

# LANDER UNIVERSITY

Greenwood, South Carolina 29649



## Institutional Effectiveness Summary

August 1, 2008

*Report prepared by Tom Nelson, Director  
Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness  
[tnelson@lander.edu](mailto:tnelson@lander.edu)  
(864) 388-8914*

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.

Lander University now follows its own internal cycle of assessment reporting since the CHE discontinued its uniform schedule or program reporting in 2005. Lander's reporting cycle can be found at the [Lander Assessment Website](#). The 2008 Institutional Effectiveness Report for Lander University reports on the assessment of educational effectiveness for the following areas:

#### **MAJORS UNDER REVIEW (FULL REPORTS)**

- [Business Administration](#)
- [Nursing](#)
- [Spanish](#)

#### **OTHER AREAS UNDER REVIEW**

- [Academic Advising](#)

#### **ADDITIONAL INFORMATION**

- [National Survey of Student Engagement](#)
- [Policies and Procedures for Preparing a Technologically Skilled Workforce](#): Pursuant to the 2001 legislative amendment to SC 59-101.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

In calendar year 2007, Lander University adopted an improved Strategic Planning system for measuring progress in achieving each of its five Strategic Goals:

1. Learning: We will promote learning and the development of life skills that will enable each graduate to make a meaningful living and live a meaningful life.
2. Enrollment: We will increase the student population through recruiting and retaining highly motivated, diverse students, faculty and staff. We will attract, retain and graduate increasing numbers of students from diverse backgrounds who have the potential to succeed in the university environment.
3. Linkages: We will enhance linkages with local, regional and statewide constituents to increase enrollment and support the concept of preparing students for a meaningful life by developing and coordinating activities in applied scholarship and service and by providing innovative opportunities in lifelong learning.
4. Environment: We will improve the learning and living environment of the University, through the appearance and utility of the campus, so that it may serve a larger student body and an increased program of community outreach.
5. Accountability: We will assure long-term stability of the University through ongoing, comprehensive assessment, planning, financial oversight and management of all areas of the university.

Each unit within the University defined their own set of goals, measures, benchmarks and rating criteria and then rated on their performance against those criteria in order to create an annual "Report Card"; the "Report Card" is produced primarily for an internal audience on an calendar-year basis in order to coincide with the budgeting process. As a result, all units report on a calendar-year basis (Spring, Summer and Fall terms, as appropriate).

The following program summaries link program goals to one of the five University Strategic Goals and focus on the outcomes of assessment efforts in order to provide, in narrative form, a description of the changes that have been made or that are under consideration to improve or maintain the quality of the institution.

## Program Assessment Summary for Business Administration

### I. PROGRAM GOALS:

The mission of the Department of Business Administration is to provide high quality business education that prepares students for positions of leadership and responsibility. This mission will be accomplished through high quality instruction, an integrated curriculum, and intellectual contributions that focus on applied business research and instructional development. Students majoring in business administration may select from four emphases: accounting, finance/economics, health care management, and management/marketing.

Students graduating with a major in business administration will...

1. ...be effective communicators in oral and written communications
2. ...be effective users of technology in decision-making
3. ...have a clear perception of business ethics
4. ...possess leadership skills
5. ...be capable problem solvers

### II. MEANS OF ASSESSMENT:

Assessment	Goals Addressed (see above)	Frequency of Administration	Frequency of Evaluation
ICT Literacy Assessment – Advanced Level	1, 2, 5	Each Semester	Annually
Memo Writing Rubric	1	Each Spring Semester	Annually
Oral Presentation Rubric	1	Each Semester	Annually
Business Reality Ethics Assessment	3	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually
Ethics Games	3	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually
Student Leadership Practice Inventory	4	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually
Business Strategy Game	4, 5	Each Spring Semester	Annually

