



U N I V E R S I T Y O F
SOUTH CAROLINA®
A I K E N

Laying the Foundations for Excellence: Institutional Effectiveness Report 2006

*Submitted to
The South Carolina Commission for Higher Education
on July 31, 2006*

*Available online at:
<http://ie.usca.edu/assessment/IEReports>*

Prepared by:

Braden J. Hosch, Ph.D.
Director, Office of Institutional Effectiveness

University of South Carolina Aiken

Dr. Thomas L. Hallman
Chancellor

University Mission

Founded in 1961, the University of South Carolina Aiken (USCA) is a comprehensive liberal arts institution committed to active learning through excellence in teaching, faculty and student scholarship, research, creative activities and service. In this stimulating academic community, USCA challenges students to acquire and develop the skills, knowledge, and values necessary for success in a dynamic global environment.

The university offers degrees in the arts and sciences and in the professional disciplines of business, education, and nursing. All courses of study are grounded in a liberal arts and sciences core curriculum. USCA also encourages interdisciplinary studies and collaborative endeavors.

Emphasizing small classes and individual attention, USCA provides students with opportunities to maximize individual achievement in both academic and co-curricular settings. The institution challenges students to think critically and creatively, to communicate effectively, to learn independently, and to acquire depth of knowledge in chosen fields. The university values honesty, integrity, initiative, hard work, accomplishments, responsible citizenship, respect for diversity, and cross-cultural understanding.

USC Aiken attracts students of varying ages and diverse cultural backgrounds who have demonstrated the potential to succeed in a challenging academic environment. In addition to serving the Savannah River area, USCA actively seeks student enrollment from all parts of South Carolina as well as from other states and countries.

As a senior public institution of the University of South Carolina, USCA combines the advantages of a smaller institution with the resources of a major university system. Located in beautiful, historic Aiken, South Carolina, USCA is an institution of moderate size (2,500-5,000 students) that offers baccalaureate degrees in a number of disciplines, completion baccalaureate degrees at University of South Carolina regional campuses, and master's degrees in selected programs.

The USCA World Wide Web Home Page is: <http://www.usca.edu>

The USCA Office of Institutional Effectiveness World Wide Web Home Page is: <http://ie.usca.edu>

July 2006

Suggested Citation

Hosch, B. (2006). *Laying the foundations for excellence: Institutional effectiveness report 2006*. Aiken, SC: Office of Institutional Effectiveness, University of South Carolina Aiken. Retrieved [date], from <http://ie.usca.edu/assessment/IEReports/IEReport2006.pdf>.

Contact Information

Office of Institutional Effectiveness
108 Penland Administration Building
The University of South Carolina Aiken
471 University Parkway
Aiken, SC 29801

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
General Education	5
Overview	5
Goals and Objectives	5
Assessment Methods and Overall Results	5
Competency-Specific Assessment Results and Outcomes	7
Majors/Concentrations	12
Chemistry	13
Communications	15
Education	17
Exercise Science	19
Statement on Technology Preparation	20
References	21
Institutional Effectiveness Data Tables	22
Programs Eligible for Accreditation and Programs Accredited	22
Courses Taught by Faculty	24
Success of Students in Developmental Courses	24
Student Involvement in Sponsored Research	25
Results of Professional Examinations	26

Introduction

This report documents improvements made through the comprehensive assessment system at the University of South Carolina Aiken (USCA). It is submitted to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education (CHE) and the state legislature in compliance with South Carolina Act 255 of 1992 and Act 629 of 1996.

USCA's mission, which challenges students to "acquire and develop the skills, knowledge and values necessary for success in a dynamic global environment," as well as the University's strategic plan guide all assessment efforts on campus. The extent to which students have achieved learning outcomes, developed as citizens and individuals, and reached their educational goals constitutes the measures by which we measure of our success. Outcomes assessment forms the core of campus efforts to measure progress, make adjustments, and demonstrate that the University is laying a foundation for excellence.

Assessment activities are coordinated and monitored by the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. The mission of this office is to provide internal and external constituencies with an accurate and complete understanding of how USCA is advancing its institutional mission. The IE Office uses a multifaceted and dynamic approach that integrates the collection and analysis of institutional data with the coordination of the assessment of student learning outcomes from academic units, general education, and co-curricular programs in an ongoing effort to improve programs and services throughout the university. The IE Office disseminates assessment results and institutional data to support institutional planning and decision-making as well as advancing quality and innovation in the teaching and learning process, co-curricular programs, and other administrative units.

A variety of institution-wide assessment efforts were completed in 2005-06 that impact learning across academic programs. Results from these various studies provide detail about how students at USCA interact with the college experience, and these global findings inform assessment processes and use of results at the unit and program levels. Highlights among these efforts include USCA's participation in or completion of:

Academic Tracking Reports (#6 and #7):

Success and Retention of Entering Freshmen With Admission Prerequisite
Exceptions (2004 and 2005)

Fall 2004 First Year Cohort Retention to Fall 2005

Cooperative Institutional Research Program Freshman Survey 2005

Faculty Salary Study, 2004-05 (2005)

Faculty Survey 2004-2005: Results and Analysis for USC Aiken

National Survey of Student Engagement 2006

Perceptions of USC Aiken's Image, Mission, and Values

*Perceptions of Administration, Work Load, and Academic and Campus Services at USC
Aiken*

Study of Faculty Advising Loads: Fall 2003 through Fall 2005

Survey of USC Aiken Alumni: Classes of '00-'01 and '01-'02

Findings from these studies have been analyzed and disseminated to communicate to a variety of constituencies that the improvement of educational outcomes lies at the heart of institutional priorities to improve retention and completion rates. Administration of these assessment tools and ongoing studies about campus-wide academic success continues to proceed on a regular schedule to promote quality learning and data-driven decisions. Results and recommendations from most of these are available on the IE Office website: <http://ie.usca.edu>.

Further, USCA grounds its assessment efforts in the scholarship of teaching and learning by involving faculty and staff directly in measurement throughout the assessment system. These individuals are involved in presenting the findings of their research about student learning and the best practices for conducting these assessments in regional and national conferences, in grant applications, and in various forthcoming publications. The significant link between scholarship and the utility of assessment integrates the elements of teaching, scholarship, and service central to the University's mission.

While the focus of this report lies in changes and improvements made as a result of assessment data, assessment is an ongoing practice across all campus units, and improving the quality of the education experience remains a collective aim, as results are analyzed, adjustments made, and goals for outcomes refined. The process of assessment at USCA allows the institution to lay a foundation for excellence and promote student success.

General Education

Overview

General education competencies at USCA represent the foundational skills, knowledge and values necessary for success in a dynamic global environment, and all students are expected to acquire and develop proficiency in these competencies throughout their careers at the University. These outcomes for student learning are grounded in the liberal arts for all students regardless of their majors in order to promote critical thinking, intellectual flexibility, re-trainability, the capacity for lifelong learning, and meaningful citizenship during and beyond the undergraduate experience.

Goals and Objectives

Goals and objectives for general education were intensively examined between 2003 and 2006 and explicit, verb-driven learning outcomes were developed and approved by departmental and college faculty under the leadership of the Academic Assessment Committee. These goals are discussed in more detail below, but roughly fall into nine categories: Oral and Written Communication, Mathematics, Statistics & Logic, Foreign Language, Natural Sciences, Social & Behavioral Sciences, Humanities, World Civilizations, American Political Institutions, and Cross Cultural Understanding. A full description of all revised objectives appears online at <http://ie.usca.edu/assessment>.

