.

The team has considered any potential implications for accreditation by the Higher Learning Commission of sanction or loss of status by the institution with any other accrediting agency or loss of authorization in any state.

Important note: If the team is recommending initial or continued status, and the institution is now or has been in the past five years under sanction or show-cause with, or has received an adverse action (i.e., withdrawal, suspension, denial, or termination) from, any other federally recognized specialized or institutional accreditor or a state entity, then the team must explain the sanction or adverse action of the other agency in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report and provide its rationale for recommending Commission status in light of this action. In addition, the team must contact the staff liaison immediately if it learns that the institution is at risk of losing its degree authorization or lacks such authorization in any state in which the institution meets state presence requirements.

1. Review the information, particularly any information that indicates the institution is under sanction or show-cause or has had its status with any agency suspended, revoked, or terminated, as well as the reasons for such actions.
2. Determine whether this information provides any indication about the institution's capacity to meet the Commission's Criteria for Accreditation. Should the team learn that the institution is at risk of losing, or has lost, its degree or program authorization in any state in which it meets state presence requirements, it should contact the Commission staff liaison immediately.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

- X The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.
- The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team investigated concerns noted in the panel's report and concluded that evidence of compliance was ultimately supplied by the university. Specifically, MU provided documentation that its response to NASM was accepted in June 2015 and the progress report to CAATE was accepted July 21, 2015.

Additional monitoring, if any:

Public Notification of Opportunity to Comment

The institution has made an appropriate and timely effort to solicit third party comments. The team has evaluated any comments received and completed any necessary follow-up on issues raised in these comments. Note that if the team has determined that any issues raised by third-party comment relate to

the team's review of the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation, it must discuss this information and its analysis in the body of the Assurance Section of the Team Report.

1. Review information about the public disclosure of the upcoming visit, including sample announcements, to determine whether the institution made an appropriate and timely effort to notify the public and seek comments.
2. Evaluate the comments to determine whether the team needs to follow-up on any issues through its interviews and review of documentation during the visit process.
3. Check the appropriate response that reflects the team's conclusions:

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution to meet the Commission's requirements but recommends Commission follow-up.

The team has reviewed this component of federal compliance and has found the institution not to meet the Commission's requirements and recommends Commission follow-up.

The team also has comments that relate to the institution's compliance with the Criteria for Accreditation. See Criterion (insert appropriate reference).

Comments: The team concurs with the panel's comments

Additional monitoring, if any:

Institutional Materials Related to Federal Compliance Reviewed by the Team

Provide a list materials reviewed here:

Appendix

Team Worksheet for Evaluating an Institution's Program Length and Tuition, Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours

Institution under review: _____ Marshall University _____

Part 1: Program Length and Tuition

Instructions

The institution has documented that it has credit hour assignments and degree program lengths within the range of good practice in higher education and that tuition is consistent across degree programs (or that there is a rational basis for any program-specific tuition).

Review the "*Worksheet for Use by Institutions on the Assignment of Credit Hours and on Clock Hours*" as well as the course catalog and other attachments required for the institutional worksheet.

Worksheet on Program Length and Tuition

A. Answer the Following Questions

Are the institution's degree program requirements within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes No

Comments:

As indicated in the Federal Compliance document and catalogues of Marshall University, the University offers associate, undergraduate graduate, and doctoral degrees requiring specific credit hours to complete. Marshall University policies and practices are consistent with the credit hour definition provided by federal regulation 34 CFR §600.2.

In compliance with the federal regulation 34 CFR §600.2, Marshall University requires 60 credit hours for an associate's program, a minimum of 120 hours for most 4 year degree programs, while other Engineering and degrees in the health professions, require up to 132 hours. Master's programs generally require 30-36 credit hours to complete, with a few requiring more than 40 credit hours.

The team agrees with the panel's comments

Are the institution's tuition costs across programs within the range of good practice in higher education and contribute to an academic environment in which students receive a rigorous and thorough education?

