

Lander University
Institutional Effectiveness Summary 2001-2002

According to [Section 59-101-350 of the SC Code of Laws, 1976, as amended](#), each public institution in the state of South Carolina must submit an Institutional Effectiveness Report annually to the South Carolina Legislature and to the people of the state of South Carolina. Lander University's assessment procedures are very much a part of our mission. Lander University has been an institution dedicated to providing higher education to the people of South Carolina, particularly in the upstate region, from its inception, and we want to show the taxpayers of South Carolina, to whom we are accountable, that our institution is both extremely effective and cost-efficient. At Lander University, each unit establishes its program goals and assessment measures to be consistent with both the university's mission statement and each unit's unique area of expertise. Lander University assesses its effectiveness continually, and we strive to maintain educational excellence while working to improve in any area that demonstrates a need for improvement.

The 2001-2002 Institutional Effectiveness Report for Lander University reports on the assessment of educational effectiveness for the following areas, following the Commission on Higher Education's established uniform schedule for reporting:

Full Reports

[Environmental Science](#)

[Exercise Studies](#)

[Sports Medicine/Athletic Training](#)

[Psychology](#)

[History](#)

[Political Science](#)

[Sociology](#)

Interim Reports

[Biology \(Life Sciences\)](#)

[English Language and Literature](#)

Update

[Student Development](#)

In addition, pursuant to the 2001 legislative amendment to SC 59-101, we include a statement on Lander University's policies and procedures for preparing a technologically skilled workforce.

Majors and Concentrations

The various academic units employ a broad array of assessment techniques in their program evaluation, each using multiple measures tailored for the specific qualities of the discipline. During the 2000-2001 academic year, majors in Environmental Science, Sports Medicine, Athletic Training, Exercise Studies, History, Political Science, Sociology, and Psychology reported assessment findings through the CHE Program Reviews, and interim reports were submitted for Life Sciences (Biology) and English Language and Literature. The table below summarizes the assessment measures used by the majors under review.

Table 1. Assessment Measures of Majors under Review

| Discipline | Alumni Interviews/ Surveys | Exit Interviews/ Student Surveys | Content Area Exams | Portfolios/ Student Work |
|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|---|
| Environmental Science | X | | X | X |
| Exercise Studies | X | X | X | X |
| Sports Medicine/ Athletic Training | X | X | X | |
| Psychology | X | | X | |
| History | X | X | X | |
| Political Science | X | X | X | |
| Sociology | X | | X | |
| Life Sciences (Biology) | X | X | X | X |
| English Language and Literature | | X | | X |

Environmental Science

The Environmental Science program at Lander University uses several assessment measures to monitor students' learning in the field of Environmental Science, students' perceptions of the program, and students' abilities to communicate effectively specialized information to a general audience. The assessment measures employed by the Environmental Science program are very specifically tied to the program goals.

Program Goals and Assessment

The goal of the Environmental Science program is to train environmental scientists and to produce graduates who are prepared for post-baccalaureate pursuits, including graduate or professional schools and employment in the discipline. Program graduates will:

1. possess an understanding of a broad spectrum of the accumulated knowledge and methodology in the discipline.
2. be able to enter and compete in graduate or professional school programs, or be able to secure employment in the discipline.
3. possess an understanding of the vocabulary of the discipline and be able to communicate concepts through the proper use of this vocabulary.

Students are given a multiple choice professional knowledge examination developed by the environmental science faculty assessing material presented in the core courses of the program as freshmen and again as seniors in order to measure the change in each student's knowledge of the discipline, the methodology, and the vocabulary/ability to communicate concepts as a result of matriculation in the program. Alumni are surveyed in order to determine their continued placement in environmental science careers or graduate programs. Students are required to submit writing samples as freshmen and again as seniors in order to measure the gained ability of students to use appropriate environmental science vocabulary in order to communicate basic concepts to a general audience, and senior students are required to present a 30 minute PowerPoint presentation on a research topic approved by the faculty in order to assess further their gained communication abilities.

Outcomes

Professional knowledge exam

This exam was first administered in the fall of 1998 to the second group of incoming freshmen in the newly created Environmental Science Program and has been administered annually since then to freshmen and for the first time to seniors in the spring of 2001. As the following table shows, the average score of incoming freshmen for the first four years varied between 23 and 28%. The available data for graduating seniors (N=7) show an average score of 56%.

Table 2. Mean results of professional knowledge exam

| Year | Entry Mean | Exit Mean |
|-------------|-------------------|------------------|
| 1998 | 28.5 (N=4) | |
| 1999 | 23.1 (N=7) | |
| 2000 | 27 (N=4) | 56.3 (N=7) |
| 2001 | 23.6 (N=5) | |

N = the number of students who took the exam

The Professional Knowledge Exam is directly related to the educational objectives of the program and provides a standardized way of measuring student knowledge. Numerically, the students doubled the score on the exam due to the knowledge that they gained during their stay at Lander.

The exam is periodically reviewed and questions are added or deleted for the purpose of ensuring that the exam corresponds to the curriculum that the students have taken.

Alumni Surveys

Alumni of the Environmental Science program were surveyed, and the surveys showed the following breakdown of career paths. All of the graduates remained in South Carolina with the exception of one, who now attends graduate school at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Table 3. Career Paths of Environmental Science Graduates

| Career path | Number of Students |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| graduate school | 2 (Oceanography/MBA) |
| environmental consulting companies | 2 |
| analytical laboratory | 1 (double major in chemistry) |
| chemical industry | 1 |

The placement of all of the Environmental Science graduates is good, particularly when seen in light of the recession that began approximately at the same time the first students graduated from the program. Competitiveness was shown especially by the student attending Georgia Tech, who competed against graduates from highly regarded institutions. The location of placement indicates that the program serves the needs of the state of South Carolina.