Assessment Methods and Overall Results

Assessment of general education outcomes is coordinated by the Academic Assessment Committee in conjunction with the Office of Institutional Effectiveness. Academic departments that deliver general education courses report assessment results in annual program reviews and how such findings are used for improvement. These findings are reviewed on a three-year cycle by the academic assessment committee in the program review process. Multiple measures are used to assess general education outcomes, and three broad strategies are deployed to assess general education outcomes: the National Survey of Student Engagement, a bi-annual survey of recent alumni, and direct measurement within the curriculum.

USCA has participated in the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) in 2004 and 2006, and plans to continue administration of the instrument every two years. Data reported here are for the 2004 administration of this assessment instrument. Response rates have doubled since the first administration of the survey due to institutional commitment to its value as a nationally benchmarked assessment (Bergstrom & Hosch, 2006). On all relevant measures of educational and personal growth, USCA seniors score above benchmark compared to students at one or more national comparison groups.

Questions about general education appear on the bi-annual alumni survey about graduates' abilities compared to other college graduates. In most areas, a majority of graduates from USCA report that they are above average or outstanding in each area of general education compared to graduates of other institutions. Particular strengths were reported in understanding written information and understanding the interaction between people and society. Weaknesses were reported in understanding and applying scientific principles and speaking a second language.

USCA is a national leader in assessment techniques for the direct measurement of learning outcomes. Student competencies across most outcomes are either directly measured by faculty or other qualified professionals, or these measures are under development. Several recent peer-reviewed presentations have outlined the effectiveness of these methods as well as their improved utility compared to self-reported measures (Hosch, 2006; Foote & Hosch, 2006; Hosch & Rhodes, 2005). Additionally, the Office of Institutional Effectiveness has developed and continues to expand a web-based dynamic reporting tool that allows for detailed analysis of direct measurements of student learning outcomes (Fogle & Hosch, 2006).

General Education Assessment Points

General Education Area	NSSE	Alumni Survey		Curricular Measurement
		% Above Avg., Outstanding	(Rank out of 11 outcomes) ^o	
Oral and Written Communication				
- Reading Comprehension	NA	77.2	1	*
- Written Communication	+	67.0	5	x
- Oral Communication	+	60.0	6	*
Mathematics, Statistics & Logic	+	52.6	8	*
Foreign Language	NA	11.9	11	x
Natural Sciences	NA	40.4	10	x
Social and Behavioral Sciences	+	73.9	2	*
Humanities	+	44.5	9	
World Civilizations	NA	59.1	7	*
American Political Institutions	+	68.3	3	x
Cross Cultural Understanding	+	59.1	7	

+ USCA student outcomes are above one or more comparison groups at a statistically significant level.

^o Technology skills were ranked #4, although this competency is not yet formally included in general education.

x Direct measurement by faculty in a course or graduation requirement; data reported below.

* Direct measurement by faculty in a course or graduation requirement; data will be collected in 2006-07.

2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) General Education Results

Data are reported here for seniors only

11. Educational and Personal Growth <i>To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas? 1=very little, 2=some, 3=quite a bit, 4=very much</i>	USC-Aiken	USC-Aiken compared with:								
		American Democracy Proj			Baccalaureate-General Insts			NSSE 2004		
		Mean	Mean	Sig	Effect Size	Mean	Sig	Effect Size	Mean	Sig
a. Acquiring a broad general education	3.39	3.21	*	.22	3.36			3.32		
b. Acquiring job or work-related knowledge and skills	3.14	3.02			3.10			3.02		
c. Writing clearly and effectively	3.29	3.03	**	.30	3.14			3.12	*	.21
d. Speaking clearly and effectively	3.14	2.93	*	.24	3.07			3.01		
e. Thinking critically and analytically	3.47	3.27	**	.26	3.35			3.37		
f. Analyzing quantitative problems	3.08	2.82	**	.30	2.84	**	.27	2.87	*	.24
g. Using computing and information technology	3.32	3.15			3.12	*	.23	3.12	*	.23
h. Working effectively with others	3.34	3.08	**	.30	3.18	*	.20	3.14	*	.24
i. Voting in local, state, or national elections	2.07	1.77	**	.32	1.87	*	.20	1.84	*	.24
j. Learning effectively on your own	3.15	3.01			3.10			3.09		
k. Understanding yourself	2.81	2.73			2.95			2.88		
l. Understanding people of other racial/ethnic backgrounds	2.83	2.54	**	.30	2.61	*	.22	2.58	**	.26
m. Solving complex real-world problems	2.97	2.63	***	.37	2.71	**	.28	2.69	**	.30
n. Developing a personal code of values and ethics	2.80	2.54	**	.26	2.87			2.72		
o. Contributing to the welfare of your community	2.46	2.25	*	.22	2.55			2.42		

* p<.05 ** p<.01 ***p<.001 (2-tailed).

Effect size = mean difference divided by comparison group standard deviation.

American Democracy Project Institutions are public baccalaureate and master's institutions participating in an initiative through American Assoc. of State Colleges and Universities to promote civic engagement.

Competency-Specific Assessment Results and Outcomes

Oral and Written Communication

Goal: *Drawing upon a foundation of critical thinking skills, students will listen and read with understanding and communicate effectively in speech and in writing.*

Reading Comprehension

Assessment Results	NSSE:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not available.
	Alumni Survey: Understanding Written Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 1st out of 11 general education outcomes 77.2% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data expected in 2006-07
Actions Taken	Additional emphasis on and measurement of reading comprehension and analysis of written materials have been added to English 101 and 102 in 2005. Course specific assessment data are expected in 2006-07.	

Oral Communication

Assessment Results	NSSE: 11d. Speaking clearly and effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = small
	Alumni Survey: Speaking effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 6th out of 11 general education outcomes 60.0% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data expected in 2006-07
Actions Taken	Faculty in the Communications Department are refining a rubric to be used in ACOM 241 Public Speaking and ACOM 201 Interpersonal Communications. Preliminary data will be available for analysis in 2006-07.	