### III. OUTCOMES OF ASSESSMENT:

Program Goal	University Strategic Goal Addressed	Use of Results / Plans for Improvement
1. ...be effective communicators in oral and written communications	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ICT Literacy Assessment: Measurement criteria for will be modified for the next measurement cycle based on a change in the base group scores (48% to 42%) used for comparison.</li> <li>• Oral Presentation Rubric: An additional measurement that focuses on Oral Presentations will be added in the next measurement cycle. Pre-assessment data collected in Spring 2008 indicated that the area of greatest weakness was in eye contact and familiarization with material being presented. Presentations will be recorded so students can view their presentations.</li> <li>• Oral Presentation and Writing Rubric: Additional measurements in core classes (Memos: ACCT-202, MGMT-301, BA-325, BA-499; Legal Briefs: BA-251; Business Plans: BA-414; Business Letters: BA-499; Oral Presentations: ECON-201, MGMT-330, FINA-301) for oral and written communications will be implemented in the next measurement cycle and will be assessed using a rubric developed by the faculty in the Business Administration program, in consultation with the faculty who teach ENGL-275, and shared with the students prior to the assessments.</li> <li>• Interactive grammar tutorials will be made available to all students via the Department's home page.</li> <li>• Writing Criterion (a writing evaluation tool): Pilot testing was administered in ECON-202 in academic year 2007-2008 and will be continued to determine its value in assessing this goal.</li> </ul>
2. ...be effective users of technology in decision-making	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Content for BA-304 and BA-205 are being reviewed to determine if content items need to be added or modified.</li> <li>• Content taught in BA-204 and BA-205 will be reinforced in both core and emphasis classes.</li> </ul>
3. ...have a clear perception of business ethics	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Business Reality Ethics Assessment: started in Fall 2007. At the end of Spring semester, it was determined by the vendor that there was a program malfunction and the vendor was not able to provide data needed to complete analysis of data. A new assessment tool will be pilot tested Summer 2008. If the new program functions properly and is able to produce the data needed, it will be implemented as assessment tool beginning Fall 2008. This goal involves tracking individual students from sophomore to senior year. Although scoring targets will be determined after the pilot is complete and the data analyzed, Department will not have first results until December 2010 when Fall 2008 sophomores</li> </ul>

		<p>are in their senior year.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A new course in Business Ethics has been approved and was taught on a pilot basis in the past year but will be a part of the regular course rotation beginning Fall 2008.</li> <li>• Increased emphasis on ethical decision-making will be made in core and emphasis courses.</li> <li>• Ethics Games: Pilot-tested in Summer 2008. Additional measures might be developed after this assessment tool is evaluated.</li> </ul>
4. ...possess leadership skills	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Leadership Practice Inventory and Business Strategy Game: The Department reviewed and discussed the definition of leadership approved by departmental faculty in Fall 2007. Strategies and techniques to more actively support the acquisition of these skills will be part of faculty planning in August 2008 when expected outcomes will be evaluated and adjusted accordingly.</li> <li>• Business Strategy Game: Spring 2008 success rate on Leadership Skills was in the 55<sup>th</sup>-58<sup>th</sup> percentile. This is in the "Met" category of the Expected Outcome.</li> </ul>
5. ...be capable problem solvers	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Beginning Fall 2007 one subgroup in the Evaluate Skill area is no longer being reported as part of the I-Skills assessment. This modified the reference group results. The levels for meeting criteria have been adjusted accordingly.</li> <li>• The ICT Literacy Assessment – Advanced Level measures student proficiency in seven constructs by incorporating real-time scenario-based tasks in the assessment tool. Define, Access, and Evaluate are three of the seven constructs in The ICT Literacy Assessment – Advanced Level that measure problem solving skills.</li> <li>• Business Strategy Game: Spring 2008 success rate on Financial Analysis was in the 55<sup>th</sup>-58<sup>th</sup> percentile. This is in the "Met" category of the Expected Outcome.</li> </ul>

### **Program Assessment Summary for Nursing**

#### **I. PROGRAM GOALS:**

The nursing program is accredited by the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) and approved by the South Carolina Board of Nursing. Reaccreditation is scheduled for Fall 2011. Within the nursing program are two options for study, the traditional four-year option appropriate for students new to nursing and the RN-BSN option appropriate for those registered nurses desiring to achieve a baccalaureate degree in nursing. While the RN-BSN option is provided in an asynchronous web-based format using Blackboard, congruency across the two options is maintained.

Students who graduate with a major in nursing will...

1. ...apply the nursing process by using primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention/intervention strategies to assist families, groups, and communities in the retention and attainment of wellness.
2. ...be able to synthesize nursing theory with knowledge from selected other disciplines as a basis for care giving.
3. ...use appropriate problem solving approaches in varied settings to promote wellness for diverse client systems.
4. ...demonstrate leadership strategies to advance nursing practice and the nursing profession.
5. ...utilize nursing research findings to improve the quality of nursing practice.
6. ...be eligible to take the NCLEX-RN upon graduation from the traditional option of the nursing program