Writing Sample

Writing samples were collected from freshmen and graduating seniors. The samples are graded on a 0-4 scale based on the organization of the essay, the development of ideas, the clarity of explanations, and the usage of standard, grammatically correct English. A grade of "4" is given to essays that demonstrate a high degree of writing competence, a grade of "3" signifies competence, and a grade of "2" indicates limited competence due to obvious weaknesses in one or more of the evaluated areas. A grade of "1" reflects on fundamental deficiencies in writing skills, and unintelligible essays are given a grade of "0".

Table 2 shows a paired comparison of the writing sample evaluations for the six graduated Environmental Science majors.

Table 4. Comparison of Scores for First year and Graduating Senior Writing Samples

| Student | Freshman score | Senior score |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| 1 | AP credit | 3.0 |
| 2 | 2.5 | 3.0 |
| 3 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| 4 | transfer | 2.0 |
| 5 | 1.5 | 3.0 |
| 6 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Average | 2.50 | 2.67 |

All of the Environmental Science graduates demonstrated limited competency or higher on their writing samples. No particular pattern of improvement is noticeable. This agrees with faculty impressions from class work.

Since the scores on the writing samples did not indicate fundamental deficiencies in writing skills, no changes are necessary.

Oral Presentation

Graduates of the Environmental Science Program should be able to present information effectively and coherently about a specialized topic. To assess this ability, students in the first graduating cohort (2001) were required to prepare and deliver a 30 minute PowerPoint presentation on a topic in the field of environmental science. The talks were presented in the senior seminar course, ES-499, under the direction of a faculty member. Topics were chosen by the students and approved by the faculty. The oral competency of each student was assessed subjectively on a pass-fail basis.

All graduating members of the 2001 cohort received passing grades. It is believed that a more objective and quantitative grading system is desirable, and in the future, a 5-point Likert scale will be used to evaluate the organization, presentation, use of English, vocal projection, and clarity of presentation.

Exercise Studies

The Exercise Studies program at Lander University employs several assessment measures to measure the professional knowledge of graduating seniors with degrees in Exercise Studies have, how competitive they are in the field, and what perceptions they have of the program.

Program Goals and Assessment

The Exercise Studies program with an emphasis in Exercise Science is designed to prepare students for careers in public, private, and corporate wellness programs, industrial and cardiac rehabilitation programs, and fitness and conditioning programs. Students will also be well prepared for graduate study in areas such as cardiac rehabilitation, exercise physiology, and physical therapy.

The student will possess necessary competencies and knowledge by meeting the following objectives of the Exercise Studies program:

1. Understand the role of exercise in maintenance of lifetime physical fitness.
2. Know the physiological/biochemical changes occurring in the human organism when it is placed under physical stress.
3. Know methods, techniques, and procedures used to assess physical fitness, i.e. cardiovascular

- endurance, body composition, muscular strength and endurance, and flexibility.
4. Know and be able to use scientifically-collected data to prepare accurate programs of exercise, progressive resistance, flexibility, and body composition alterations.
 5. Know the scientific methods of conducting research and possess the ability to understand basic discipline-based research material presented in verbal or written form.
 6. Know the basic legal implications associated with every aspect of a wellness (fitness) program.
 7. Know the scientific basis of nutrition and the relationship of proper nutrition to physical performance.
 8. Know and be certified in CPR and first aid.

Students are given a professional knowledge examination consisting of 100 multiple choice questions developed by the Physical Education and Exercise Studies faculty assessing material presented in the core courses of the program. Alumni are surveyed in order to determine their placement in related graduate programs, and graduating students are asked to complete exit interviews. Students are required to complete two graded three credit hour internships with businesses or institutions outside of the university, and as seniors, students must present a research project at a colloquy open to the university community and the public in order to assess their gained communication abilities within this field.

Outcomes

Professional knowledge exam

Of the 18 students taking the Exercise Studies professional knowledge exam in 2001, 3 passed and 15 failed. The percentage of students who passed the exam is 16.6%.

There are two possible explanations for the marginal performance of graduating seniors on the professional knowledge examination. There have been several instructor changes since 1998 when the professional knowledge exam was revised, which may have impacted the continuity of information given to students in the core courses. In addition, the students' performances on the professional knowledge exam have no impact on graduation, grades, or completion of core requirements of the program. Anecdotally, most students report not preparing for this inventory. The Division of Physical Education and Exercise Studies is currently considering the possibility of making this assessment a part of the capstone course and requiring a passing grade on it for graduation.

Alumni Surveys

According to the alumni surveys, four students applied for graduate or professional programs related to exercise studies. All four students were accepted into the programs to which they applied.

Exit Interviews

Fifteen of the 18 graduating seniors completed anonymously the exit interview questionnaire. Strengths identified within this process were student satisfaction with Lander University, the general education program, and the education they received within the Exercise Studies program. The greatest strengths of the Exercise Studies program were the quality contact with professors and the outstanding facilities and equipment of the Chandler Center. Weaknesses identified were a need for more PEES faculty and a greater availability of classes within the division.

