

**Lander University  
Institutional Effectiveness Summary 2003**

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 2003 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:

**MAJORS UNDER REVIEW**

Full Reports

- [Mass Communication and Theater](#)
- [Interdisciplinary Studies \(IDS\)](#)

Interim Reports

- [Teacher Education Programs](#)

**OTHER AREAS UNDER REVIEW**

- [Student Development](#)
- [Policies and Procedures for Preparing a Technologically Skilled Workforce](#): 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.
- [Survey of 1999-2000 Alumni](#): State law requires that every two years institutions survey the alumni of the class that graduated three years prior to the survey. Therefore, Lander will report the survey data for 1999-2000 graduates.

**MAJORS UNDER REVIEW**

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 2002-2003 academic year, majors in Mass Communication and Theater and Interdisciplinary Studies reported assessment findings through the CHE Program Reviews, and an interim report was submitted for majors in Teacher Education. The table below summarizes the assessment measures used by the majors under review.

**Assessment Measures of Majors under Review**

Assessment Measure	Full Reports		Interim Report
	Mass Comm	IDS	Education
Alumni Surveys	X	X	
Employer Surveys			X
Questionnaires			

ADEPT evaluations			X
Content area exams			X
Exit interviews	X	X	
Capstone projects	X		
External adjudication	X		X
Auditions	X		
Portfolios			X
Pre-registration meetings	X		

---

### **Major Program Assessment Summary for Mass Communication and Theater**

The BA degree in Mass Communication and Theatre has two emphases: the Mass Communication Emphasis and the Theatre Emphasis. The program goals for each emphasis are the same and are as follows:

Students graduating from Lander University with a degree in mass communication and theatre should:

1. possess the skills necessary for successful careers in theatre and related professions including educational, community, or professional organizations.
2. possess the skills necessary for successful careers in electronic or print media and related professions including educational, industrial, or professional organizations.
3. have sufficient preparation for the pursuing of further specialized training in theatre, journalism, electronic media, and related professions.
4. possess the skills necessary to become critical and informed supporters of mass communication, theatre, and related art forms with an awareness of how these reflect, affect, and enrich human life.

The assessment measures for both emphases are tied to these goals and are common except in the capstone projects and courses, and production evaluations usually are of most interest to Theatre Emphasis students and faculty. Over the period of the review the faculty and chair have not changed, and the assessment of these students and programs has been consistent each year. The data gleaned from the measures has caused a number of curricular changes for the better and even the replacement of one full-time faculty member. An additional full-time faculty member and several part-time faculty have been added to meet student needs.

#### **Capstone Projects**

In the Mass Communication Emphasis, students take MCOM 400, Critical Issues in Mass Communication, in their senior year. This course involves exploration of careers in the field, graduate schools, professional ethics, and analysis of ethical and legal issues. This course has been taught each spring during the review period, as well as in the fall of 2001 and several other times by independent study. The independent studies have been necessary when transfer majors are out of sequence and would otherwise be unable to graduate. Eighty students took the course over 5 years, and 80 graduated. The success rate of 100% in this course suggests majors are meeting the goals of the major.

In the Theatre Emphasis, students direct one-act plays, and are creatively involved in all aspects of their productions. Theatre 415 and 416 are the capstone courses. Success in these courses is documented through concept statements and directing prompt books, as well as the programs, posters, and post-production evaluations done by faculty. These courses have been offered once a year in the period with the exception of 2001-02. Between 1998-99 and 2002-03 seventeen students took 415 and 10 took 416. Thirteen students graduated during the period with nothing less than a B in these courses. Although this measure has been most satisfactory, a new curricular change has made it possible to take an additional course (as an elective) to receive credit for directing a second play.

## **Pre-registration Meetings**

Students are given an opportunity to express their concerns with and evaluations of the program during pre-registration; this information helps us to focus our attention on creating a priority list of areas that need to be adjusted, updated, or restructured, in order meet the growing needs of our students. The Department of Mass Communication and Theatre provide email announcements of important production information, changes in requirements, and pre-registration reminders for one-on-one meetings with students and advisors. Although the practice has been consistent, some students miss email notices and various faculty members independently send notices of events as needed. In the spring of 2003, a new quarterly newsletter for students in mass communication and theatre was developed to keep students informed of workshops, speakers, productions, and registration information.