Written Communication

Assessment Results	NSSE: 11c. Writing Clearly and Effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = medium Above benchmark nationally, effect size = small 																																																		
	Alumni Survey: Writing Effectively	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 5th out of 11 general education outcomes 67.0% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates 																																																		
	Curricular Measures: The Junior Writing Portfolio is a graduation requirement for all majors. It is submitted in the junior year and evaluated by two faculty members. Students must earn a minimum combined score of 3 out of 5 to pass.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Objective for Student Learning</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Learning Outcome (N=1,343)</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>Clarity of Purpose</td><td>3.47</td></tr> <tr><td>Quality of thought</td><td>3.46</td></tr> <tr><td>Organization of Content</td><td>3.43</td></tr> <tr><td>Grammar and Mechanics</td><td>3.18</td></tr> <tr><td>Language and Style</td><td>3.30</td></tr> <tr><td>Use of sources</td><td>3.22</td></tr> <tr><td>Aggregate</td><td>3.34</td></tr> </tbody> </table> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Gender & Ethnicity</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Learning Outcome (N=1,343)</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>African American Men</td><td>3.03</td></tr> <tr><td>African American Women</td><td>3.04</td></tr> <tr><td>White Men</td><td>3.37</td></tr> <tr><td>White Women</td><td>3.45</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Objective for Student Learning		Learning Outcome (N=1,343)	Mean	Clarity of Purpose	3.47	Quality of thought	3.46	Organization of Content	3.43	Grammar and Mechanics	3.18	Language and Style	3.30	Use of sources	3.22	Aggregate	3.34	Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Gender & Ethnicity		Learning Outcome (N=1,343)	Mean	African American Men	3.03	African American Women	3.04	White Men	3.37	White Women	3.45																				
	Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Objective for Student Learning																																																			
Learning Outcome (N=1,343)	Mean																																																			
Clarity of Purpose	3.47																																																			
Quality of thought	3.46																																																			
Organization of Content	3.43																																																			
Grammar and Mechanics	3.18																																																			
Language and Style	3.30																																																			
Use of sources	3.22																																																			
Aggregate	3.34																																																			
Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Gender & Ethnicity																																																				
Learning Outcome (N=1,343)	Mean																																																			
African American Men	3.03																																																			
African American Women	3.04																																																			
White Men	3.37																																																			
White Women	3.45																																																			
	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Major</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Major</th> <th>N</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>English</td><td>32</td><td>4.08</td></tr> <tr><td>Chemistry</td><td>13</td><td>3.61</td></tr> <tr><td>History</td><td>26</td><td>3.57</td></tr> <tr><td>Fine Arts</td><td>49</td><td>3.50</td></tr> <tr><td>Biology</td><td>91</td><td>3.45</td></tr> <tr><td>Nursing</td><td>157</td><td>3.43</td></tr> <tr><td>All Other Majors</td><td>16</td><td>3.39</td></tr> <tr><td>Education</td><td>228</td><td>3.37</td></tr> <tr><td>Political Science</td><td>24</td><td>3.36</td></tr> <tr><td>Psychology</td><td>80</td><td>3.30</td></tr> <tr><td>Math</td><td>38</td><td>3.28</td></tr> <tr><td>Business</td><td>368</td><td>3.26</td></tr> <tr><td>Exercise Sci.</td><td>71</td><td>3.22</td></tr> <tr><td>Communications</td><td>73</td><td>3.21</td></tr> <tr><td>Sociology</td><td>77</td><td>3.06</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Major			Major	N	Score	English	32	4.08	Chemistry	13	3.61	History	26	3.57	Fine Arts	49	3.50	Biology	91	3.45	Nursing	157	3.43	All Other Majors	16	3.39	Education	228	3.37	Political Science	24	3.36	Psychology	80	3.30	Math	38	3.28	Business	368	3.26	Exercise Sci.	71	3.22	Communications	73	3.21	Sociology	77	3.06
Junior Portfolio Results 2003-2006 by Major																																																				
Major	N	Score																																																		
English	32	4.08																																																		
Chemistry	13	3.61																																																		
History	26	3.57																																																		
Fine Arts	49	3.50																																																		
Biology	91	3.45																																																		
Nursing	157	3.43																																																		
All Other Majors	16	3.39																																																		
Education	228	3.37																																																		
Political Science	24	3.36																																																		
Psychology	80	3.30																																																		
Math	38	3.28																																																		
Business	368	3.26																																																		
Exercise Sci.	71	3.22																																																		
Communications	73	3.21																																																		
Sociology	77	3.06																																																		
Actions Taken	Emphasis on Use of Sources and research methods throughout the curriculum in several majors beginning in 2004 has increased the mean score for Use of Sources. Departments and Schools use this indicator to monitor student writing ability, and some units have set passage of this portfolio as a pre-requisite for selected upper-level classes. Significantly weaker performance of African American or Black students on this curricular requirement has been examined by the Minority Success Action Team of the campus-wide Enrollment Planning Team.																																																			

Mathematics, Statistics, and Logic

Goal: *Students will exhibit computational competence and employ mathematical and logical thinking to solve abstract and applied problems relevant to a dynamic global environment.*

Assessment Results	NSSE: 11f. Analyzing Quantitative Problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = medium Above benchmark for baccalaureate-general institutions, effect size = small Above benchmark nationally, effect size = small
	Alumni Survey: Using Mathematics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 8th out of 11 general education outcomes 52.6% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures: Common final exam in Math 108 College Algebra	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Initial data collected in Spring 2006; data collection will be ongoing and analysis will begin in 2006-07
Actions Taken	Assessment data and a high DFW rate in some math courses has prompted more focused assessment activities. A common final exam was adopted for all sections of Math 108 College Algebra in Spring 2006. Findings from this assessment project will be used to inform curricular adjustments.	

Foreign Language

Goal: *Students will demonstrate proficiency at the introductory level in the target language consistent with ACTFL standards for foreign language education.*

Assessment Results	NSSE:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not available. 																																														
	Alumni Survey: Speaking a Second Language	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 11th out of 11 general education outcomes 11.9% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates 																																														
	Curricular Measures: Beginning in Fall 2005 foreign language faculty began an assessment program of measuring ACTFL learning outcomes on final exams at the 101, 102, and 210 course levels.	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2">Student Learning Outcomes Measured on Final Exams 2005-06 (5=Outstanding, 3=Acceptable, 1=Poor)</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Learning Outcome (N=673)</th> <th>Mean</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Reading</td> <td>3.74</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Writing</td> <td>3.55</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Listening</td> <td>3.60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Speaking*</td> <td>3.51</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Culture</td> <td>3.28</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Aggregate</td> <td>3.62</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>*Not measured for Latin</p>	Student Learning Outcomes Measured on Final Exams 2005-06 (5=Outstanding, 3=Acceptable, 1=Poor)		Learning Outcome (N=673)	Mean	Reading	3.74	Writing	3.55	Listening	3.60	Speaking*	3.51	Culture	3.28	Aggregate	3.62	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3">Student Learning Outcomes By Course Grade</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Grade</th> <th>N</th> <th>Score</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>A</td> <td>134</td> <td>4.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B+</td> <td>65</td> <td>3.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>B</td> <td>105</td> <td>3.50</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C+</td> <td>50</td> <td>3.11</td> </tr> <tr> <td>C</td> <td>71</td> <td>2.87</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D+</td> <td>14</td> <td>2.23</td> </tr> <tr> <td>D</td> <td>15</td> <td>2.45</td> </tr> <tr> <td>F</td> <td>17</td> <td>1.56</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Student Learning Outcomes By Course Grade			Grade	N	Score	A	134	4.45	B+	65	3.87	B	105	3.50	C+	50	3.11	C	71	2.87	D+	14	2.23	D	15	2.45	F	17
Student Learning Outcomes Measured on Final Exams 2005-06 (5=Outstanding, 3=Acceptable, 1=Poor)																																																
Learning Outcome (N=673)	Mean																																															
Reading	3.74																																															
Writing	3.55																																															
Listening	3.60																																															
Speaking*	3.51																																															
Culture	3.28																																															
Aggregate	3.62																																															
Student Learning Outcomes By Course Grade																																																
Grade	N	Score																																														
A	134	4.45																																														
B+	65	3.87																																														
B	105	3.50																																														
C+	50	3.11																																														
C	71	2.87																																														
D+	14	2.23																																														
D	15	2.45																																														
F	17	1.56																																														
Actions Taken	Because this assessment has just been implemented, coordinated actions have not been taken. The faculty review of initial data from Fall 2005 revealed that faculty members were surprised that students' weakest performance was in the area of culture.																																															

Natural Sciences

Goal: Successful students will demonstrate the ability to apply principles of science to show their understanding of the biological and physical world.