Yes

No

Comments:

Tuition is approved by the Board of Governors. As stated in the Federal Compliance document, “For Fall 2015, The Board of Governors approved removing nearly all course and lab fees and creating program fees to generate the same amount of revenue.”

It is also stated that Marshall University created a new Distance Program tuition rate for programs that can be completed totally online with affordable special tuition rate. Page 37 of the Undergraduate catalogue states: “The university and its governing board reserve the right to change fees and rates without prior notice. Fee assessments are calculated on student level, not course level. Please note: All fee listings in the fee section of this catalog show the rates authorized and in effect for the fall semester of the 2015-2016 academic year.”

The team agrees with the panel’s comments

B. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution’s program length and tuition practices?

Yes

No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:

Part 2: Assignment of Credit Hours

Instructions

In assessing the appropriateness of the credit allocations provided by the institution the team should complete the following steps:

1. Review the Worksheet completed by the institution, which provides information about an institution’s academic calendar and an overview of credit hour assignments across institutional offerings and delivery formats, and the institution’s policy and procedures for awarding credit hours. Note that such policies may be at the institution or department level and may be differentiated by such distinctions as undergraduate or graduate, by delivery format, etc.
2. Identify the institution’s principal degree levels and the number of credit hours for degrees at each level. The following minimum number of credit hours should apply at a semester institution:
 - Associate’s degrees = 60 hours
 - Bachelor’s degrees = 120 hours
 - Master’s or other degrees beyond the Bachelor’s = at least 30 hours beyond the Bachelor’s degree
 - Note that one quarter hour = .67 semester hour
 - Any exceptions to this requirement must be explained and justified.

3. Scan the course descriptions in the catalog and the number of credit hours assigned for courses in different departments at the institution.
 - At semester-based institutions courses will be typically be from two to four credit hours (or approximately five quarter hours) and extend approximately 14-16 weeks (or approximately 10 weeks for a quarter). The description in the catalog should indicate a course that is appropriately rigorous and has collegiate expectations for objectives and workload. Identify courses/disciplines that seem to depart markedly from these expectations.
 - Institutions may have courses that are in compressed format, self-paced, or otherwise alternatively structured. Credit assignments should be reasonable. (For example, as a full-time load for a traditional semester is typically 15 credits, it might be expected that the norm for a full-time load in a five-week term is 5 credits; therefore, a single five-week course awarding 10 credits would be subject to inquiry and justification.)
 - Teams should be sure to scan across disciplines, delivery mode, and types of academic activities.
 - Federal regulations allow for an institution to have two credit-hour awards: one award for Title IV purposes and following the above federal definition and one for the purpose of defining progression in and completion of an academic program at that institution. Commission procedure also permits this approach.
4. Scan course schedules to determine how frequently courses meet each week and what other scheduled activities are required for each course. Pay particular attention to alternatively-structured or other courses with particularly high credit hours for a course completed in a short period of time or with less frequently scheduled interaction between student and instructor.
5. **Sampling.** Teams will need to sample some number of degree programs based on the headcount at the institution and the range of programs it offers.
 - At a minimum, teams should anticipate sampling at least a few programs at each degree level.
 - For institutions with several different academic calendars or terms or with a wide range of academic programs, the team should expand the sample size appropriately to ensure that it is paying careful attention to alternative format and compressed and accelerated courses.
 - Where the institution offers the same course in more than one format, the team is advised to sample across the various formats to test for consistency.
 - For the programs the team sampled, the team should review syllabi and intended learning outcomes for several of the courses in the program, identify the contact hours for each course, and expectations for homework or work outside of instructional time.
 - The team should pay particular attention to alternatively-structured and other courses that have high credit hours and less frequently scheduled interaction between the students and the instructor.
 - Provide information on the samples in the appropriate space on the worksheet.
6. Consider the following questions:
 - Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution?