#### **II. MEANS OF ASSESSMENT:**

<b>Assessment</b>	<b>Goals Addressed (see above)</b>	<b>Frequency of Administration</b>	<b>Frequency of Evaluation</b>
Assessment Technologies Institute™, LLC (ATI) Standardized Testing	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Each semester	Annually
National Council Licensure Examination for Registered Nurses (NCLEX-RN)	1, 2, 3	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually
Health Education Systems, Inc (HESI) Version I and version II Exit Examinations	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Annually	Annually
Alumni Survey	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Annually	Annually
Clinical Performance Evaluation (in-house instrument)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually
Course-specific Research Analysis	5	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually
Department Chair Evaluation	6	Each Fall and Spring Semester	Annually

#### **III. OUTCOMES OF ASSESSMENT:**

<b>Program Goal</b>	<b>University Strategic Goal</b>	<b>Use of Results / Plans for Improvement</b>

	Addressed	
1. ...apply the nursing process by using primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention/intervention strategies to assist families, groups, and communities in the retention and attainment of wellness.	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the past three years, instruments provided by ATI have been pilot tested and recently incorporated for evaluating student progress in comparison with national data. Use of this data is currently being evaluated by Nursing faculty for value in programmatic and curricular planning and for the determination of appropriate benchmark scores on content tests and how these scores will be used in determining student progression within the program.</li> <li>• The primary determinate of outcome for any registered nurse educational program is results on NCLEX-RN for first-time-test-takers. Graduates of the Lander University nursing program have consistently demonstrated first-time pass rates for NCLEX-RN above the national and state averages. (See table below)</li> <li>• HESI Exit Examinations: Remediation plans established to assist those students having difficulty including, but not limited to, student-produced self-study plans, teaching plans for weak areas and writing of NCLEX-style question sets.</li> <li>• While 90% of graduates rate their perception of achievement of outcomes as fully to mostly achieved, the return rate of the surveys averages less than 3% at both one and five years. The Nursing Department is investigating alternate methods of obtaining this data. It is with responses to the alumni survey, input from the Nursing Advisory Board, and use of the clinical evaluation instrument developed by the department that achievement of the goal relating to incorporation of standards of nursing in practice are best evaluated. Therefore, the need to improve data gathering from graduates is recognized.</li> </ul>
2. ...be able to synthesize nursing theory with knowledge from selected other disciplines as a basis for care giving.	Learning	<p>Within the past three years, instruments provided by ATI have been pilot tested and recently incorporated for evaluating student progress in comparison with national data. Use of this data is currently being evaluated by Nursing faculty for value in programmatic and curricular planning and for the determination of appropriate benchmark scores on content tests and how these scores will be used in determining student progression within the program.</p>
3. ...use appropriate problem solving approaches in varied settings to promote wellness for diverse client systems.	Learning	<p>Within the past three years, instruments provided by ATI have been pilot tested and recently incorporated for evaluating student progress in comparison with national data. Use of this data is currently being evaluated by Nursing faculty for value in programmatic and curricular planning and for the determination of appropriate benchmark scores on content tests and how these scores will be used in determining student progression within the program.</p>
4. ...demonstrate leadership strategies to advance nursing practice and the nursing profession.	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the past three years, instruments provided by ATI have been pilot tested and recently incorporated for evaluating student progress in comparison with national data. Use of this data is currently being evaluated by Nursing faculty for value in programmatic and curricular planning and for the determination of appropriate benchmark scores on content tests and how these scores will be used in determining student progression within the program.</li> <li>• Leadership is evaluated for each student within each appropriate nursing course using the clinical evaluation instrument. This data is used for decision-making related to progression of each individual student within the nursing program and has not been compiled and trended. The nursing faculty will be considering the value of compiling this data in the fall of 2008.</li> </ul>
5. ...utilize nursing research findings to improve the quality of nursing practice.	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the past three years, instruments provided by ATI have been pilot tested and recently incorporated for evaluating student progress in comparison with national data. Use of this data is currently being evaluated by Nursing faculty for value in programmatic and curricular planning and for the determination of appropriate benchmark scores on content tests and how these scores will be used in determining student progression within the program.</li> <li>• Clinical Performance: Students are expected to improve their analysis and use of nursing research over the course of their program as evaluated using an instrument developed by the Nursing faculty; a score of no lower than 5 out of 7 for that item on the clinical evaluation instrument is expected. Data have not been compiled previously but in Fall 2008, Nursing faculty will determine appropriateness and value of compiling and trending this data for annual reporting to the Nursing faculty by the assessment and Evaluation Committee.</li> <li>• Course-specific behaviors: Students are required to analyze current research, according to published research guidelines, in multiple courses each year. Data have not been compiled previously but in Fall 2008, Nursing faculty will determine appropriateness and value of compiling and trending this data for annual reporting to the Nursing faculty by the assessment and Evaluation Committee.</li> <li>• Use of research is evaluated for each student within each appropriate nursing course using the clinical evaluation instrument. This data is used for decision-making related to progression of each individual student within the nursing program and has not been compiled and trended. The nursing faculty will be considering the value of compiling this data in the fall of 2008.</li> </ul>
6. ...be eligible to take	Learning	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Within the past three years, instruments provided by ATI have been pilot tested and</li> </ul>