Assessment Results	NSSE:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not available. 														
	Alumni Survey: Understanding and applying scientific principles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 10th out of 11 general education outcomes 40.4% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates 														
	Curricular Measures: Beginning in Fall 2005 some science faculty began an assessment system of measuring common student learning outcomes in science courses using online quizzes.	<p>Student Learning Outcomes Measured on Online Quizzes</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>General Education Outcome (Ranked by Level of Proficiency)</th> <th>Observations (N)</th> <th>Avg. % Correct</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2b. Understand the difference between data or observations and interpretation.</td> <td>150</td> <td>87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1a. Use representative nomenclature and define appropriate terminology.</td> <td>300</td> <td>76%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1b Describe applicable principles, processes, phenomena, or theories.</td> <td>1050</td> <td>65%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3b. Use appropriate formulas to solve problems</td> <td>300</td> <td>64%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	General Education Outcome (Ranked by Level of Proficiency)	Observations (N)	Avg. % Correct	2b. Understand the difference between data or observations and interpretation.	150	87%	1a. Use representative nomenclature and define appropriate terminology.	300	76%	1b Describe applicable principles, processes, phenomena, or theories.	1050	65%	3b. Use appropriate formulas to solve problems	300
General Education Outcome (Ranked by Level of Proficiency)	Observations (N)	Avg. % Correct														
2b. Understand the difference between data or observations and interpretation.	150	87%														
1a. Use representative nomenclature and define appropriate terminology.	300	76%														
1b Describe applicable principles, processes, phenomena, or theories.	1050	65%														
3b. Use appropriate formulas to solve problems	300	64%														
Actions Taken	<p>Because this assessment program is in a pilot stage, a coordination plan of action has not been adopted. Initial findings were reported at a faculty professional development workshop in May 2006. More faculty in the sciences will participate in data collection in 2006-07.</p>															

Social and Behavioral Sciences

Goal: Students will describe and understand basic principles of human behavior and evaluate how their application can explain everyday occurrences.

Assessment Results	NSSE: 11h. Solving Complex Real-World Problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = medium Above benchmark for baccalaureate-general institutions, effect size = small Above benchmark nationally, effect size = medium
	Alumni Survey: Understanding Interactions Between People & Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 2nd out of 11 general education outcomes 73.9% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data expected in 2006-07
Actions Taken	<p>Common learning outcomes for all disciplines in the social and behavioral sciences were developed and approved in 2005-06. Curricular-based measurement will begin in 2006-07 and be monitored for consistency with self-reported assessment measures.</p>	

Humanities

Goal: *Students will think critically and creatively about what it means to be human through analysis, interpretation, contextualization, and evaluation of what they study in the humanities.*

Assessment Results	NSSE: 11n. Developing a personal code of values and ethics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = small
	Alumni Survey: Understanding and appreciating the arts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 9th out of 11 general education outcomes 44.5% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data expected in 2006-07
Actions Taken	Common learning outcomes for all disciplines in the humanities were developed and approved in 2005-06. Curricular-based measurement will begin in 2006-07 and be monitored for consistency with self-reported assessment measures.	

World Civilizations

Goal: *Students will demonstrate an awareness of and appreciation for the cultural, political, social, and economic forces in the past that have been instrumental in the evolution of world civilizations.*

Assessment Results	NSSE:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not available.
	Alumni Survey: Understanding Philosophies and Cultures Different from Your Own	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 7th out of 11 general education outcomes 59.1% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Data expected in 2006-07
Actions Taken	Common learning outcomes for courses fulfilling the World Civilizations requirement were developed and approved in 2005-06. Reporting of curricular-based measurement will begin in 2006-07 and be monitored for consistency with self-reported assessment measures.	

American Political Institutions

Goal: *Students will also understand the workings of the American political process and recognize their role in American society.*

Assessment Results	NSSE: Voting in Local, State, or National Elections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = medium Above benchmark for baccalaureate-general institutions, effect size = small Above benchmark nationally, effect size = small
	Alumni Survey: Understanding Your Rights Responsibilities and Privileges as a Citizen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ranked 3rd out of 11 general education outcomes 59.1% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	Curricular Measures: American Gov't test in APLS 201.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tests taken by over 2,000 students as of Summer 2005.
Actions Taken	Each year the results are computer analyzed and results made available to faculty teaching the American government class. Results from assessment in this area have appeared in a peer-reviewed journal (Botsch & Botsch, 2001).	

Cross Cultural Understanding (Non-Western Requirement)

{Outcomes are under development}

Students will exhibit a sense of cross-cultural understanding, understand a variety of perspectives, and become effective participants and contributors in a dynamic global society.

Assessment Results	<p>NSSE: Understanding people of other racial/ethnic backgrounds</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Above benchmark for ADP Institutions, effect size = medium • Above benchmark for baccalaureate-general institutions, effect size = small • Above benchmark nationally, effect size = small
	<p>Alumni Survey: Understanding Philosophies and Cultures Different from Your Own</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ranked 7th out of 11 general education outcomes • 59.1% of alumni reported being above average or outstanding compared to other college graduates
	<p>Curricular Measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outcomes for this area are under development
Actions Taken	<p>Objective-level outcomes for this area of general education are still under development.</p>

Plans for General Education in 2006-07 and Beyond

A comprehensive review of USCA's general education curriculum and requirements will begin in 2006-07 under the auspices of a group of faculty convened by the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This review will use assessment data collected to date as well as data and analysis to be reported during 2006-07 to develop recommendations for how the general education curriculum should evolve to meet the needs of students in an increasingly fast-paced, technologically-driven, and globally competitive world.

Majors/Concentrations

Assessment of student learning outcomes at USCA is critically linked to the principles of faculty peer review and the connection of outcomes assessment to budgetary requests made in the program review process. USCA has completed the third year of a new practice by which an update on assessment activities is required in the annual program review submitted to the Academic Council and the Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. This focus on the assessment of student learning outcomes complements traditional elements such as credit hour production, personnel needs, budget requests, and future plans. This practice successfully connected requests to resources with learning outcomes.

In addition to annual program review, the Faculty Academic Assessment Committee reviews each academic program leading to a degree at USCA every three years. This review is accomplished with a rubric to evaluate the quality of assessment programs and an iterative process of feedback and dialogue between academic units and the Committee. Further, the Committee has charged the Director of Institutional Effectiveness to review assessment reports of units in the year following Committee review to determine the extent to which Committee recommendations have been addressed. The Director has also been charged to meet with unit leaders the semester before materials are due to the Committee to coach them through the submission process. This review process was also in the third year of implementation during the 2005-06 academic year, and while refinements continue to be made, the effectiveness of the reinvigorated process are already noticeable, with the quality of assessment data being collected. The processes and outcomes of this review process will be presented at the upcoming meeting of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission of Colleges (Hosch, Ozment, Rhodes, Schweder, 2006).