## **Auditions**

Open auditions are promoted on campus and in the community before each of the four theatre productions of the academic year. The directors of the productions choose the appropriate actor for each role and a casting list is posted. Students not selected for major roles are given the opportunity to be understudies or work in any of the backstage roles. Students are cast each year for at least three to four productions, selected by various faculty and guest directors, affirming the student's talents and range of characters appropriate to the parts. The honor of being selected is greater since the auditions are always open, and many compete to be in the plays. As this is a traditional theatrical process of assessment and casting has been successful, there is no need to change.

## **External Adjudication of Performance**

All students involved in theatrical productions, whether technical or performance, have the opportunity to evaluate the production. This can include their personal involvement and the overall organization of the production. These forms can be anonymous and shared with the director and other faculty in the department. In addition, critical evaluation of faculty and student production work is made by outside professional adjudicators working for the Kennedy Center/American College Theatre Festival. This takes place every other year in the fall. The adjudicators supply the production personnel with a written and oral critique.

Each production on campus has undergone the scrutiny of post-production evaluations of every aspect of the show. Since these can be done early in the run of a show (typically 4 nights) the feedback has been used to adjust timing, sound, effects, make-up, lighting, etc. Twice in the period of review, productions have been submitted for adjudication at regional KC/ACTF competitions. Although neither production progressed to the national level of judging, we did garner many highly complimentary comments on various important parts of the production effort.

Adjustments have been made as a result of these evaluative assessments. Next fall we will submit our production of Canterbury Tales to KC/ACTF with our new Technical Director in charge of scenic and lighting design.

## **Alumni Survey**

Each year the Career Services office sends out an alumni survey of the past year's graduates. The survey gives the alumni the opportunity to give each department feedback on how well the programs prepared students for their careers. Each fall the responses to the survey are compiled in a report and shared with the entire faculty. Responses from each of the years under review (except the last, 2002, which will not be ready for distribution until September) were available. In general, although the sample participating may be of some value to the University with return rates of 28% to 37%, the Mass Communication and Theatre students responded at such a low rate most years we cannot call the sample significant. In 1999 9%, in 2000 9%, and in 2001 31% Mass Communication and Theatre students

participated. Nonetheless, the survey is studied each fall by the faculty and taken into consideration with much better and comprehensive feedback that comes from exit interviews with seniors. Seniors are told now to expect the survey and to please participate in their first year out in the world of work, hoping that our alumni will yield a better sample in the future.

### **Exit Interviews**

Exit interviews are conducted in the last semester of each senior in both Mass Communication and Theatre. One is conducted by the faculty of the department as a group, and another by the Chair of the Division, one-on-one. Both interviews give valuable insight into the program's strengths and weaknesses. Curricular, equipment, and personnel changes have been implemented as a result of this feedback. The departmental interview is also used as an opportunity to evaluate each student's oral and writing skills. Forms have been developed to assess these critical skills, and are kept on record. Writing samples are evaluated independently by Faculty and kept on file in the Humanities Division. Writing samples were obtained from 8 Mass Communication and Theater students in fall 2002 (the latest period for which data were gathered). These writing samples are evaluated on a 1-4 scale. The average score for the 8 students was 2.5. Pre-test scores from students' first-year writing samples were available for 2 of the 8 students (first-year samples were not available for 3 students because they were transfer students and the remaining 3 never completed the first-year sample). Both students showed improvement in their writing, one improving from a 2.5 to a 3.0 and the other improving from a 1.0 to a 2.5.

All seniors are requested to make appointments for both the exit interviews with the faculty of the department and with the Division Chair. The faculty gain first-hand feedback from the students about suggestions for improvements in curriculum, extracurricular experiences, equipment needs, etc. The Chair in one-on-one confidential interviews can get additional information about faculty performance, classes, as well as the other suggestions. The average numbers of students to participate in both surveys is about 50% over the 5-year period.

A great many changes have been precipitated by the feedback derived from these interviews:

1. The technical director has been replaced.
2. An additional full-time Mass Communication Instructor was added.
3. 3 more editing workstations have been added for TV/Radio.
4. The Media Center wing of the Carnell Building is now our space.
5. 2 work-study positions have been added to assist with technical help.
6. A 4-hr. Drafting course has been replaced with a 1-hr course, Thtr. 101.
7. Meda. 341, Advertising and Public Relations, now a requirement.
8. More sections of Scriptwriting class have been added.
9. BA 205, Management Information Systems, added as requirement.
10. Journalism requirement reduced to 2 from 3, more electives possible.
11. Adjunct Costumer added to faculty.
12. Additional adjunct faculty are now used for Theatre History, Speech, Theatre and Film Appreciation, and Scriptwriting.
13. New course added in Desktop Publishing, Jour. 302.