<p>the NCLEX-RN upon graduation from the traditional option of the nursing program.</p>		<p>recently incorporated for evaluating student progress in comparison with national data. Use of this data is currently being evaluated by Nursing faculty for value in programmatic and curricular planning and for the determination of appropriate benchmark scores on content tests and how these scores will be used in determining student progression within the program.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Chair's Evaluation: All traditional students who have successfully completed the Nursing program and graduated from Lander have been endorsed to take NCLEX-RN (2003 – 2008 N = 81). Therefore, desired outcomes have been achieved thus far but will continue to be evaluated in an on-going fashion.</li> </ul>
-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

### Baccalaureate Nursing Programs in South Carolina: NCLEX – RN Passing Rates

COMPARISON GROUP	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Lander University	84.60	96.60	100.0	95.45	100.0	92.59	96.30	90.32	100.0
MUSC	87.50	78.70	87.25	85.90	86.36	95.65	92.24	84.78	98.53
Clemson University	84.50	93.30	94.74	85.00	79.01	84.69	86.41	88.24	90.48
National Average	83.84	85.53	86.70	87.01	85.26	87.29	88.77	87.06	88.23
S. C. Average	87.25	88.28	89.71	89.54	84.22	88.50	88.77	87.19	87.57
USC – Columbia	83.00	83.50	85.71	89.66	78.57	94.81	96.19	92.86	82.69
USC - Upstate	85.70	69.80	89.58	95.56	92.86	78.95	86.27	67.12	82.14
Piedmont Technical College	100.0	97.10	78.79	84.21	83.02	78.33	86.11	86.67	80.00

The primary challenge and opportunity for the Nursing Department in the near future is to increase the numbers of students admitted, graduated, and entering the nursing workforce. Currently the program has more qualified applicants than it is able to accommodate given current faculty and physical resources. Plans are in place to develop a simulation laboratory which will provide additional clinical experience for students in selected courses. Faculty members continue to seek out and develop collaborative relationships with additional clinical sites. The Lander nursing program's reputation contributes to its ability to consistently admit one of the largest classes to the University each year to meet the challenges of the regional, state, and national nursing shortage. In the 2008-2009 academic year the Nursing Department will be considering changing accreditation providers from the National League for Nursing Accrediting Commission (NLNAC) to the American Association of Colleges of Nursing Commission on Collegiate Nursing Education (CCNE). NLNAC reviews and makes accrediting decisions for all levels of registered nurse education programs, while CCNE reviews and makes accrediting determinations solely for baccalaureate and higher degree nursing education programs and is used by all other baccalaureate nursing programs in South Carolina. On initial review of CCNE standards and criteria, it appears to fit well with the Lander University Nursing Program.

### Program Assessment Summary for Spanish

#### I. PROGRAM GOALS:

The Spanish major program at Lander University is currently undergoing fundamental changes in purpose and emphasis to make it more valuable and more attractive to the Lander student population. The Spanish major program that was first implemented in 1995 has not succeeded in attracting the numbers of students that were originally anticipated. We attribute this failure in part to the way in which the program has been structured: as a literature-based curriculum designed primarily to prepare students for the teaching profession. However, Lander no longer has a Spanish Education program, and has not sent any Spanish majors to graduate studies in Spanish in at least the last five years; more importantly, the majority of Spanish majors are actually double majors. Based on these facts, we believe that we can best serve Lander's students by restructuring Spanish as a co-major program that will enable them to communicate effectively in Spanish and function comfortably in a Hispanic culture while working in the profession of their choice. The goals that drive this revised program are guided by the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages (ACTFL) Standards for World Language Learning.

Students majoring in Spanish will...:

1. ...communicate verbally and in writing in Spanish.
2. ...demonstrate knowledge and understanding of other cultures.
3. ...understand the nature of language and how it works.
4. ...understand the concept of culture.