Ratings of Assessment Programs from Assessment Committee Review

(Target Mean Rating = 3.0)

Program Review Year	2003-04	2004-05
Number of Degree Programs Reviewed	6*	8**
Review Completed	2004-05	2005-06
Ratings		
<i>4=Exceeds Guidelines, 3=Meets Guidelines, 2=Approaches Guidelines, 1=Does Not Meet Guidelines or Missing</i>		
Goals	1.8	2.8
Goals are stated clearly.	1.8	2.9
Goals are about student learning.	1.7	2.8
Goals are formulated with "students" as the grammatical subject.	1.8	2.8
Objectives	2.0	2.3
Objectives derive from each goal.	1.8	2.3
Objectives are measurable in scope.	2.1	2.3
Objectives are formulated with "students" as the grammatical subject.	2.1	2.4
Measurement	2.0	2.3
Outcomes of objectives have been measured.	1.8	2.1
Measures for each outcome include one measure independent of student grades.	2.1	2.3
Measurements have been made by faculty or other qualified professionals.	2.1	2.4
Findings	1.7	2.5
All findings are presented.	1.7	2.3
Data from findings appear in tables and/or appendices.	1.6	2.6
Findings about supplementary assessment data (e.g. satisfaction surveys, focus groups, self-assessments) are presented when appropriate.	1.8	2.5
Actions Taken	1.7	2.0
Actions prompted by the results are described.	1.7	2.0

* School of Nursing Program Review includes 2 degree programs.

** School of Education Program Review includes 5 degree programs.

Chemistry

Mission

The Department of Chemistry and Physics strives to offer curricula of high academic quality, to foster an environment supportive of scholarly activity, to provide service courses for the general education of undergraduate students, and to serve as a physical science resource for the community. To this end, the department offers a Bachelor of Science degree with a major in chemistry, a minor in chemistry, and courses that may be used to satisfy the chemistry and physics requirements that are stipulated by other degrees or to satisfy the general education requirements in the natural sciences.

Goals for Learning Outcomes

1. Students will understand and appreciate the fundamental principles of the chemical sciences including the theory and practice of the discipline and its major subfields, including: Analytical Chemistry, Inorganic Chemistry, Organic Chemistry, Physical Chemistry.
2. Students will graduate with the appropriate credentials to pursue any one of the following career paths: employment as an entry-level chemist in industry or with the government, advanced studies in chemistry or related disciplines, studies in professional schools in areas such as medicine, pharmacy, dentistry, and law, and professional teaching with a certification at the secondary school level.
3. Students will synthesize acquired classroom and laboratory knowledge into a solid foundation that fosters critical thinking which will serve the students well throughout their careers and lives.

Assessment Results

Learning Outcomes

Learning Outcome	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	5-yr Avg.	Nat'l Avg.	Exit Survey 5-yr Average		
	American Chemical Society Exam Results							% Excellent	% Good	% Excellent + Good
Analytical	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	27	62	89
Inorganic	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	15	50	65
Organic (ACS Exam)	(49)	(47)	(48)	(54)	(53)	(51)	(53)	19	38	57
Physical (ACS Exam)	(40)	(42)	(38)	(41)	(47)	(42)	(52)	19	46	65
Assessment	Locally Developed Assessment									
Lab skills	--	--	--	--	--	--	NA	69	31	100
Instrumental Techn.	--	--	--	--	--	--	NA	46	50	96
Exit Exam (Fall / Spr.)	53 / 58	43 / 43	39 / 51	47 / 59	52 / --	49	NA	NA	NA	NA
Thesis	79	59	67	69	75	70	NA	NA	NA	NA
Oral Presentation	87	71	84	84	84	82	NA	NA	NA	NA

Placement Outcomes, 2001-2005

Post Graduation Placement	Percent
Degree-related employment	71.4
Graduate school	14.3
Medical/health professional school	10.7
Other	3.6

Actions Taken Based on Assessment Results

- **Annual review of assessment results.**

The department faculty members annually review assessment data. This process provides an ongoing feed-backward and feed-forward system to address curricular areas that may require adjustment and to inform faculty about the strengths and weakness of incoming students. Over the ten years that this data has been collected, the general trend for all assessment tools is that outcomes tend to track with the performance of each graduating class. The faculty members have examined the cumulative results from both parts of the exit exams. Consistently the students have performed about the same on both parts with an average near 60%. These exam scores do not necessarily correlate with the students' class grades but the general trend is that the stronger students perform better.
- **Addition of online computer course into curriculum to address student needs in technology education/application.**

In response to this shift in needs and our graduates' responses to questions of self-evaluated computer competency, the department has developed a one semester course on-line course which will allow students in the sophomore year to gain proficiency with the types of software tools chemists now use. This includes presentation software, mathematical packages, spreadsheets, chemical drawing, and electronic literature database searching. Integration of this course into the curriculum will help address the needs of the 65% of our students who rated their computer skills as only good or fair and the 39% of students who use library resources no more than once per semester. This new course complements but does not replace the existing programming requirement.
- **Consideration of senior review seminar or senior oral exam to address weak understanding of background material and project purpose**

Although not readily apparent from the evaluation scores for the senior oral presentation, the faculty observed as the students were preparing their talks, that the students' understanding of background material and of the project purpose was weak in some cases. The evaluations of the papers show that many students have difficulty discussing the results of the project, drawing the appropriate conclusions, and describing possible future plans for the work. The faculty members have discussed several ways in which this may be remedied such as having a senior review seminar or implementing a senior oral exam but have not yet come to a final conclusion.
- **Consideration of mid-program review course to address weakness in Chemistry fundamentals.**

Discussions are underway to expand this course to include a review of key topics from general chemistry that every student should have mastered before graduation. It is clear from the exit exams and the performance on senior projects that many students still have considerable weakness in the fundamentals even into their senior year. Although a mid-program review course won't necessarily change their work habits or attitudes, it may help to reinforce basic skills in which all graduating chemistry majors should be proficient.

Communications

Mission

The mission of the Department of Communications is to provide students with superior educational experiences in a respectful and supportive environment where the traditional academic concerns of teaching, service and scholarship are inherently intertwined to enhance and inform one another. The Department strives to help students become ethical and competent communicators who can use their knowledge of communications to:

- Facilitate their individual and professional growth and development,
- Enhance their personal relationships, and
- Effectively serve and improve their communities.

Additionally, members of the Department endeavor to develop professionally, contribute to and enhance the communication discipline, strengthen the institution, and effectively serve the community by sharing their professional expertise.

Goals for Learning Outcomes

The specific educational objectives of the program are to provide majors with learning experiences which will enable them to:

1. Demonstrate an understanding of the different areas of study within the communication discipline, as well as the theories, principles and concepts associated with those different areas of study;
2. Critically analyze and evaluate their own communication and that of others across a variety of situations;
3. Develop an understanding of the situational, cultural, legal and ethical aspects of communicative acts;
4. Use their communication knowledge and skills—whether one-to-one, in small groups, or in a one-to-many setting—to: (a) communicate ideas and information clearly and accurately, (b) communicate persuasively, (c) deliberate and solve problems.
5. Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills, both verbal and nonverbal, when interacting with others; and
6. Demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively in writing, considering both verbal and visual communication.