- Does that policy address the amount of instructional or contact time assigned and homework typically expected of a student with regard to credit hours earned?
- For institutions with courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy also equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe allotted for the course?
- Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)
- If so, is the institution's assignment of credit to courses reflective of its policy on the award of credit?

7. If the answers to the above questions lead the team to conclude that there may be a problem with the credit hours awarded the team should recommend the following:

- If the problem involves a poor or insufficiently-detailed institutional policy, the team should call for a revised policy as soon as possible by requiring a monitoring report within no more than one year that demonstrates the institution has a revised policy and evidence of implementation.
- If the team identifies an application problem and that problem is isolated to a few courses or single department or division or learning format, the team should call for follow-up activities (monitoring report or focused evaluation) to ensure that the problems are corrected within no more than one year.
- If the team identifies systematic non-compliance across the institution with regard to the award of credit, the team should notify Commission staff immediately and work with staff to design appropriate follow-up activities. The Commission shall understand systematic noncompliance to mean that the institution lacks any policies to determine the award of academic credit or that there is an inappropriate award of institutional credit not in conformity with the policies established by the institution or with commonly accepted practices in higher education across multiple programs or divisions or affecting significant numbers of students.

Worksheet on Assignment of Credit Hours

A. Identify the Sample Courses and Programs Reviewed by the Team (see #5 of instructions in completing this section)

B. Answer the Following Questions

1) Institutional Policies on Credit Hours

Does the institution's policy for awarding credit address all the delivery formats employed by the institution? (Note that for this question and the questions that follow an institution may have a single comprehensive policy or multiple policies.)

Yes

No

Comments: Marshall University has the standard format of 16 week terms. The University offers programs in compressed formats; 12 Weeks Session (Summer, 8 Weeks Session, 5 Weeks Session (Summer III), and 4 Weeks Session (Intersession) as referenced in "Appendix A/Attachment A: Assignment of Credit Hours." Additional information is provided in the document titled "Degree Programs - Hours to Complete Degree."

The team agrees with the panel's comments.

Does that policy relate the amount of instructional or contact time provided and homework typically expected of a student to the credit hours awarded for the classes offered in the delivery formats offered by the institution? (Note that an institution's policy must go beyond simply stating that it awards credit solely based on assessment of student learning and should also reference instructional time.)

Yes No

Comments: It is stated that a typical full-time undergraduate takes 15 hours and a typical full-time graduate student (excluding professional schools) takes 9 hours. Additional information is provided in the document titled "Degree Programs - Hours to Complete Degree."

The team agrees with the panel's comments.

For institutions with non-traditional courses in alternative formats or with less instructional and homework time than would be typically expected, does that policy equate credit hours with intended learning outcomes and student achievement that could be reasonably achieved by a student in the timeframe and utilizing the activities allotted for the course?

Yes No

Comments: Examples of the information provided on the "Course Formats" for each session provides information for contact hours.

The team agrees with the panel's comments.

Is the policy reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that the Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments: The policy meets the general requirements.

The team agrees with the panel's comments

2) Application of Policies

Are the course descriptions and syllabi in the sample academic programs reviewed by the team appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit? (Note that the

Commission will expect that credit hour policies at public institutions that meet state regulatory requirements or are dictated by the state will likely meet federal definitions as well.)

Yes No

Comments: Course descriptions in the catalogues and syllabi provided were reviewed and evaluated against the institution's policy on the award of credit. The sample courses complied with the institution's policy on the award of credit. However, outcomes data need to be verified by the site team.

The team concluded the outcomes are appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit.

Are the learning outcomes in the sample reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit?

Yes No

Comments: Sample syllabi were provided. Learning outcomes are appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed. Differentiated expectations and complexity of thought were reflected across course levels. However Learning outcomes were not provided in few courses. Outcomes data need to be verified by the site team.

The team verified the outcomes data which are in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit.