Internships

For the 2000-2001 school year, 100% of the Exercise Studies students passed their internship experiences. In addition, Exercise Studies majors regularly comment very positively regarding the "hands-on" approach to learning within the PEES Division. Successful entry into graduate programs has been linked to this emphasis on practical skills and applications.

Research Projects

For the 2000-2001 school year, 100% of the Exercise Studies seniors passed their research presentation requirement.

Sports Medicine/Athletic Training

The Sports Medicine/Athletic Training program at Lander University is a relatively new program that has not yet graduated its first students. It is currently undergoing its initial self-study for the purpose of external review and accreditation by the accrediting bodies JRC-AT (Joint Review Committee on Athletic Training) and CAAHEP (Council on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs).

Program Goals and Assessment

The mission of the Sports Medicine/Athletic Training program is to provide a comprehensive and progressive undergraduate educational experience that prepares students for a career in athletic training. Through a systematic progression of pedagogical and clinical instruction, supervised learning, and continuous evaluation each student has the opportunity to develop and master the concepts and clinical proficiencies necessary to provide the highest quality of sports injury prevention, assessment, care and rehabilitation services in a dynamic and rapidly-changing society.

Goals and Objectives

- I. To develop athletic trainers who understand and appreciate the contemporary role of athletic training within the context of a rapidly changing health care delivery system.

Objectives: After successfully completing the Lander University Sports Medicine/Athletic Training program, the student will be able to...

- A. Identify and discuss the major factors in the evolution of the field of athletic training from its earliest historical roots to its present position in American allied health services.
- B. Demonstrate an understanding of critical issues facing contemporary health care in America and discuss possible strategies for addressing those issues that directly impact the athletic training profession.

- II. To develop and maintain an environment that encourages and enables cognitive, psychomotor, and affective learning excellence.

Objective: On a continuing basis, the Lander University Sports Medicine/Athletic Training faculty will identify, develop, and utilize a variety of instructional methods and directed learning experiences that address the cognitive, psychomotor, and affective learning needs of the students.

- III. To develop and maintain a broad and effective network of allied health resources in Greenwood and the surrounding area.

Objective: On a continuing basis, the Director of the Lander University Sports Medicine/Athletic Training will seek out, identify, recruit, and establish contractual relationships with a wide variety of allied health professionals and clinical sites within Greenwood and the adjacent counties.

- IV. To develop athletic trainers who possess competencies and clinical proficiencies necessary to meet the challenging sports injury management needs of our rapidly-changing society.

- Objectives:
- A. perform anthropometric measurement techniques and other appropriate examination/screening procedures on physically active participants.
 - B. obtain and interpret data regarding environmental factors, and recognize potentially hazardous conditions and situations in the activity setting.
 - C. select and apply preventive and protective equipment, taping, wrapping, splinting, bracing, and other rehabilitative devices in order to prevent re-injury.
 - D. perform proper clinical evaluation techniques.
 - E. utilize selected therapeutic modalities.
 - F. demonstrate an understanding of pharmacological agents and their appropriate utilization in the management of exercise-related injuries and illnesses.
 - G. design and carry out appropriate rehabilitative activities utilizing contemporary isokinetic, isotonic, and isometric strength testing/improvement devices.
 - H. use contemporary computer hardware and software.
 - I. perform record-keeping duties with sensitivity to patient confidentiality.
 - J. design, evaluate, and manage an athletic training facility.
 - K. design and implement an emergency management plan (EMP).
- V. To develop athletic trainers who will successfully meet the NATA-BOC standards for certification, consistent with the domains of the most current NATA-BOC Role Delineation Study.

Objective: After successfully completing the Lander University Sports Medicine/Athletic Training program, 100% of the students who take the NATABOC certification exam will pass the exam and attain NATABOC certification.

Outcomes

The program goals and objectives will be assessed by student course evaluations, clinical instructor evaluations, alumni surveys, senior exit interviews, and the pass rate of graduates on the NATA-BOC certification exam. The results of the accreditation self-study will be available September 15, 2002. The self-study process has yielded several curriculum changes.

Psychology

Program Goals and Assessments

The plan for assessing the psychology program at Lander University is based on the following goals, which were revised in the fall of 2001.

Lander University students graduating with a baccalaureate degree in psychology will have

1. The ability to comprehend complex written material concerning psychological issues;
2. The ability to think logically, critically, and objectively;
3. A general knowledge of the theories, issues, and findings in the areas of human development, experimental methodology, and personality;

4. The ability to write technical reports in APA style;
5. A knowledge of basic methods of statistical analysis;
6. Knowledge of ethical issues pertaining to psychology.

Means of Assessment

Achievement Test in Psychology: this instrument was devised by the faculty in 1998 and consists of 100 multiple choice items. The test has five subtests that measure knowledge of general psychology, development, personality, methodology (including ethics), and statistics. The test is administered annually to seniors, whose scores are compared to those of past senior classes and to baseline scores of students enrolled in freshman level, sophomore level, and junior level psychology classes.

ETS Major Field Test: this standardized, nationally-normed test consists of 160 multiple choice items that pertain to various areas within the discipline.

University Alumni Survey: this is conducted annually by the Office of Career Services and reports the average salary of graduates and how many graduates have jobs related to their majors.

Faculty/Student Feedback Committee: this was created in 1999 in order for the faculty to get feedback about the program from upper-division students.

Annual S.C.P.A. Psychology Bowl: this is a jeopardy-like contest in which teams of psychology majors from various colleges and universities within the state compete against each other.