### **Major Program Assessment Summary for IDS**

The Interdisciplinary Studies program provides students with very specialized interests the opportunity to work with faculty sponsors in designing their own major programs of study from courses drawn from at least two disciplines. Each student's program must be approved by faculty sponsors from the two curricular areas and by the Interdisciplinary Studies Advisory committee in order for the student to be accepted as an Interdisciplinary Studies major. The director of the Interdisciplinary Studies program is responsible for the administration of the program as well as program assessment; turnover in the position three times in the last four years has brought new perspectives to that endeavor. Prior to 1996, assessment of the program focused on the students' total university experience and gave more attention to general education than to the major. Since the major program was distinct for each student, that

approach was understandable; nevertheless, in 1996, the plan of assessment was redesigned to focus on the major program itself. The present interim director, who assumed responsibility for the program in Spring 2002, has approached assessment of the program from the standpoint of what things need to be done now in order to make the program fit more compatibly with other majors within Lander University. In keeping with that consideration, assessment this year has focused more on what the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee, the faculty in general, the Vice President of Academic Affairs, and the Registrar have identified as specific problems with the program.

As a result of this assessment, the Interdisciplinary Studies Committee has implemented several new policies. One important change is that students who wish to make last-minute changes on their program sheets must now petition for those changes through the Registrar's Office; petitions must be signed by the major advisor, the IDS Director, and then approved by the Registrar. Clearer guidelines are currently being written for the IDS 499 class, as students in past exit interviews have indicated that such clarity is lacking and needed. In addition, the new IDS recipe page (advising sheet) has the requirement of signatures for all advisors, indicating that they have met and have discussed the program with each other and with the student; our assessment this year indicates that there is a lack of communication among advisors, the IDS Committee, and the IDS Director. The IDS Committee is also revisiting the issue of how students determine whether the degrees they plan are BS degrees or BA degrees. The interim IDS Director is writing a policies and procedures sheet to address all of these issues clearly, and it will be made available to all IDS Committee members and major advisors via the IDS webpage.

In exit interviews, graduating seniors have been very positive about the program. Placement data for IDS graduates has been very positive. Since students choose the IDS major because they have very specific educational and career goals, they tend to have specific career plans in place prior to graduation. Employment in the field of study by graduates is very high. No students from this assessment period reported being employed in fields unrelated to their IDS programs.

Assessment data for Interdisciplinary Studies has been limited in part by the small number of graduates in the program, so several initiatives have been instituted to give the program a higher profile, particularly among transfer students. Transfer agreements have been established with several technical colleges allowing smoother transitions for students who wish to pursue a baccalaureate degree focused on fields that are not offered as majors at Lander. Frameworks have been designed for innovative and unique programs of study that allow students to use their technical college training in interdisciplinary majors. Information specific to these frameworks has been distributed in the community, and the IDS director has held presentations at technical college campuses, at local industries, and for a regional business / education partnership. Response to these initiatives has been very positive, with over 100 inquiries regarding the IDS program being made since April 1998.

In addition to that, inquiry has begun to establish an exchange agreement with the University of Plymouth in England that will allow our IDS students to work on their degrees there and students from the University of Plymouth to come to Lander to work on their degrees. The University of Plymouth is the site of the Lander University exchange program in England; it is proving to be a relatively simple matter to work out an IDS exchange agreement with Professor Harry Bennett, the IDS Director there.

### **Interim Assessment Summary for Teacher Education**

Lander University's School of Education offers baccalaureate programs in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education and Special Education, and collaborates with other academic units in offering Secondary/K-12 programs. The M.Ed. in elementary education and MAT in secondary education, with a concentration in art, are offered. The National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) requires that all teacher education units develop and implement a comprehensive assessment plan. This plan must include scheduled examination of all teacher education programs, students and faculty. The plan is broad based and incorporates assessment of knowledge, skills, and dispositions as defined in the unit's conceptual model. While various surveys, exams and performance-based observations are used in the evaluation of initial certification and advanced programs, the overall

structure of the assessment program is consistent across all teacher education areas. The disciplinary content for the Secondary/K-12 programs is evaluated chiefly in conjunction with major program assessment, which is reported separately; however, the appropriateness of those programs for teacher education is validated through the PRAXIS II area examinations and student developed portfolios.