The fulltime Spanish faculty has turned over completely in the last two years, and perhaps for this reason we have been able to make good progress with the curriculum change. Last year we implemented a new placement exam policy that has already provided positive results: more than 100 incoming students tested into intermediate or advanced level Spanish courses, and it is from among these students that we will actively recruit



Spanish majors. The complete revised major program will be submitted this fall (2008) and implemented as soon as it is approved. Upon approval, the Lander University catalog description of the Spanish program will also be rewritten to reflect the changes in purpose and emphasis.

## II. MEANS OF ASSESSMENT:

Assessment	Goals Addressed (see above)	Frequency of Administration	Frequency of Evaluation
Diploma de Español como Lengua Extranjera (DELE)	1	Every Spring and Fall Semester	Annually
Senior Project	1, 2, 3, 4	Every Spring and Fall Semester	Annually
Study Abroad Journal	2, 3, 4	Every Spring, Fall and Summer Term	Annually

## III. OUTCOMES OF ASSESSMENT:

Program Goal	University Strategic Goal Addressed	Use of Results / Plans for Improvement
1. ...communicate verbally and in writing in Spanish.	Learning	The cornerstone of Lander's Spanish major program is proficiency in spoken and written communication. Student proficiency will be evaluated on the DELE (Diploma de Español como Lengua Extranjera) and the Senior Project. The DELE is an internationally recognized exam, created and administered by the Instituto Cervantes for Spain's Ministry of Education and Science, that tests linguistic competence (in reading, writing, listening, and speaking) to function in everyday situations and circumstances that do not require specialized language. For the purposes of accountability, we believe it is essential that our students demonstrate their ability on an instrument created and administered outside of the Lander community. In this regard, the DELE replaces and expands upon the Exit Interview described in the 2000 Program Assessment. Systematic deficiencies demonstrated by our students in any of the areas tested will alert us to the need to revise our course content, methods of instruction, and curricular emphasis. The Senior Project serves to show that our majors have the linguistic ability to do research and make an original presentation in the type of specialized context not evaluated by the DELE. We envision that the project will correspond most often to the student's other area of major or minor concentration. More than anything else, student performance on this assessment will let us know if our underlying idea is correct: that Spanish should be set up as a co-major.
2. ...demonstrate knowledge and understanding of other cultures.	Learning	Students begin to learn about the world in which Spanish is spoken in on-campus coursework, and then acquire true familiarity with it during their required overseas study experience. Students show their understanding of Hispanic culture in the Study Abroad Journal and in the Senior Project. The Study Abroad Journal includes written exercises for before, during, and after the overseas experience; these exercises are designed to raise student awareness of current cultural practices, and the attitudes and ideas from which these practices spring, in the country of their overseas experience. The degree to which such an awareness is expressed by students will let us know how we need to adjust our on-campus and overseas expectations and offerings. On the Senior Project presentation, students will show, in one specialized context, their familiarity with the cultural practices or products related to their research project. Again, the degree to which this familiarity is expressed will direct our course and program revisions.
3. ...understand the nature of language and how it works.	Learning	Beyond proficiency in the Spanish language, we want our students to gain an understanding of the nature of language in general. Spanish language courses offered on campus routinely use comparisons with English to show how Spanish works, and thus provide insight into the workings of language in general. We expect that the Study Abroad Journal will elicit the students' own reflections on the comparison of Spanish and English. Similarly, we expect that students will be able to express their awareness of how language in general functions during the oral defense component of the Senior Project. The quantity and quality of student reflections in the Study Abroad Journal, and the quality of student answers during the Senior Project defense, will provide us feedback for adjusting how we approach and improving how we present this material.
4. ...understand the concept of culture.	Learning	Beyond familiarity with Hispanic cultures, we want our students to gain an understanding of the concept of culture in general. Hispanic civilization and literature courses offered on campus and overseas routinely utilize cross-cultural comparisons, and these often lead to the consideration of the concept of culture. In addition, Spanish majors and minors will be encouraged to enroll in the introductory Honors Program humanities course, which deals extensively with issues of cultural formation and identity. We expect that the Study Abroad Journal will elicit the students' own reflections on the comparison of Hispanic and North American cultures. We also expect that students will be able to express their understanding of the concept of culture on the oral defense component of the Senior Project. As with understanding the nature of language, student reflections in the Study Abroad Journal, and student answers during the Senior Project defense, will provide us feedback for adjusting and improving how we present this material.