Assessment Results

Goal for Student Outcome	Student Self-Assessment		Faculty Direct Assessment	
	% very well or extremely well prepared	Mean (max.=7)	% reporting yes	Mean (max.=6)
1. Demonstrate an understanding of the different areas of study within the communication discipline	67%	5.65	--	--
2. Critically analyze and evaluate their own communication and that of others	70%	5.68	92%	5.30
3. Develop an understanding of the situational, cultural, legal and ethical aspects of communicative acts.	56%	5.49	--	--
4. Use communication knowledge and skill to:	--	--	94%	5.30
a. Communicate ideas and information clearly and accurately,	82%	5.94	--	--
b. Communicate persuasively,	73%	5.64	--	--
c. Deliberate and solve problems.	70%	5.61	96%	4.96
5. Demonstrate effective interpersonal skills, both verbal and nonverbal, when interacting with others.	88%	5.97	--	--
6. Demonstrate an ability to communicate effectively in writing, considering both verbal and visual communication.	75%	5.87	98%	4.93

Actions Taken Based on Assessment Results

- **Curricular revision.**
The Department completed a major revision of the curriculum, implemented in Fall 2005. Courses were deleted and added, and the program of required courses was restructured in response to earlier assessment results. This revision demonstrates the utility of the assessment data and procedures.
- **Realignment of goals and objectives for student learning.**
Based on a recommendation from the Academic Assessment Committee, the Department is revisiting its broader goals and align or realign goals and objectives for student learning outcomes for Communications majors with the newly revised curriculum. This includes 1) placing more weight on faculty's measurement of student learning than on students' self-assessments of their abilities, and 2) alignment of rubrics with these goals and objectives as well as use of a common rating scale. This process began in Spring 2006.
- **Special attention devoted to student writing skills.**
Results from the exit survey continued to raise concerns, because results were somewhat inconsistent and below the high standards we set of communications majors. Verbal comments suggested that students perceive variation in the quality of teaching. The Department has initiated structural and personnel changes, discussed below, which bode well for the future. Furthermore, strong Spring 2005 evaluations for all full-time faculty suggest that previous enlightened steps to address teaching quality may have already borne fruit.
- **Sustain and monitor high quality of teaching.**
Verbal comments suggested a high, albeit not universal, satisfaction with teaching quality. Therefore, it is possible that the old curriculum simply did not adequately expose students to the areas considered important in our educational objectives. The new curriculum, just introduced for students beginning their work in Fall 2005, is specifically designed to achieve those educational objectives. The curriculum revision specifically responded to previous and similar assessment results, and this revision may sufficiently address these concerns. Since students usually need four or more years to graduate, one would expect the assessment measures to reflect these changes in time.

Education

The School of Education offers bachelor's degrees in Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Secondary Education (various concentrations), and Special Education. An undergraduate degree in Music Education is offered jointly with the Department of Visual and Performing Arts. Master's degrees are offered in Elementary Education as well as Educational Technology.

Mission

As an integral part of the University of South Carolina Aiken, the School of Education is committed to the University goals of active learning through excellence in teaching, faculty and candidate scholarship, and service. Candidates in the School of Education participate in a rigorous curriculum, which is anchored by a strong liberal arts and sciences component, comprised of courses in the humanities, fine arts, social sciences, mathematics, and natural sciences. These courses provide a foundation upon which the pedagogical content and pedagogy are built and dispositions such as responsible citizenship, respect for diversity, and cross-cultural understandings are developed. The School of Education faculty model instruction based on research, infused with technology, and aligned with national, state, and local standards. The School of Education collaborates with schools, school districts, and community service organizations to provide numerous and varied field experiences that are structured to prepare candidates to work with all students.

Expected Candidate Outcomes

The teacher education faculty in the School of Education challenges candidates to acquire and develop the knowledge, skills, and dispositions necessary to become successful Dynamic Educators who can:

- Plan
- Instruct
- Manage
- Communicate
- Grow professionally.

Specific and measurable objectives follow from these goals for outcomes and may be found in the Conceptual Framework for the USCA School of Education, which is available online at <http://www.usca.edu/education/framework.html>.

Assessment Results

The School of Education pursues a rigorous and comprehensive assessment program as one requirement of its accreditation through the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. Overall measures of program quality are collected and monitored. These measures include: grade distributions, student grade point averages, pass rates on Praxis examinations.

Praxis Pass Rates					
	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Percent of Test-Takers Passing on 1 st Attempt*	86.3	89.3	90.4	92.4	83.2

* Time periods = April 1 through March 31 of the following year.

Learning Outcomes from Artifact Assessments

(3=Target, 2=Acceptable, 1=Unacceptable)

Degree	Dynamic Educator Outcome	2002-03		2003-04		2004-05	
		N	Mean	N	Mean	N	Mean
Early Childhood Education	Plan	254	2.33	579	2.18	267	1.97
	Instruct	147	2.32	467	2.13	211	2.15
	Manage	119	2.11	221	2.08	79	2.18
	Communicate	94	1.93	126	2.04	54	2.07
	Professional	138	2.06	219	2.12	98	2.05
Elementary Education	Plan	191	2.28	266	2.25	309	2.19
	Instruct	92	2.16	229	2.14	240	2.16
	Manage	107	2.07	171	2.12	243	2.16
	Communicate	125	2.09	157	2.10	245	2.11
	Professional	87	2.09	111	2.05	178	2.11
Secondary Education	Plan	22	2.23	100	2.19	37	2.17
	Instruct	22	2.23	65	2.17	29	2.00
	Manage	11	2.09	52	1.92	34	2.14
	Communicate	11	2.09	70	2.01	26	2.00
	Professional	11	2.09	46	2.14	31	2.17
Special Education	Plan	--	--	--	--	41	1.99
	Instruct	--	--	--	--	50	1.99
	Manage	--	--	--	--	8	2.10
	Communicate	--	--	--	--	38	1.99
	Professional	--	--	--	--	7	2.10

N = number of measurements

Mean calculations weight all artifacts equally

Actions Taken Based on Assessment Results

- **Curricular changes based on Praxis exam data**

Many candidates had to take the exam more than one time, and the PPST (Praxis I) continues to be the major factor keeping candidates from acceptance into the professional program. Additionally, the success rate Reading and Writing Portion of the PPST has continued to decline. Changes have been made to the new student Orientation program to encourage students to take this exam in their first semester at USCA since the exam content is based on high school material. On the positive side, the PRAXIS II Elementary and Early Childhood pass rate improved. Faculty in these programs reviewed Praxis results and made changes to the curriculum to include topics covered in the PRAXIS II that may not have been covered in the past.

- **Curricular alignment with artifact data and alignment of rubrics**

Each program in the School of Education assesses a wide range of student “artifacts” -- assignments that are aligned with the standards outlined by the various professional associations and the five elements of the Dynamic Educator conceptual framework. Data indicate that candidates in these programs have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions outlined in the conceptual framework. Nevertheless, the number of target artifacts has decreased, while the number of unacceptable artifacts has increased. This change is a result of annual faculty evaluation of each artifact to determine if it is providing the information needed to accurately assess each candidate’s abilities. Changes in outcomes reflect a refinement of rubrics, a process that has enabled faculty to more clearly differentiate between the three performance levels (target, acceptable, and unacceptable).

- **Reduction of Faculty Advisement Load**

Working with the Advisement Office, the School of Education advisement load was spread more evenly among faculty members. In 2003-2004 the average advisement load for a School of Education faculty member was 33.3. That was reduced to 27.6 in 2004-2005. In 2003-2004, the largest number of advisees was 67. In 2004-2005 the greatest number of advisees a faculty member had was 46.