## **PRAXIS II**

The primary means of monitoring the content knowledge of graduates from teacher education programs at Lander is the tracking of scores on professional examinations. The chart below includes results for the past two years. Data are collected for each year and reported to the CHE, South Carolina Department of Education and the Federal Government.

The following table displays data for the academic years 2000-2001 and 2001-2002. The statistics displayed in this table are taken from Lander University's Title II reports for the years indicated. PRAXIS II reports in the format required by the CHE were submitted and are available at the Commission.

2000-2002 Testing Information for Program Completers\*

	00-01			01-02			Two-year totals		
	N of Program Completers Taking Exam	N of Program Completers Passing Exam	% Pass Rate	N of Program Completers Taking Exam	N of Program Completers Passing Exam	% Pass Rate	N of Program Completers Taking Exam	N of Program Completers Passing Exam	% Pass Rate
TYPE OF ASSESSMENT									
Education in the Elementary School	1	1	100%				1	1	100%
Elementary Education: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment	20	20	100%	26	26	100%	46	46	100%
Elementary Education: Content Area Exercises	5	5	100%	5	5	100%	10	10	100%
Early Childhood Education	9	9	100%	16	16	100%	25	25	100%
Special Education	4	4	100%	6	5	83%	10	9	90%
Art	2	2	100%	2	2	100%	4	4	100%
Spanish				1	1	100%	1	1	100%
Social Studies	3	3	100%	3	3	100%	6	6	100%
Mathematics				4	4	100%	4	4	100%
Music	2	2	100%	3	3	100%	5	5	100%
Physical Education	7	7	100%	7	6	87%	14	13	93%
PLT K-6	6	4	67%	3	3	100%	9	7	77%
PLT 7-12	5	5	100%	2	2	100%	7	7	100%

\*Exams taken by Program Completers that are not required by the South Carolina Department of Education for certification, exams taken by candidates in areas other than the candidate's major area and exams taken by candidates prior to completing the appropriate coursework have been excluded.

During this two-year period, only two graduates did not pass the required PRAXIS test(s) required for initial certification in South Carolina; however, several students failed the required test on their first attempt. Interviews with students failing on their first attempt revealed that these students often did not

prepare themselves for the test by learning about the test format, the amount of time allowed to take the test and the nature of the questions posed on the test. The School of Education instituted a PRAXIS Preparation Workshop based on commercially available programs. The number of students failing on their first attempt decreased and this workshop is now offered as part of the Directed Teaching semester. Since the workshop focused on test-taking strategies and did not attempt to re-teach the content of the test, it is likely those students failing on their first attempt possessed the knowledge and skills required but introduced error into the testing situation by not preparing themselves as wise test takers.

In the last full report (1999) changes in special education, history and political science certifying programs have resulted in a significant increase in the passing rate for these areas. The unit hired a new special education professor in the fall of 1998 who revitalized the program and revised courses and clinical experiences to ensure alignment with new national special education standards. Major programmatic changes were made in both the history and the political science majors leading to teacher certification. The PRAXIS II social studies test is a broad-based content test of the social sciences. Prior to 1997, the degrees in history and political science were relatively non-prescriptive so that adequate coverage of subject matter depended on the student's choice of courses. Beginning with the 1997-98 catalog, all the 27 hours of political science required to complete the major leading to teacher certification are either specified courses or courses from distribution lists, whereas previously only nine of the thirty-six required hours in political science were designated courses. In addition, the revised political science program requires eighteen hours of history survey courses, whereas only six hours had been required previously. With the 1998-99 catalog, the history major leading to teacher certification was also revised to be more prescriptive. Whereas the program previously required only one survey course, the revised program requires three--one from world history and two from United States history--, and nine of the program's remaining twenty-seven hours in history must be in non-U.S. history. One may infer that these changes resulted in students being better prepared for the breadth of the PRAXIS II Social Studies test.