## Assessment Summary for Academic Advising

### I. PROGRAM GOAL:

1. To maintain a high level of student-faculty interaction and academic advising.

### II. MEANS OF ASSESSMENT:

Assessment	Goals Addressed (see above)	Frequency of Administration	Frequency of Evaluation
Student Perceptions of Academic Advising Survey	1	Every Fall and Spring Semester	Every Spring and Fall Semester
ACT Student Opinion Survey	1	Every First and Second Spring Semester	Every First and Second Fall Semester
National Survey of Student Engagement	1	Every Third Spring Semester	Every Third Fall Semester

For the in-house “*Student Perceptions of Academic Advising*” survey, students are required to respond to the survey as a part of the advising process and prior to being permitted to register for the upcoming term. Data is collected on each of the ten questions using the following Likert Scale: 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly Agree. The responses shown in the table below are the average of all student responses. And although they are not shown here, the data from the survey is also analyzed by individual academic advisors and provided to the four college deans for distribution to their advisors as well as to their department chairs for use in year-end faculty evaluations.

The *National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)* was administered for the first time in Spring 2007. The NSSE data contains mean comparisons for all survey items comparing Lander with our selected peers, our Carnegie peers and all NSSE participants with separate results provided for first-year and senior students. In addition, it contains benchmark comparisons for five clusters of effective educational practice: 1) level of academic challenge, 2) active and collaborative learning, 3) student-faculty interaction, 4) enriching educational experiences, and 5) supportive campus environment.

Items on the Survey which relate to student-faculty interaction are those in which students learn first-hand how experts think about and solve practical problems by interacting with faculty members inside and outside the classroom. As a result, their teachers become role models, mentors, and guides for continuous, life-long learning:

- ◆ Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
- ◆ Talked about career plans with a faculty member or advisor
- ◆ Discussed ideas from readings or classes with faculty members outside of class
- ◆ Worked with faculty members on activities other than coursework (committees, orientation, student-life activities, etc.)
- ◆ Received prompt written or oral feedback from faculty on academic performance
- ◆ Worked with a faculty member on a research project outside of course or program requirements

The mean scores presented below are the *weighted*<sup>1</sup> arithmetic average of student-level benchmark scores.

### III. OUTCOMES OF ASSESSMENT:

Indicator(s) of Success	Spring 2007	Fall 2007
1. My advisor is knowledgeable about the University's policies and procedures.	4.54	4.55
2. My advisor is knowledgeable about the General Education requirements.	4.56	4.59
3. My advisor is knowledgeable about my Major requirements.	4.69	4.71
4. My advisor is available for consultation.	4.47	4.52
5. My advisor and I spend sufficient time together in order to meet my academic needs.	4.19	4.17
6. My advisor respects my right, within Catalog restrictions, to make my own decisions regarding the direction of my education.	4.57	4.60
7. My advisor effectively answers my questions or directs me to appropriate resources to answer my questions.	4.58	4.59
8. My advisor is respectful and empathetic/sympathetic.	4.59	4.62
9. Overall, my advisor does an effective job of advising/	4.62	4.63
10. NSSE Student-Faculty Interaction Items (First-Year Students) (Selected Peers = 33.4; Carnegie Peers = 34.8; NSSE 2007 = 32.8)	38.1	N/A
11. NSSE Student-Faculty Interaction Items (Senior Students) (Selected Peers = 42.0; Carnegie Peers = 45.4; NSSE 2007 = 41.2)	52.6	N/A

<sup>1</sup> Weighted by gender, enrollment status and institutional size.



12. NSSE Overall evaluation of quality of academic advising received (First-Year Students) (Selected Peers = 2.98; Carnegie Peers = 3.14; NSSE 2007 = 3.18)	3.07	N/A
13. NSSE Overall evaluation of quality of academic advising received (Senior Students) (Selected Peers = 2.84; Carnegie Peers = 3.03; NSSE 2007 = 2.84)	3.32	N/A