Goal 4, the ability to write technical reports in APA style, is assessed in terms of being a requirement in the methodology and behavioral statistics course.

Outcomes

1. Achievement Test in Psychology

Table 5. Comparisons of Mean Scores of Psychology Achievement Test by Class

| class | mean score |
|---|-------------------|
| PSYC 101 (General Psychology) | 39.75 |
| PSYC 203 (Developmental Psychology) | 51.08 |
| PSYC 330 (Methods of Behavioral Research) | 54.58 |
| average senior score* | 66.083 |

*Scores from 1999, 2000, 2001, and 2002 classes have been averaged.

A one-way analysis of variance and post hoc analyses were performed on the scores of the senior classes of 1999 (N=16), 2000 (N=18), 2001 (N=24), and 2002 (N=41). The analysis also included the baseline scores of students enrolled in general psychology (N=91), developmental psychology (N=52), research methods and logic (N=31), and behavioral statistics (N=14).

As expected, significant differences in achievement were found among the groups, $F(7,286) = 66.18, p < .0001$. The senior classes had means varying from 64.12/100 to 68.05/100, and these means were not significantly different from each other. The senior classes significantly outperformed the baseline groups except for the behavioral statistics class (mean = 67.29/100). The means of the general psychology, developmental psychology, and research methods classes were 39.75/100, 51.08/100, and 54.58/100, respectively.

These baseline groups also significantly differed from each other depending on how advanced the courses were. Specifically, students in the most advanced course, the junior-level statistics course, scored higher on the test than did students in the less advanced courses in junior-level methodology, sophomore-level

developmental, and freshman-level general psychology. In turn, the methodology students outperformed the students in developmental and general psychology, and the students in developmental outperformed the students in general psychology.

Another one-way analysis of variance, with subsequent post hoc analyses, was performed on the five sub-test scores of the four senior classes. Some significant mean differences were found, $F(4,380) = 101.68$, $p < .0001$. Achievement levels in developmental psychology and personality were not significantly different (means of 15.12/100 and 14.81/100, respectively). Achievement levels in general psychology and methodology were not significantly different, either (means of 13.59/100 and 13.10/100, respectively). However, the achievement levels in developmental psychology and personality were significantly greater than the achievement levels in general psychology, methodology, and statistics (mean of 9.25/100). The achievement levels in general psychology and methodology were significantly greater than the achievement level in statistics.

2. ETS Major Field Test

ETS results are reported in 11 ways—a mean scale score for the entire test and mean subscale scores for the following areas.

Table 6. Scores and Percentiles of ETS Major Field Test in Psychology

| Areas of ETS Test | Score | Percentile |
|--|-----------|------------------|
| The entire test | 153.4/200 | 30 th |
| Learning and Cognition | 53.9/100 | 30 th |
| Perception/Sensation/Physiology/Comparative/Ethology | 50.9/100 | 12 th |
| Clinical/Abnormal/Personality | 55.9/100 | 28 th |
| Developmental and Social | 56.7/100 | 43 rd |
| Memory and Thinking | 48.7/100 | 38 th |
| Sensory and Physiology | 25.3/100 | 7 th |
| Developmental | 48.8/100 | 80 th |
| Clinical and Abnormal | 41.9/100 | 25 th |
| Social | 50.6/100 | 23 rd |
| Measurement and Methodology | 50.7/100 | 67 th |

No comparative data are available for the psychology program as 2001 was the first year that the ETS Psychology Field Test was administered. The scores presented above represent a baseline against which future scores will be measured.

3. Alumni Surveys

Survey findings were available for the class of 1999 (N=5) and the class of 2000 (N=12). Four of the five 1999 respondents had jobs related to the major, and the respondents had an average salary of \$26,999. Eleven of the 12 2000 respondents had jobs related to the major, and the respondents had an average salary of \$31,363.

4. Faculty/Student Feedback Committee

Consistently since 1999 the representatives from the junior and senior classes have reported being generally satisfied with their program. The students perceive the program as being well-structured and as being demanding. They also consistently report that the courses in methodology and statistics are the most difficult. The seniors reported that the internship course was helpful in making career choices and gaining work experience that, in turn was helpful in finding employment. Students further reported being very satisfied with the one hour introduction-to-the-major course. That course helped clarify what is expected of majors and provided realistic information about graduate programs.

5. Annual S.C.P.A. Psychology Bowl

Since the inception of the Psychology Bowl in 1996, our teams have performed well against teams from such schools as Furman, Clemson, Francis Marion, Winthrop, and the College of Charleston. Our teams won first place in 1996 and 2001, and third place in 1999 and 2000.

Assessment of Outcomes

1. Achievement Test in Psychology

These results indicate that in general, psychology majors do acquire more and more knowledge of their curriculum as they progress from being freshmen to being seniors. The sole exception is in the area of statistics. Perhaps the abstract nature of statistical concepts and decision-making could explain why students have difficulty retaining knowledge of the material.

The achievement test has a high degree of reliability as evidenced by the consistency of scores from senior class to senior class. The test also has a high degree of content validity in that all items were derived from the content base of the required core psychology courses. The test will continue to be used as an internal measure of student knowledge and progress.

2. ETS Major Field Test

ETS cautions that major field test results are not to be used for the purpose of curriculum assessment until several years worth of data have been collected. Not surprisingly, the seniors did better in developmental and measurement/methodology because courses in those areas are required for all majors.

3. Alumni Surveys

These findings seem to indicate that psychology graduates are able to find employment related to the major and earn an adequate income. Since the survey data are scanty, the psychology program devised its own website survey in 2001.