### **Alumni and Employer Surveys**

The School of Education has conducted Alumni and Employer Surveys for many years. Employer surveys were conducted in the spring of 1999 and spring 2002. The survey form was substantially revised as a part of the NCATE process for the spring 2002 administration. Personnel administrators from 14 school districts completed the 1998 survey while representatives of 17 school districts completed the 2002 survey. Strengths identified in both surveys included: knowledge of the ADEPT process, content expertise, work ethic, professionalism and pedagogical skill. A weakness identified in the 1998 employer survey was a lack of knowledge of the South Carolina Curriculum Standards and a weakness in designing instruction for diverse learners. The unit implemented changes in clinical requirements in response to these concerns. Students are now required to correlate all lesson plans, including assessment activities, with South Carolina Curriculum Standards. In addition, students are required to conduct a case study with a diverse learner and to develop lesson plans that have provisions for capitalizing upon the diversity found in South Carolina classrooms. In addition, all students must provide evidence of their competence in these areas within their portfolio. Survey results from 2002 indicate that students interviewing for teaching positions were perceived as being knowledgeable of curriculum standards and able to address the needs of diverse learners.

An extensive survey designed to assess the preparation of students for the teaching profession was administered to program graduates in the spring of 1999 and 2002. These surveys were sent to graduates two years following graduation. The survey instructed graduates to respond to statements regarding how well Lander University prepared them to teach. Graduates were also invited to make comments regarding any aspect of their preparation. Ratings and comments were overwhelmingly positive on both of the surveys. Three areas that were identified as in need of attention were the use of educational technology, preparation in the ADEPT instrument and the South Carolina Curriculum Standards. As previously presented, data collected from employers in 2002 indicate satisfaction with graduates preparation to use state standards and participate in the ADEPT process. Surveys have recently been mailed to 2000-2001 graduates. The unit will examine these surveys to see if there is evidence that more recent graduates perceive themselves as being prepared in these two areas. The faculty is addressing student preparation to use instructional technology. Many teacher education

students complete an educational technology course as a part of their degree program. In some majors, educational technology is stranded through several courses and experiences. The faculty voted in the spring of 2003 to require students to demonstrate specific technology competencies as part of the program admission process. This requirement will go into effect for students seeking program admission during the 2003-2004 school year.

Graduates from the M.Ed. program are surveyed yearly. As with undergraduate surveys, results are overwhelmingly positive. Most graduates of the M.Ed. program indicated they were "well prepared" in the areas identified on the survey. Again, the only area of concern was instructional technology. At this time no changes have been made in the program in response to this concern. The degree does not require a graduate-level technology course, although students may take a technology course as an elective. Members of the graduate faculty have discussed requiring specific technology competencies to be met in core graduate courses. It is expected that new policy regarding educational technology will be developed during the 2003/2004 school year.

Limited data have been collected related to the MAT – Art degree program since the program is relatively new. Exit interviews have been conducted with two graduating classes. Graduates indicate they are well prepared to deal with the ADEPT process and to teach the South Carolina Art Curriculum Standards. The sequence of education courses was revised based upon input from one of the early graduating class of MAT-Art students.

### **ADEPT and Portfolio Evaluations**

In addition to information from surveys, the School of Education also collects information about its program from ADEPT evaluations of student teachers and from portfolios developed as part of the undergraduate teacher education program. While the primary purpose of the ADEPT evaluation is to assist the candidate in improving teaching practices, the faculty examines the evaluations in the aggregate to determine areas for improvement. The portfolio requirement allows students to move beyond ADEPT and toward national standards for beginning teachers. Students typically perform well on the ADEPT instrument and the faculty is confident the standards of ADEPT are being addressed in all teacher education programs. An analysis of student portfolios has revealed that portfolios developed by students who complete all four years of the teacher education program at Lander University are better written and organized than portfolios developed by students who transfer at least 50 semester hours of coursework from other institutions. In addition, transfer students do not appear to integrate content from different subject areas when teaching as well as students completing their entire degree at Lander. These findings are preliminary in nature and the unit will continue to analyze student portfolios to see if these findings occur across groups of student teachers.

### **External Evaluation**

In the summer of 2003, the Dean of the unit met with 155 South Carolina Teacher Specialists. These master teachers are employed by the State Department of Education to assist low-performing P-12 schools in curriculum revision and professional development. The Teacher Specialists reviewed the Learner Outcomes of the School of Education and identified the relative importance of each outcome for beginning and experienced teachers. On average 150 of the teachers rated each learner outcome as either critical or very important for the beginning teacher and 151 teachers rated each learner outcome as either critical or very important for the experienced teacher. This data provides evidence that Lander University's teacher education programs are based upon knowledge, skills and dispositions that are valued by the profession. In addition other advisory groups composed of business leaders, community leaders and students have displayed support for the unit's learner outcomes and program structure. The unit will continue the implementation of a comprehensive assessment plan and the refinement of all programs.