Expected Outcome:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Indicator 1 - 9: <u>Met</u> = Spring and Fall scores between 4.00 and 5.00; <u>Partially Met</u> = Spring or Fall scores between 3.00 and 3.99; <u>Not Met</u> = Spring and Fall scores less than or equal to 2.99</li> <li>▪ Indicator 10 - 11: <u>Met</u> = Benchmark comparison for Lander is above all of the following - Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE participants for the year; <u>Partially Met</u> = Benchmark comparison for Lander is above one or two of the following - Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE participants for the year; <u>Not Met</u> = Benchmark comparison for Lander is above none of the following - Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE participants for the year.</li> <li>▪ Indicator 12 - 13: <u>Met</u> = Benchmark comparison for Lander is above all of the following - Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE participants for the year; <u>Partially Met</u> = Benchmark comparison for Lander is above one or two of the following - Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE participants for the year; <u>Not Met</u> = Benchmark comparison for Lander is above none of the following - Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE participants for the year.</li> </ul>						
Actual Outcome:	<p>Each Indicator of Success was scored according to the criteria noted in the Expected Outcome. When scores on all thirteen Indicators of Success are averaged, the goal scored a 2.92. When that number is compared to a University-wide scoring scale (below), the goal target has been met.</p> <table style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <tr> <td>Target Met:</td> <td>3.00 – 2.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target Partially Met:</td> <td>2.00 – 1.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Target Not Met:</td> <td>0.01 – 1.00</td> </tr> </table>	Target Met:	3.00 – 2.01	Target Partially Met:	2.00 – 1.01	Target Not Met:	0.01 – 1.00
Target Met:	3.00 – 2.01						
Target Partially Met:	2.00 – 1.01						
Target Not Met:	0.01 – 1.00						

### **Assessment Summary for National Survey of Student Engagement**

#### **Introduction**

Colleges and universities cannot accurately judge their effectiveness in the absence of good information about what students do and the quality of the student experience. The National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) annually assesses the extent to which students take part in educationally sound activities and the institutional policies and practices that induce students to take part in such activities. The NSSE is an initiative of The Pew Charitable Trusts and is co-sponsored by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching and the Pew Forum for Undergraduate Learning. The NSSE is administered and coordinated by the Indiana University Center for Post-Secondary Research and Planning under the direction of Dr. George D. Kuh.

Lander University participated in the NSSE for the first time in 2007. This report summarizes 2007 NSSE data for Lander, comparison data from selected peer institutions, comparison data from Carnegie peer institutions. The complete NSSE annual report, including details about the statistical analyses, can be obtained from the Office of Assessment and Institutional Effectiveness.

#### **Response Rates**

A total of 275 Lander students classified as freshmen or seniors completed the 2007 NSSE, resulting in a response rate of 25%. This compares with average response rates of 26% for selected peer institutions, 34% for our Carnegie peer institutions and 30% for all NSSE 2007 participants. Numbers of respondents for Lander were 114 first-year students and 161 seniors. These data are compared with responses of 25,466 first-year students and 26,897 seniors from selected peer institutions, 10,261 first-year students and 8,489 seniors from our Carnegie peer institutions in the 'Baccalaureate Colleges – Diverse Fields' peer comparison group, and 147,112 first-year students and 148,352 seniors from all NSSE 2007 participants.

#### **AREAS OF EXCELLENCE AND POTENTIAL AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT INDICATED BY NSSE DATA**

NSSE data point to both areas of excellence and potential areas for improvement, but it is only one source of information about student experiences. Nevertheless, the NSSE provides a unique perspective on the educational experiences of Lander freshmen and seniors and how those experiences compare with other U.S. institutions of higher learning.

#### **Areas of excellence include:**

Freshmen:

- ◆ 'Student-Faculty Interaction' benchmark scores are significantly higher than those of our Selected Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.

Seniors:

- ◆ 'Level of Academic Challenge' benchmark scores are significantly higher than those of our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Active and Collaborative Learning' benchmark scores are significantly higher than those of our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Student-Faculty Interaction' benchmark scores are significantly higher than those of our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers, NSSE 2007 participants and the top 50% of all NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Enriching Educational Experiences' benchmark scores are significantly higher than those of our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Supportive Campus Environment' benchmark scores are significantly higher than those of our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.

**Potential areas for improvement include:**

Freshmen:

- ◆ 'Level of Academic Challenge' benchmark scores are significantly lower than those of the top 50% and the top 10% of all NSSE 2007 participants and lagged behind our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Active and Collaborative Learning' benchmark scores were significantly lower than those of the top 50% and the top 10% of all NSSE 2007 participants and lagged behind our Carnegie Peers and NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Enriching Educational Experiences' benchmark scores are significantly lower than those of our Selected Peers, Carnegie Peers, NSSE 2007 participants, the top 50% and the top 10% of all NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Supportive Campus Environment' benchmark scores are significantly lower than those of the top 50% and the top 10% of all NSSE participants.

Seniors:

- ◆ 'Level of Academic Challenge' benchmark scores are significantly lower than those of the top 10% of all NSSE 2007 participants.
- ◆ 'Enriching Educational Experiences' benchmark scores are significantly lower than those of the top 10% of all NSSE participants.