4. Faculty/Student Feedback Committee

As a result of feedback from previous years, in the fall of 2001 the faculty made the second required courses in mathematics more flexible. Options were expanded from MATH 121 or 212 to MATH 121 or 212 or 111 or 131. A similar change was made for the required third composition course. Students are no longer restricted to ENGL 373, but now can choose between ENGL 373 or 275.

5. Annual S.C.P.A. Psychology Bowl

This successful record is another indication that the psychology program is doing its job of imparting knowledge to its majors. The successful performance of our teams is also a reflection of their ability to think logically, critically, and objectively, and to do so while under pressure.

History

Program Goals and Assessments

The plan for assessing the history program at Lander University is based on the following goals. Lander University students graduating with a baccalaureate degree in history will:

1. Know the basic historical chronologies of the United States and western civilization;
2. Possess detailed knowledge of selected areas of European, U.S., and world histories;
3. Be able to read and evaluate critically primary and secondary historical sources;
4. Be able to examine and evaluate conflicting interpretations of events and personalities;
5. Be able to perform historical research in libraries, archives, and other appropriate

- repositories of historical records;
6. Be able to write about historical questions and evidence in a clear, analytical, and organized manner, including the technical ability to document research and to construct a bibliography;
 7. Be able to discuss historical findings in clear and coherent oral presentations;
 8. Be able to understand and explain historical information drawn from other cultures, both within the United States and from other countries.

Means of Assessment

Student Exit Questionnaire: This instrument uses a 5-point Likert scale (ranging from 1—strongly disagree to 5—strongly agree) to measure the perception of seniors concerning how well the program met its goals.

Exit Exam: This instrument was devised by the history faculty and consists of 100 questions. The exam measures knowledge of historical chronologies and selected areas of history.

Lander University Alumni Survey: This is conducted annually by the Office of Career Services and reports the average salary of graduates and how many graduates have jobs related to their majors.

Outcomes

1. Student Exit Questionnaire

Table 7. Graduates’ Perceptions of History Program’s Goals Outcomes

| Goal | Average rating on 5-point scale |
|---|--|
| 1. Know the basic historical chronologies of the United States and western civilization. | 3.80/5.0 |
| 2. Possess detailed knowledge of selected area of European, U.S., and world histories. | 4.4 |
| 3. Be able to read and evaluate critically primary and secondary historical sources. | 3.95 |
| 4. Be able to examine and evaluate conflicting interpretations of events and personalities. | 4.0 |
| 5. Be able to perform historical research in libraries, archives, and other repositories of historical records. | 4.9 |
| 6. Be able to write about historical questions and evidence in a clear, analytical, and organized manner, including the technical ability to document research and to construct a bibliography. | 4.56 |
| 7. Be able to discuss historical findings in clear and coherent oral presentations. | 4.65 |
| 8. Be able to understand and explain historical information drawn from other cultures, both within the United States and from other countries. | 4.8 |

These findings indicate that the five seniors of 2001 agreed that goals 1 and 3 were met. The seniors substantially agreed that the other goals were met. The only slightly low ratings were given to goal 1, which received a score of 3.80.

The history faculty will need to determine why item 1 (knowing the basic chronologies of the U.S. and western civilization) was somewhat lower than the others.

Item 13 of the Student Exit Questionnaire needs to be modified. It is worded in a negative fashion that could cause confusion for some students.

2. Exit Exam

The original exam consisted of 120 items that measured knowledge of U.S., European, and western civilization chronologies and knowledge of selected areas of U.S., European, and world histories. As noted above, some assessment data from the questionnaire were not available because of administrative transitions. Similarly, the exit exam data for the senior classes of 1999 and 2000 were not available.

Baseline data were obtained in the spring of 2002 from students (N=85) who had completed a freshman-level course. They and five members of the senior class of 2002 were given a shorter version of the exam, 100 items, in order to let them complete the exam within a 50 minute class period. Scores from the 120 item test were available for the seniors of 1998 (N=14) and 2001 (N=5). These scores were transformed to percentages in order to make comparisons with the baseline data and the data from the 2002 seniors.

A one-way analysis of variance was performed on the four sets of scores. The baseline group had a mean of 47.01/100 with a standard deviation of 12.32. The means and standard deviations of the senior classes were as follows:

Table 8. History Program Exit Exam Means and Standard Variations

| class | mean | standard deviation |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| 1998 | 73.71 | 11.51 |
| 2001 | 61.40 | 20.20 |
| 2002 | 78.11 | 8.93 |

The analysis found that the mean scores of the senior classes of 1998 and 2002 were not significantly different. Both of these senior classes significantly outscored the 2001 class and the baseline group. The 2001 seniors did not differ significantly from the baseline group.

The exam scores of the 1998 and 2002 seniors indicate that the history program met its goals of imparting knowledge of historical chronologies and knowledge of selected areas of U.S., European, and world history to the history majors as they progress through the curriculum. The aberrant nature of the class of 2001 results can be accounted for by the smallness of the sample and the wide disparity in scores. Two seniors were evidently strong, and two others were evidently weak.

The faculty will continue to review the exam to ensure that its content is consistent with program goals. Future baseline data will be gathered from students enrolled in 100 level courses.

3. Alumni Surveys

Survey findings were available for the class of 1999 (N=2) and the class of 2000 (N=2). None of these four survey respondents had jobs related to the major. The two 1999 respondents earned less than \$15,000. The two 2000 respondents had an average income of \$24,000.