If the institution offers any alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, were the course descriptions and syllabi for those courses appropriate and reflective of the institution's policy on the award of academic credit?

Yes No

Comments: The sample of reviewed syllabi and course descriptions were appropriate for the degree level and program sequence and reflected the institution's policy on the award of academic credit.

The team agrees with the panel's comments.

If the institution offers alternative delivery or compressed format courses or programs, are the learning outcomes reviewed by the team appropriate to the courses and programs reviewed and in keeping with the institution's policy on the award of credit? Are the learning outcomes reasonably capable of being fulfilled by students in the time allocated to justify the allocation of credit?

Yes No

Comments: The learning outcomes and course expectations for the sampled online and accelerated format courses were appropriate to the courses and programs. Outcomes of compressed formats need to review in detail on site. Learning outcomes were not provided in few courses.

Courses in compressed format or in a non-traditional format have comparable expectations to those delivered in a traditional format. However, outcomes data needs to be verified by the site team.

The team verified the outcomes data as requested by the panel.

Is the institution's actual assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution reflective of its policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes No

Comments: Information provided meets standard requirement but this can be verified by the side team.

The team verified that the institution meets standard requirements.

C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Review the responses provided in this section. If the team has responded "no" to any of the questions above, the team will need to assign Commission follow-up to assure that the institution comes into compliance with expectations regarding the assignment of credit hours.

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's credit hour policies and practices?

Yes No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:

D. Identify and Explain Any Findings of Systematic Non-Compliance in One or More Educational Programs with Commission Policies Regarding the Credit Hour

Part 3: Clock Hours

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs in clock hours?

Yes

No

Does the institution offer any degree or certificate programs that must be reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs?

Yes

No

If the answer to either question is “Yes,” complete this part of the form.

Instructions

This worksheet is not intended for teams to evaluate whether an institution has assigned credit hours relative to contact hours in accordance with the Carnegie definition of the credit hour. This worksheet solely addresses those programs reported to the Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes.

Complete this worksheet **only if** the institution offers any degree or certificate programs in clock hours OR that must be reported to the U.S. Department of Education in clock hours for Title IV purposes even though students may earn credit hours for graduation from these programs. Non-degree programs subject to clock hour requirements (an institution is required to measure student progress in clock hours for federal or state purposes or for graduates to apply for licensure) are not subject to the credit hour definitions per se but will need to provide conversions to semester or quarter hours for Title IV purposes. Clock-hour programs might include teacher education, nursing, or other programs in licensed fields.

For these programs Federal regulations require that they follow the federal formula listed below. If there are no deficiencies identified by the accrediting agency in the institution’s overall policy for awarding semester or quarter credit, accrediting agency may provide permission for the institution to provide less instruction provided that the student’s work outside class in addition to direct instruction meets the applicable quantitative clock hour requirements noted below.

Federal Formula for Minimum Number of Clock Hours of Instruction (34 CFR §668.8)

1 semester or trimester hour must include at least 37.5 clock hours of instruction

1 quarter hour must include at least 25 clock hours of instruction

Note that the institution may have a lower rate if the institution’s requirement for student work outside of class combined with the actual clock hours of instruction equals the above formula provided that a semester/trimester hour includes at least 30 clock hours of actual instruction and a quarter hour include at least 20 semester hours.

Worksheet on Clock Hours

A. Answer the Following Questions

Does the institution’s credit to clock hour formula match the federal formula?

Yes

No

Comments:

If the credit to clock hour conversion numbers are less than the federal formula, indicate what specific requirements there are, if any, for student work outside of class?

Did the team determine that the institution's credit hour policies are reasonable within the federal definition as well as within the range of good practice in higher education? (Note that if the team answers "No" to this question, it should recommend follow-up monitoring in section C below.)

Yes

No

Comments:

Did the team determine in reviewing the assignment of credit to courses and programs across the institution that it was reflective of the institution's policy on the award of credit and reasonable and appropriate within commonly accepted practice in higher education?