**Policies and Procedures for Preparing a Technologically Skilled Workforce**

Lander University adopted a plan in 2002 to promote proactively the adoption and usage of technology. The ability to reach, support and expand these original goals has been greatly aided by the funds provided by the South Carolina Education Lottery and the student technology fee. That plan called for

- ◆ *95% of the faculty to have laptop computers by the end of the 2004-05 academic year*  
In an effort to provide faculty with means to facilitate communication with students as well as an aid in teaching and preparing scholarly work, Lander instituted a faculty laptop program with a refresh cycle every three to four years. As of June 2008, approximately 99% of the University's full-time faculty members have been issued a laptop.
- ◆ *A "Technology Learning Center" to provide training for faculty and staff.*  
The instructional technology services portion of the Information Technology Services department, referred to as The Technology Learning Center (TLC), actively offers technology training classes, as well as providing one-on-one coaching sessions. The training sessions include instruction in productivity tools, course management, Bearcat Web/Banner (Lander's student information system), as well as how to operate the classroom technology equipment, and the Lander e-mail account - considered an official means for communication.
- ◆ *The conversion of our traditional classrooms into "smart" classrooms*  
Lander has 52 'smart' classrooms that are equipped with all of the electronics needed for projection and Internet access (all of the classrooms that feasibly can be transformed have been converted from traditional to 'smart' classrooms). The equipment in the classrooms are maintained regularly and upgraded as needed. A distance learning classroom equipped with both teleconferencing and videoconferencing equipment. Even though this classroom is used to host and receive remote classes between Lander and Greenville's University Center, it is possible to participate with any location that has the internet based remote processing equipment.
- ◆ *The purchase and implementation of one student information systems software package and one course management software package*

Lander utilizes Sungard Higher Education's Banner enterprise resource planning system (ERP), and all five major modules are live and in production: student, finance, human resources, financial aid, and advancement. Banner is a modern, integrated system that utilizes one database for all of its major administrative and academic data and processes. As a result, the student has the ability to select classes and register online, pay online, and review grades and order transcripts online. The faculty members are able to track their students' progress as well as view class rosters and advise students. In addition, Blackboard CE 6 is the course management system used at Lander and is tightly integrated with Banner. The integration of the course management system with the student information system reduces the amount of effort that is needed to populate course and grade information, while allowing an online component to class work.

In addition to the five core Banner modules, Lander has also implemented some additional Banner related programs. A document imaging application, xTender, has been implemented in several campus offices including student, financial aid, registrar, business office, information technology services, procurement, and human resources. xTender allows access to scanned documents within Banner, thus saving time in having to access and maintain manual paper files. Another optional Banner product implemented by Lander is the Luminis Campus Portal. Luminis allows single sign-on for multiple campus systems such as Bearcat Web self-service, Banner, Blackboard, and web mail. In addition, the portal provides a means to group content according to an individual's role(s) at the university (student, faculty, employee etc.).

- ◆ *Conversion of the campus into a wireless campus*  
All of Lander's academic buildings and most non-academic buildings are wireless including four out of Lander's six residence halls. Even though all residence halls already have wired access to the network, plans are underway to provide wireless access in all residence halls. Lander also provides a pool of dial-up modems for off-campus access to those students and employees who may not have access to the Internet through high-speed or other internet service providers.
- ◆ *Student training in the use of the student information and course management software*  
In order to support student technology access and use on campus the Technology Resource Access Center for Students, referred to as TRACS, was established in 2007. TRACS is a place where students can learn how to care for their laptops, update virus protection, to connect to the network, and update operating system patches. Virus protection is made available to all students. In addition, the Information Technology Services Student Technology Coordinator participates in various sessions that provide training for students in pertinent technology areas, such as accessing and using the MyLander campus portal, Blackboard (course management system), Bearcat web (Banner self-service), and email.

Goals added to the original plan include:

- ◆ *Student laptop requirement phased in by freshmen class until all classes are covered*  
In an effort to prepare our students for a mobile technology workforce and to enhance the student's experience with the campus community, in August 2005 a laptop requirement for freshmen was established. Now the requirement extends to all full-time students. The purpose of the requirement is to ensure that students have access to the Internet, Lander email account, online course material, online discussion groups, research materials, online course registration, class schedules, course syllabi and more. Even though there is a student laptop requirement, open access, departmental and library computer labs are still maintained. The equipment in open access computer labs are rotated on a regular basis.
- ◆ *Support for student laptop requirement*  
Financial aid includes the cost of a computer in the "cost of attendance" so that aid is available for the student to purchase a laptop.