Since only four graduates responded to the survey, no meaningful conclusions can be drawn.

Greater survey participation might be obtained in the future if the history faculty were to devise their own survey and post it on the program's website.

Political Science

Program Goals and Assessments

The plan for assessing the political science program at Lander University is based on the following goals:

Lander University students graduating with baccalaureate degrees in political science will:

1. Attain a factual knowledge in most of the generally recognized areas of the discipline;
2. Be equipped with skills of political analysis;
3. Both receive the broad training and develop the general competence in the discipline required to equip them for successful careers in professions such as government service, politics and campaigning, legal practice, journalism, business, the ministry, military service, law enforcement, teaching, public relations, and service in public, quasi-public, and private agencies;
4. Acquire skills and knowledge to enable them to be effective citizens;
5. Will exhibit their capacity to read quickly and retentively, to express their ideas in writing in a concise and lucid manner, and to speak with precision and cogency;
6. Be acquainted with those skills of analysis (e.g. statistical analysis, computer-aided analysis, and sampling) necessary to conduct research and solve problems involved in the study of politics.

Means of Assessment

The political science program at Lander University revised its assessment strategies in the spring of 2002.

Student Exit Questionnaire: this instrument uses a 5-point scale (1—poor; 2—less than adequate; 3—adequate; 4—good; 5—excellent) to measure the perception of seniors concerning how well the program met its goals.

ETS Major Field Test: this standardized, nationally-normed test consists of 160 multiple choice items that pertain to various areas within the discipline.

University Alumni Survey: this is conducted annually by the Office of Career Services and reports the average salary of graduates and how many graduates have jobs related to their majors.

Outcomes

1. Student Exit Questionnaire

Table 9. Results of Student Exit Questionnaires in Political Science (5.0 Scale)

| Goal and Year | Class of 1999 | Class of 2000 | Class of 2001 |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
| 1 | 3.57 | 3.74 | 3.83 |
| 2 | 4.75 | 4.4 | 4.70 |
| 3 | 3.25 | 4.2 | 4.4 |
| 4 | 3.5 | 4.4 | 4.7 |
| 5 | 4.16 | 4.16 | 4.42 |
| 6 | 4.13 | 4.5 | 3.79 |

With regard to goals 2-5, the results indicate a trend for seniors to perceive those goals as being better met from year to year. The ratings for goal 6 were good in 1999 and better in 2000, then dropped in 2001. All three groups of seniors viewed goal 1 as being less well met than the other goals. In particular, seniors' average ratings of items 30 and 32 were lower than the averages of the other items that comprised this goal. These low averages account for the relatively low goal average.

2. ETS Major Field Test

Prior to 2002, seniors' knowledge of political science was measured by a multiple choice test devised by the faculty. The data from this test were not available for the years 1999, 2000, and 2001, nor was the test itself available, because the department had three chairs within four years and the data were lost.

The political science faculty therefore decided to use the ETS field test beginning in 2002.

3. Alumni Surveys

Survey findings were available for the class of 1999 (N=2) and the class of 2000 (N=4). Half of these six survey respondents had jobs related to the major. The two 1999 respondents had an average salary of \$26,999. The four 2000 respondents had an average salary of \$29,249.

Since only six graduates responded to the survey, no meaningful conclusions can be drawn. Greater survey participation might be obtained in the future if the political science faculty were to devise their own survey and post it on the program's website.

Sociology

Program Goals and Assessments

The plan for assessing the sociology program at Lander University is based on the following goals:

Lander University students graduating with baccalaureate degrees in sociology will:

1. Be able to design, implement, and interpret sociological research;
2. Be able to apply sociological theory to the analysis and understanding of particular social phenomena;
3. Be able to organize, analyze, and communicate both orally and in writing the central issues in the discipline.
4. Acquire an understanding of the historical and cultural underpinnings of social phenomena that constitute the human experience;
5. Be able to apply the principles of sociological theory and research acquired in the classroom to situations in a professional setting;
6. Promote and create an interest in the pursuit of sociology both as an area of study and as a profession.

Means of Assessment

Assessment Inventory of Sociological Concepts: this instrument was devised by the sociology faculty and consists of 100 multiple choice items that tap knowledge of a broad range of sociological concepts. The test is given annually to seniors whose scores are then compared to baseline scores of beginning students in SOCI 101.

ETS Major Field Test: this standardized, nationally-normed test consists of 160 multiple choice items that pertain to various areas within the discipline.

University Alumni Survey: this is conducted annually by the Office of Career Services and reports the average salary of graduates and how many graduates have jobs related to their majors.

No adequate means of assessing goals 3, 5, and 6 have been devised. In 2002-2003 the sociology faculty will work on finding ways to assess these goals.

Outcomes

1. Assessment Inventory of Sociological Concepts

Senior scores from the classes of 1999, 2000, and 2001 were combined as a single group and compared to the SOCI 101 baseline group. A t-test was performed on these sets of scores and as expected, revealed that the seniors significantly outperformed the baseline group. The mean scores and standard deviations follow:

Table 10. Means and Standard Deviations of Assessment Inventory of Sociological Concepts

| group | mean | standard deviation |
|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|
| seniors | 64.13/100 | 3.59 |
| baseline | 39.26/100 | 5.45 |

These results indicate that sociology majors do acquire more knowledge of their curriculum as they progress from being freshmen to being seniors.