Yes

No

Comments:

B. Does the team approve variations, if any, from the federal formula in the institution's credit to clock hour conversion?

Yes

No

(Note that the team may approve a lower conversion rate than the federal rate as noted above provided the team found no issues with the institution's policies or practices related to the credit hour and there is sufficient student work outside of class as noted in the instructions.)

C. Recommend Commission Follow-up, If Appropriate

Is any Commission follow-up required related to the institution's clock hour policies and practices?

Yes

No

Rationale:

Identify the type of Commission monitoring required and the due date:



STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: Marshall University WV

TYPE OF REVIEW: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:

DATES OF REVIEW: 10/12/2015 - 10/13/2015

No Change in Statement of Affiliation Status

Nature of Organization

CONTROL: Public

RECOMMENDATION: No Change

DEGREES AWARDED: Associates, Bachelors, Doctors, Masters, Specialist, Certificate

RECOMMENDATION: No Change

Conditions of Affiliation

STIPULATIONS ON AFFILIATION STATUS:

Accreditation at the doctoral level is limited to the Ph.D. in Biomedical Sciences, the Doctor of Psychology (Psy.D.), the Doctor of Education (Ed.D.), the Doctor of Management Practice in Nurse Anesthesia (DMPNA), the Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT), the Doctor of Pharmacy (Pharm.D.), and the M.D. International programs are limited to the M.B.A. offered at Bharatiya Vidya Bhavan, Bangalore.

RECOMMENDATION: No Change

APPROVAL OF NEW ADDITIONAL LOCATIONS:

The institution has been approved for the Notification Program, allowing the institution to open new additional locations within the United States.

RECOMMENDATION: No Change

*Recommendations for the
STATEMENT OF AFFILIATION STATUS*

APPROVAL OF DISTANCE EDUCATION DEGREES:

Approved for distance education courses and programs. The institution has not been approved for correspondence education.

RECOMMENDATION: No Change

ACCREDITATION ACTIVITIES: None

RECOMMENDATION: Interim Report due May 16, 2016; a report on student complaint policies and procedures.

Summary of Commission Review

YEAR OF LAST REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2005 - 2006

YEAR FOR NEXT REAFFIRMATION OF ACCREDITATION: 2015 - 2016

RECOMMENDATION: 2025-26



ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

INSTITUTION and STATE: 1665 Marshall University WV

TYPE OF REVIEW: Open Pathway: Comprehensive Evaluation

DESCRIPTION OF REVIEW:

No change to Organization Profile

Educational Programs

	<u>Program Distribution</u>
Programs leading to Undergraduate	
Associates	2
Bachelors	57
Programs leading to Graduate	
Doctors	7
Masters	50
Specialist	2
Certificate programs	
Certificate	40

Recommended Change:

Off-Campus Activities:

In State - Present Activity
Campuses: None.

Additional Locations:

- Raleigh County - Beaver, WV
- Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA) - Beaver, WV
- Bluefield - Bluefield, WV
- Charleston Area Medical Center - Charleston, WV
- Clay County BOE - Clay, WV
- St. Mary's Center for Education - Huntington, WV
- Teays Valley Regional Center - Hurricane, WV
- 167th Air National Guard Base - Martinsburg, WV
- Pressley Ridge - Ona, WV
- Pickering Associates - Parkersburg, WV

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Mid-Ohio Valley Center - Point Pleasant, WV
Mercer County BOE - Princeton, WV
Marshall University-South Charleston Campus - South Charleston, WV
Braxton County - Sutton, WV
Pressley Ridge Center - Walker, WV
SMC-Williamson - Williamson, WV

Recommended Change: No Change

Out Of State - Present Activity
Campuses: None.

Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change: No Change

Out of USA - Present Activity
Campuses: None.

Additional Locations: None.