Exercise Science

Mission

The Exercise and Sports Science Program provides quality classroom and applied educational experiences to students pursuing a broad spectrum of exercise-related employment and graduate school opportunities.

Goals for Learning Outcomes

Students will:

1. Understand and apply basic principles related to the muscular system
2. Understand and apply basic principles related to the cardiovascular system
3. Understand and apply basic principles related to nutrition / risk factors / body composition
4. Understand and apply basic principles related to exercise training responses/adaptations
5. Understand and apply basic principles related to communication
6. Understand and apply basic principles related to athletic training diagnostics
7. Understand and apply basic principles related to athletic training therapeutics/prophylactics

Assessment Results

Data collection is still in a preliminary phase, but some data have been collected in a pilot project as rubrics for all goals and objectives were developed.

Performance Indicators	Superior	Adequate		Inadequate		Mean
	5	4	3	2	1	
2.2 Students will be able to measure heart rate by palpating the radial pulse.	5	8		3		3.25
2.3 Students will be able to measure blood pressure by the arm/cuff method.	11	5		0		4.38

Actions Taken Based on Assessment Results

- **Curricular adjustments.**
Objective 2.2: With a mean of 3.25, students demonstrated adequate ability to palpate the pulse. We changed the description and format of AEXS 239 (a prerequisite course) to include more instruction and practice in palpation of heart rate.

Objective 2.3: With a mean of 4.38, students demonstrated adequate to superior ability to measure blood pressure. We changed the description and format of AEXS 239 (a prerequisite course) to include more instruction and practice in blood pressure measurement.
- **Development of comprehensive rubrics and measurement plan.**
New tools for assessment of student knowledge and skills have been significantly developed over the last year with further development, completion, and implementation being carried out. At present, the seven goals, 19 objectives, and seven rubrics have been established. Data have been collected for two of the objectives. Further development and implementation will occur during 2005-06.
- **Transition to Department status.**
Based on institutional and unit review guided by the University strategic plan including an examination of academic productivity, number of students served, and organizational structure, the Exercise Science Program will make a transition from a program in the School of Education to a Department in the College of Sciences in 2006-07.

Statement on Technology Preparation

At USCA, major programs ensure that their graduates are proficient in technology at a level acceptable to their disciplinary and professional standards. Outcomes for technological proficiency are typically addressed in goals for student learning in the Program Review Process and measured in the course of the unit's overall assessment plan. For instance, in the professional schools, such outcomes have been fashioned to meet the standards of national bodies (AACSB, NCATE, NLNAC) that have accredited USCA's programs. Other majors provide for technology instruction in ways that are uniquely tailored to their specific curricula, often through a research methods or technology course (Business, Psychology, Sociology). Other programs integrate technological preparation throughout the curriculum (Communications, Education, English, Exercise Science, Fine Arts, Mathematics and Computer Science) and also develop these skills in conjunction with specific instruction from faculty librarians who promote use of electronic research tools, web-based bibliographic tools, and other cutting-edge research techniques. Further, all classrooms at USCA are equipped with a computer and projector with internet access, and new interactive electronic student stations for participation in classroom are being installed in 2006-07. The entire campus supports wireless connectivity, and wireless laptops are used in curricular and co-curricular activities.

USCA has prioritized technology in its strategic plan because technological skills are so central to global competitiveness in the work force. Some examples are listed below that indicate the success with which students and faculty have made significant and expanding use of the technology available to them:

- Results from the 2004 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) indicate that USCA students use computers on academic work with slightly higher frequency than did freshmen and seniors at the 471 other institutions participating in the NSSE. Further, USCA students reported higher levels of knowledge and personal development in using computing and information technology than did students at other institutions participating in NSSE (question 11g., $p < 0.001$ for freshmen, $p < 0.05$ for seniors). See <http://ie.usca.edu/research/surveys/nsse/2004/index.htm> for a detailed presentation of all results. Results from the 2006 NSSE administration will be available in August 2006.
- The third annual Academic Technology Conference was held in May 2006, providing faculty with an opportunity to showcase exemplary instructional programs and strategies developed by USC Aiken faculty, staff, and graduate students, such as how to convert a traditional course into an online course, how to use online quizzes to promote student learning, and overview of newly installed classroom technology.

Following the adoption of a policy that makes students responsible for reading communications in their University email accounts in a timely fashion, listservs have been created for all official classes and for academic advising groups. Groups may request special listservs from the Computer Services Division.

USCA's Active Directory protocol for email and other password-protected access, which is the one of the most advanced communication networks in the USC System, has been integral in promoting high levels of student communication via electronic media and their development of technology skills.

While NSSE results indicate high levels of institutional contribution to students' technology skills, additional work remains to articulate more fully the skills and competencies that USCA graduates will have demonstrated upon graduation. Development of these specific outcomes is part of the ongoing review and measurement of general education goals and objectives.

References

All references below represent a non-comprehensive list of recent scholarly activity related to assessment at USCA.

- Bergstrom, M. and Hosch, B. (2006). How do you know they're engaged if they don't take the survey? Increasing response rates on the National Survey of Student Engagement. Southern Association for Institutional Research. 33rd Annual Conference. Arlington, Virginia.
- Botsch, C. and Botsch, R. (2001). Audiences and outcomes in online and traditional American Government classes: A comparative two-year case study. *Political Science and Politics* 34 (1), 135-141.
- Fogle, C. and Hosch, B. (2006). An approach to building an online data mart: By GEORGE, I think we've got it! Southern Association for Institutional Research. 33rd Annual Conference. Arlington, Virginia.
- Foote, S. & Hosch, B. (2006). Did they really learn anything? Transforming first-year seminar assessment to measure student learning outcomes. Presented with Ms. Stephanie Foote. 25th Annual Conference on The First-Year Experience. Atlanta, Georgia. 2006.
- Hosch, B. (2006). Dynamic delivery: Sharing learning outcomes results across the university. Association for Institutional Research. Annual Form. Chicago, Illinois.
- Hosch, B., Ozment, S., Rhodes, L., & Schweder, W. (2006). How well does your assessment review process work? Establishing processes, outcomes, and metrics for institutional effectiveness. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Annual Meeting. Orlando, Florida.
- Hosch, B. & Rhodes, L. (2005). Communicating assessment results online to promote curricular change. Presented with Dr. Lynne Rhodes. Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges. Annual Meeting. Atlanta, Georgia.

Institutional Effectiveness Data Tables

Programs Eligible for Accreditation and Programs Accredited

Applicable to four- and two-year institutions

Due August 1, 2006

This form includes a list of accrediting bodies for which one or more academic programs are currently accreditable in a South Carolina institution as reported on U.S. Department of Education FORM IPEDS-1C-1 (6-1-94) and/or have been approved by the Commission on Higher Education.

According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting “the number and percentage of accredited programs and the number and percentage of programs eligible for accreditation” from four- and two-year post-secondary institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly. The Commission on Higher Education also uses this information as a base to fulfill requirements in Section 59-103-30 for performance funding to collect information on Instructional Quality by looking at the accreditation of degree-granting programs.