2. ETS Major Field Test

ETS results are reported in 11 ways—a mean scale score for the entire test and mean subscale scores for several areas:

Table 11. Scores and Percentiles of ETS Major Field Test in Sociology

| Areas of ETS Test | Score | Percentile |
|--|--------------|-------------------|
| The entire test | 138.7/200 | 17 th |
| Core Sociology | 37.8/ 100 | 17 th |
| Critical Thinking | 41.3/100 | 50 th |
| General Theory | 23.3/100 | 5 th |
| Methodology and Statistics | 32.5/100 | 19 th |
| Deviance and Social Problems | 52.7/100 | 30 th |
| Demography and Urban/Rural/ Community | 33.2/100 | 16 th |
| Multi-culturalism | 44.5/100 | 9 th |
| Social Institutions | 51.3/100 | 40 th |
| Social Psychology | 36.2/100 | 23 rd |
| Gender | 41.2/100 | 16 th |

ETS cautions that major field test results should not be used for the purpose of curriculum assessment until several years worth of data have been collected.

3. Alumni Surveys

Survey findings were available for the class of 1999 (N=12) and the class of 2000 (N=17). Nine of the 12 responding graduates of the 1999 class had jobs related to the major, and the respondents had an average salary of \$24,726. Fourteen of the 17 responding graduates of the 2000 class had jobs related to the major, and the respondents had an average salary of \$25,999.

These findings seems to indicate that sociology graduates are able to find employment related to the major and earn an adequate income.

Since such survey data are scanty, the sociology program might want to consider devising its own website survey.

Interim Reports of Major Programs Assessment

Biology

The main assessment measures of Lander University's biology program are a professional knowledge exam, devised by the biology faculty, the University Alumni Survey, conducted by the Office of Career Services, Science Division Alumni Surveys, an oral competency check, and an exit interview.

The professional knowledge exam has been created from a compilation of standardized questions and covers all core and elective courses taken for the major. The collective freshman class score for eight consecutive years was 28%. The average senior class score for the same time period was 48%. Paired data on each student were also collected. One student increased his/her professional knowledge by 172%. The lowest increase was 39%.

The most recent University Alumni Survey contains data on the biology program, but it is mixed with data from other programs within the division. The results, therefore, are speculative. This survey indicates that 100% of the science majors' first jobs were related to their majors and that 83.3% are currently in positions related to their majors. A review of the survey indicates a high degree of satisfaction with the programs within the division. With respect to satisfaction with instruction in the major, the division was ranked the second highest and tied for first with overall satisfaction. The Science Division Alumni Surveys are in the process of being implemented.

Prior to graduation, an oral competency check is made on senior biology majors. Each student is given an assignment, which requires the student to conduct library research for the information. The information must then be put into a paper, which must be submitted to the faculty, and then each student is required to make an oral presentation on the information that he/she researched. The presentation is evaluated by at least one faculty member and the other students in the class. The evaluation addresses the presenter's organization, manner of presentation, use of Standard English, vocal projection, and clarity. Over the past four years, the overall mean on the Oral Competency Check was 2.0, 1 being the highest and 5, the lowest. Student ratings of the student presenter tended to be more positive than the instructor's ratings, but evaluations from students and the faculty member tended to be similar in that those students whose presentations were rated more poorly by the faculty member also were rated more poorly by the students.

The exit interview consists of a battery of questions designed to ascertain the student's perceptions about the biology program. A review of the answers given has been relatively consistent over the past five years. The students speak well of the biology faculty. They comment positively on their professional training, their interaction with students, and the time that the faculty spends with them outside the classroom. The majority of students are pleased with the quality of the program and with the curriculum. The one negative point the students made was that they wanted more course options in the curriculum, and therefore more professors in the program. The program has been unable to attract the faculty needed because of financial restrictions placed on the division.

English Language and Literature

The main assessments of the English Language and Literature program at Lander University are a portfolio of writing samples and exit interviews.

Although a portfolio assessment of English majors has been in place for a number of years, it was significantly revised three years ago when the English faculty realized that the results were not useful for program assessment. The results consistently showed that the program was performing well, but the data were not sufficiently specific to guide revision and improvement in the major program. New goals were instituted in the 1999-2000 academic year, and each graduating senior was to provide a portfolio of writing samples that would meet those goals. In addition, the types of writing that would be considered appropriate

for the portfolio were specified. The entire English faculty worked together to score the portfolios, and the process of collecting anchor papers against which future samples could be evaluated was begun.

Over a three year period, student performance on all of the goals has been acceptable or superior. Comparing the performance on these goals to one another, however, indicates that concentrating on improving performance on goals 3 (awareness of text in larger contexts) and 4 (demonstrate evidence of figurative language or other creative elements of language) may be most useful.

The exit interview is conducted by several faculty members with each graduating senior. Students are asked to rank their preparation in each of six areas that are keyed to goal statements for the English program. Student responses to the general questions varied widely; however the overall tenor of the responses is very appreciative of the quality of the English program, especially the strength and diversity of the faculty and their availability to students. Three weaknesses were repeated several times: 1) the need to introduce students to critical terminology and to the study of various critical approaches earlier in their college careers, 2) the need for more direct instruction in grammar, and 3) the need to provide a greater variety of upper-level English courses each semester. The English faculty is in the process of implementing changes to the program based on these points.

The indicated weakness of need for a greater variety of upper-level English courses every semester speaks directly to the administrative cutting of some upper-level classes due to low enrollment and to the cutting of faculty positions due to state funding shortfalls.