### **Update on Student Development**

Lander provided a report on Student Development in its 2002 Institutional Effectiveness Report. Because CHE has now adopted a uniform reporting schedule for all schools, this resulted in Lander reporting on Student Development two years in a row. Therefore, the 2002 report is duplicated here with comments inserted where/if any changes have occurred since 2002.

### 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 variety of contexts.

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. This survey (recently renamed by ACT as the Survey of Student Opinions) was conducted at Lander annually each spring semester from 1990-2000. Due to the consistency of data outcomes and financial considerations, a three-year "break" was taken after the 2000 survey, and the survey was administered again in the Spring Semester 2003.

b. Outcomes: From 1990-2000 (with never less than a very representative one-third of the entire undergraduate student body participating each year), the Student Opinion Survey found that the consistently recurring lowest points and highest points of student satisfaction were:

**Lowest** points of student satisfaction: During the first 10 years of the Survey, of 12 possible responses, the three responses shown below were the only ones to each year register 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

In the Spring 2003 survey, of the same 12 possible responses listed in earlier surveys, the same three items continued to be the only items to record double-digit responses, although Availability of Financial Aid came close to a double-digit response by being marked by 9.8 percent of the respondents.

**Highest** points of student satisfaction on the Spring 2003 Survey of Student Opinions were:

- Class size relative to type of course
- Out-of-class availability of your instructors

c. Actions taken: Each year of the survey, members of the Board of Trustees, the central administration, the entire faculty, and all non-academic department heads are individually furnished bound copies of the survey results. These results report both all-University data and data configured by academic major. Formal audio/visual presentations of the data by the Survey Director are available upon request.

During the 2002-2003 academic year, Lander University developed a Strategic Plan that, among other things, addressed the resolution of many of the areas that have consistently been given lower satisfaction scores by the students. While action is already being taken on items such as increasing student weekend activities, the ultimate enactment of a number of the resolutions will be affected by the fluctuations of state funding.

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

b. Outcomes: Each year since 1998, two meetings each fall and two meetings 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 attend and participate actively in these meetings, as do members of the Student Affairs staff. These open forums 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 both strong and representative, and a wide variety of student ideas and concerns surface, many of which reinforce the Student Opinion Survey outcomes.

c. Actions taken: In many cases, direct verbal responses are given to matters raised by the students and prompt administrative follow-up to those responses can be made as University resources allow. 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 are 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 Lander programs and opportunities are viewed in a positive light by these student leaders.

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 development of 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 by means of a forced-response numerical rating scale, and also responded to four opened-ended items that concerned University strengths and weaknesses, enrollment and retention, and the meeting of students' expectations.

b. Outcomes: The 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.

The 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 was considered by various subcommittees that worked on the Strategic Plan, and much of that input was reflected in the final outcome of the Strategic Plan.

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

Lander University is actively involved in preparing its students for use of technology. Training and experience in technology is accomplished in a variety of ways. Students' first exposure to technology on campus is through our first-year student orientation program called EXPO. During EXPO students are

provided orientation to technology on campus, including a review of residence hall computer connections, and important internet sites for accessing student records, library resources, email, and online catalogues. Second, students complete a section on technology in our LU 101 course, a newly developed course required of all incoming first-year students. This section requires students to send at least 3 emails and 2 attachments to instructors, to use word-processing software to compute a word count of a document and report that word count via email to an instructor, to understand how to access and register via our online registration system, to review their transcript online, and to access the university catalogue online. Because Lander recently purchased a license for WebCT course management software, an introduction to WebCT is being planned for inclusion in future LU 101 offerings. Third, the newly appointed Vice President of Academic Affairs is encouraging faculty to include technology use in their courses and to increase the number of courses offered online. Toward this end, 54 faculty received laptop computers for classroom use in 2003-2004 and a number of additional classrooms on campus were converted to "smart classrooms" outfitted to allow easy connections of faculty laptops to the internet, sound system, and video projection units in each room. The increasing numbers of courses being offered online are providing students with direct, hands-on experience with technology. Lander plans to continue to increase the number of faculty and students using technology and is actively pursuing external funding sources to support these plans.

### **Survey of 1999-2000 Alumni**

[Link to 2003 Alumni Survey Summary](#)

[Link to 2003 Placement Survey Summary](#)

Prepared by Michael Sonntag  
END OF DOCUMENT