Recommended Change: No Change

Distance Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

Master 13.1202 Elementary Education and Teaching MA in Elementary Education Internet

Master 13.1205 Secondary Education and Teaching MA in Secondary Education Internet

Bachelor 52.0301 Accounting Accounting Internet

Bachelor 52.0601 Business/Managerial Economics Economics Internet

Bachelor 52.1101 International Business/Trade/Commerce International Business Internet

Bachelor 52.0201 Business Administration and Management, General Management Internet

Bachelor 52.1201 Management Information Systems, General Management Information Systems Internet

Bachelor 52.1401 Marketing/Marketing Management, General Marketing Internet

Bachelor 45.0701 Geography Geography Internet

Bachelor 54.0101 History, General History Internet

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Bachelor 45.0901 International Relations and Affairs International Affairs Internet

Bachelor 42.0101 Psychology, General Psychology Internet

Master 13.1101 Counselor Education/School Counseling and Guidance Services Counseling Internet

Master 13.1299 Teacher Education and Professional Development, Specific Levels and Methods, Other Master of Arts in Teaching Internet

Master 13.0401 Educational Leadership and Administration, General Leadership Studies Internet

Master 13.1001 Special Education and Teaching, General Special Education Internet

Bachelor 51.1004 Clinical/Medical Laboratory Technician Medical Laboratory Sciences Internet

Bachelor 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse BSN Internet

Master 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse MSN Internet

Master 03.0104 Environmental Science Environmental Science Internet

Master 11.0401 Information Science/Studies Information Systems Internet

Master 15.0701 Occupational Safety and Health Technology/Technician Safety: Mine Safety Emphasis Internet

Master 11.1099 Computer/Information Technology Services Administration and Management, Other Technology Management Internet

Bachelor 24.0102 General Studies Regents Internet

Bachelor 24.0199 Liberal Arts and Sciences, General Studies and Humanities, Other Applied Science Internet

Master 51.3805 Family Practice Nurse/Nursing Family Nurse Practitioner Internet

Master 13.1210 Early Childhood Education and Teaching Early Childhood Education Internet

Master 13.0501 Educational/Instructional Technology Educational Computing: Graduate Certificate Program Internet

Master 13.1311 Mathematics Teacher Education Math/Algebra:Graduate Certificate Program Internet

Master 13.1203 Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Education and Teaching Middle Childhood: Graduate Certificate Program Internet

Master 13.1205 Secondary Education and Teaching Post Bac Teacher: Graduate Certificate Program Internet

Master 13.1334 School Librarian/School Library Media Specialist School Library:Graduate Certificate Program Internet

ORGANIZATIONAL PROFILE WORKSHEET

Master 13.0499 Educational Administration and Supervision, Other Social Services/Attendance:
Graduate Certificate Program Internet

Master 13.1401 Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language/ESL Language Instructor
Teaching ESL: Graduate Certificate Program Internet

Master 13.1311 Mathematics Teacher Education Elementary Mathematics Specialist: Graduate
Certificate Program Internet

Bachelor 52.0801 Finance, General Finance Internet

Recommended Change: No Change

Correspondence Education Programs:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change: No Change

Contractual Relationships:

Present Offerings:

None.

Recommended Change: No Change

Consortial Relationships:

Present Offerings:

Bachelor 51.0908 Respiratory Care Therapy/Therapist Bachelor - 51.0908 Respiratory Care
Therapy/Therapist (BS in Respiratory Care)

Bachelor 51.0911 Radiologic Technology/Science - Radiographer Bachelor - 51.0911 Radiologic
Technology/Science - Radiographer (Bachelor of Science in Medical Imaging)

Associate 51.3801 Registered Nursing/Registered Nurse Associate - 51.3801 Registered
Nursing/Registered Nurse (Associate in Science in Nursing)

Doctor 51.3802 Nursing Administration Doctor - 51.3802 Nursing Administration (Doctor of
Management Practice in Nurse Anesthesia)

Recommended Change: No Change