Update on Student Development

Student Development

Overview

The Division of Student Affairs at Lander University is very cognizant of the vital importance of regularly and carefully assessing the effectiveness and value-received of Lander student development programs in general and individual student development experiences in particular. As indicated in the information that follows, a variety of methods are used in a continuing manner to conduct such assessments. These methods range from written, nationally-standardized instruments, to focus sessions with student leaders or with various groupings of a range of students, to locally-prepared survey approaches, to the informal and individual feedback that regularly occurs as the Student Affairs staff members interact daily with students in a multiplicity of modes.

The results of these assessment activities are carefully considered in both daily operations and in planning for the future. Continuing efforts are also made by Student Affairs staff members to use these data to educate the other sectors of the University about the role played by and the importance of student development in the holistic education of each student.

Summary of Assessments

1. a. Measure: Lander University ACT Student Opinion Survey [NOTE: After 10 consecutive annual administrations of the ACT Student Opinion Survey (the most recent taking place in the Spring Semester 2000), a decision was made to cease making the Survey an annual project and instead to administer it on either a two-year or a three-year cycle. This decision was based on internal financial imperatives and on the significantly high degree of consistency of the student responses over a 10-year period. Administrations of the Survey will begin again in the Spring Semester 2003 and are anticipated to occur every two years thereafter.]
- b. Outcomes: Over the 1990-2000 period of annual administrations of the Student Opinion Survey to never less than one-third of the entire undergraduate student body each year, the significant and consistently recurring low points and high points of student satisfaction were:

- Low points of student satisfaction: For each year of the 10 years of the Survey, these three responses registered double-digit responses to the question “In your opinion, which ONE of the areas listed below is MOST in need of improvement?”

Able to register with few conflicts for courses I need
Parking
Student weekend activities

Twelve areas were consistently listed as possible responses for that question, but only those three areas emerged each year with double-digit responses.

It should also be noted that in other portions of the Survey, items with consistently low student satisfaction ratings were food services, the Student Center, computer services, and the variety of courses offered.

- Highest points of student satisfaction:

Class size relative to type of course
Academic advising services
Personal counseling services

Year-in and year-out for 10 years, Lander students rated approximately two-thirds of the 63 academic and non-academic areas and programs surveyed statistically significantly higher than did students at other four-year public colleges in the Survey. The majority of those 63 areas and programs rated are considered to have a direct impact on the quality of student life and student development.

c. Actions taken: Each year from 1990-2000 members of the Board of Trustees, the central administration, the entire faculty, and all non-academic department heads were individually furnished bound copies of the Survey results. These results showed both all-University data as well as the same data configured by academic major. Formal audio/visual presentations of the data were also made by the Survey Director (the Dean of Students) on request to varying groupings of administrators, faculty schools and divisions, Student Affairs staff, and student leaders. Depending on the item being considered and the level at which it was being considered, responses ranged from immediate change, to referral for further consideration by a committee or other deliberative body, to a decision of no-action based upon other circumstances that were present.

2. a. Measure: Open forums with SGA and Presidents of Student Organizations.

b. Outcomes: Each year since 1998, two meetings each Fall and each Spring Semester have been held with the presidents of student organizations, to include the SGA President. The University President, Vice Presidents, and the Athletics Director virtually always attend and participate actively in these meetings, as do members of the Student Affairs staff. These meetings take the form of open forums and provide opportunities for questions and answers, for dissemination of information about University plans or projects of interest to students, and for dialogue. Student attendance has typically been very strong and representative and a wide variety of student ideas and concerns are surfaced, many of which parallel the Student Opinion Survey outcomes.

c. Actions taken: In many cases, direct responses could be given to matters raised by the students and prompt administrative follow-up could be made as University resources allowed. In other cases (such as the need to improve significantly the Student Center, or the need to computerize the campus more fully, for example), longer-term capital outlay priorities were fixed to address the identified student needs.

3. a. Measure: Focus Group Input from Student Leaders (other than organizational presidents)

b. Outcomes: Student leaders who fit into this category at Lander primarily include the

freshmen members of the Lander President's Leadership Program, Resident Assistants, and Presidential Ambassadors. In the case of each group, specific efforts are made each semester to provide the opportunity for verbal input from these groups about improvements needed in the quality of Lander student life and student development opportunities. Efforts are also made to identify which programs and opportunities at Lander are viewed in a positive light by these students.

c. Actions taken: Comments same as for Actions Taken in Measure 2, above.

4. a. Measure: As a one-time activity designed to provide student input for Lander's current efforts to develop a Strategic Plan, a locally-produced student satisfaction survey was administered near the end of the Spring Semester 2002 to all Lander residence hall students. Fifty-five percent (460 of 842 residents) completed the written surveys. Participants rated for satisfaction 32 items through a forced-response numerical rating mode, and also responded to four opened-ended items that concerned University strengths and weaknesses, enrollment and retention, and the meeting of student expectations.

b. Outcomes: Areas receiving the lowest ratings (less than a mean of 2.5 on a scale of 0-4) for satisfaction were food services (both quality of food and meal plan options), and parking.

Areas receiving the highest ratings (more than a mean of 3.1 on a scale of 0-4) for satisfaction were academic advising services, value of information provided by your advisor, availability of your advisor, and student health services.

c. Actions taken: The student input is currently being considered by various of the subcommittees working on the Strategic Plan process. It is too early to identify the extent to which any specific actions will be taken as a result of this particular survey.

Prepared by Melissa Standley
END OF DOCUMENT