If your institution offers one or more programs listed in the Commission’s current Inventory of Academic Degree Programs (<http://connect.che.sc.gov/AS400/Inven/Default.asp>) that is accreditable by one or more of the following agencies, you should complete the columns in the table that follows by placing an “x” in the box. For those agencies that **accredit individual programs within departments, please put the number of programs in parentheses beside the “x”**. An **accreditable** program is one that is eligible for accreditation, regardless of whether or not the institution chooses to pursue accreditation. An **accredited** program is one that has been granted **full** accreditation status by the appropriate accrediting agency.

The addition or deletion of an agency from this list is a prescribed process, administered through the Commission’s Academic Affairs Division. If an agency is added to this list the date that it is added dictates when an accreditable program should be counted “against” the institution with regard to its full accreditation. The most recent agencies that have been added to the list have their corresponding dates listed so that institutions can better calculate the time frame for accreditation. Any agencies that appear on the list without a corresponding date should be understood to have appeared at least five years prior to the current date. For a complete set of policies and procedures regarding this process, see the Commission’s website at: <http://www.che.sc.gov/AcademicAffairs/Accreditation%20Guidelines.doc>.

Institution: University of South Carolina Aiken

LIST OF NATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL AND SPECIALIZED ACCREDITING BODIES RECOGNIZED BY THE SOUTH CAROLINA COMMISSION ON HIGHER EDUCATION

These agencies and areas may also be found on the CHE's website at:
http://www.che.sc.gov/AcademicAffairs/Accrediting_Agencies_Recognized_by_CHE.htm

ACCREDITING AGENCIES AND AREAS	Accreditable Program	Fully Accredited Program	Details on Program (if program not fully accredited-do not complete if fully accredited)		
			Year program added at institution	Institution has chosen NOT to seek accreditation for this program	Accreditation Expected (if known)
American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business - International Association for Management Education	<i>An institution may be accredited by the AACSB or the ACBSP</i>				
Business (BUS)-Baccalaureate, Masters', and Doctoral degree programs in business administration and management	X	X			
Teacher Education (TED) - Baccalaureate and graduate programs for the preparation of teachers and other professional personnel for elementary and secondary schools	X	X			
NATIONAL LEAGUE FOR NURSING, INC					
Nursing (ADNUR) - Associate degree programs*	X	X			
Nursing (NUR) - Baccalaureate and higher degree programs	X	X			

Total 4 4

* This program has been discontinued following the Fall 2005 semester.

THIS INFORMATION TO BE USED FOR PERFORMANCE INDICATOR 3D

Institution:

University of South Carolina Aiken

Courses Taught by Faculty

Applicable for Four- and Two-Year Institutions – Measured for Fall 2004

According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting “the percent of lower division instructional courses taught by full-time faculty, part-time faculty, and graduate assistants” from four- and two-year post-secondary institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly.

The Commission will use previously-reported CHEMIS information for data in this table. Institutions will have an opportunity to proof this information prior to the publication of the January 2006 report. Faculty definition will be any faculty, staff or graduate assistant who teach a credit course.

Success of Students in Developmental Courses

Applicable to Four-Year Colleges and Universities

According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting “the percent and number of students enrolled in remedial courses and the number of students exiting remedial courses and successfully completing entry-level curriculum courses” from four-year institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly. The following information will be collected from the four-year colleges and universities, but excludes the research universities, as these institutions do not offer these types of courses.

For purposes of counting students who exit developmental courses and successfully complete the appropriate entry level course, a student in more than one developmental course and completing more than one entry level course should be counted once for each developmental courses he/she exits and once for each entry level course he/she completes. Appropriate entry-level courses for which successful completion is determined will be defined by the developmental instructor as the course for which the student is being prepared.

Number of first-time, full-time entering freshmen enrolled in Fall 2004 <small>(include first-time freshmen who enrolled either part-time or full-time in the Summer 2004 if they returned full-time in the Fall 2004)</small> Item (1)	Number of students in Item (1) who were enrolled in one or more developmental courses in Summer or Fall 2004 Item (2)	Number of those students in each developmental course who successfully completed the appropriate entry level course by the end of Spring 2006 Item (3)
581	n/a	n/a

Breakdown of Items (2) and (3)

List below the developmental courses taught in Summer and Fall 2004 (combine all sections for each course). For each course indicate the number of students included in Item (2) above who enrolled; the number who completed the course, and the number who successfully completed the entry level course by the end of Spring Semester 2006.

Course Title	Total Enrollment	Number Exiting Course	Number Exiting Entry-Level Course
[not applicable]			

Institution:

University of South Carolina Aiken

Student Involvement in Sponsored Research

Applicable to Four-Year Institutions – Measured for Fall 2005

According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting “the percent of graduate and upper division undergraduate students participating in sponsored research programs” from four-year institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly.

The numbers included here should reflect the graduate and upper division undergraduate students who participate in sponsored research programs. Each institution that receives research dollars generated by external funding (sponsored research) should report the number of students who benefit from these dollars.

The CHE will calculate the percentage using these data and headcount enrollment data from the Fall 2005 IPEDS Enrollment Forms.

	Number of Students Participating in Sponsored Research (Exclude first professional students)
Upper Division, Undergraduate Students	26
Graduate Students	2

Institution:

University of South Carolina Aiken

Results of Professional Examinations

Applicable to all sectors – Measured for April 1, 2005-March 31, 2006

According to Section 59-101-350, the Commission is responsible for collecting “student scores on professional examinations with detailed information on state and national means, passing scores, and pass rates, as available, and with information on such scores over time, and the number of students taking each exam” from four- and two-year institutions to be included in the annual report to the General Assembly. The Commission on Higher Education also uses this information as the primary source with which to fulfill requirements in Section 59-103-30 for performance funding to collect information on Instructional Quality and Graduates’ Achievements by looking at the scores of graduates on post-undergraduate professional, graduate, or employment-related examinations and certification tests.

Past committee work and the development of performance funding have defined the collection of this information to include only first-time test takers (except the teacher education exams at four-year institutions, which include all test takers) for those students who completed an examination during the period of **April 1, 2005 through March 31, 2006**. The following list displays the exams that each sector has reported in the past. Please use this list as a guide for the exams you report this year on the table provided. **Please be aware that your institution may have students taking certification exams that have not been reported on in the past.** This would be the case if students were just beginning to complete a new program.

The Commission will request national and state pass rates and any additional information for these examinations, as it is available, from national and state agencies to be used in the report to the General Assembly. These national and state agencies can be found in “A Closer Look.”

Name of Exam	Date(s) Administered	# of Examinees	# of 1 st Time Examinees	# of 1 st Time Examinees who Passed	% 1 st Time Examinees Passing
TEACHING SECTOR					
National Council Licensure Exam. (NCLEX) - Registered Nurse	April 1, 2005 – March 31, 2006	60	60	53	88%
PRAXIS Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (K-6)	4/16/05 6/11/05 9/17/05 1/07/06 3/04/06	18	17	11	65%
PRAXIS Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (5-9)	4/16/05 3/04/06	2	2	2	100%
PRAXIS Series II: Principles of Learning & Teaching (7-12)	6/11/05 9/17/05 1/07/06 3/04/06	5	5	4	80%
PRAXIS Series II: Specialty Area Tests	4/16/05 6/11/05 8/06/05 9/17/05 11/19/05 1/07/06 3/04/06	166	155	132	85%
USCA Total:		251	239	202	85%