

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI

Office
of the Provost

General Education

PROVOST BIOGRAPHY

STAFF

ADMINISTRATIVE
STRUCTURE

ANNOUNCEMENTS
& NEWS

ACTIVE SEARCHES

MINUTES

MISSION

REPORTING UNITS

ACCREDITATION
INFORMATION

GENERAL EDUCATION

PROVOST SCHOLARS
PROGRAM

LINKS

PLUS/MINUS GRADING
SYSTEM

GRADE APPEAL

UM SACS WEB SITE

QUALITY
ENHANCEMENT PLAN
(QEP)

QUADRENNIAL
REVIEW INFORMATION

CONTACT US

General Education/Core Curriculum Mission Statement

General Education at the University of Mississippi is that body of educational experiences that is common for all undergraduates. The purpose of General Education is to provide a broad foundation of liberal learning, assisting students in:

1. understanding their chosen professions in the broader context of human endeavor;
2. adapting to a world of evolving intellectual challenge and professional change;
3. becoming informed and involved citizens in a democratic society;
4. examining ideals from diverse backgrounds and perspectives, as well as gaining a critical understanding of ideas from Western traditions; and
5. leading lives rich with meaning and satisfaction.

Institutional Mission Reference: The University will provide excellent, student-centered undergraduate academic and co-curricular programs. Our vision is to produce graduates who have the breadth and depth of knowledge to be lifelong learners, to be successful in their discipline, and to be good citizens

The Core Curriculum: The Core Curriculum is a set of 30 hours of course work taken by students. The purpose of the Core Curriculum, along with course work in the major, electives, and co-curricular learning experiences, is to prepare students for the above general goals. The Core includes the following courses required for all entering freshmen students: six hours of English composition; three hours of college algebra or quantitative reasoning or statistics (taken from a department of mathematics) or a more advanced mathematics course; six hours of laboratory science; and fifteen hours of humanities, social/behavioral sciences, and fine arts (to include at least three hours of course work from each area).

Core Curriculum courses should enable students to

1. study the principal domains of knowledge and their methods of inquiry;
2. integrate knowledge from diverse disciplines;
3. analyze, synthesize, and evaluate complex and challenging material that stimulates intellectual curiosity, reflection, and capacity for lifelong learning;
4. communicate qualitative, quantitative, and technological concepts by effective written, oral, numerical, and graphical means;
5. work individually and collaboratively on projects that require the application of knowledge and skill;
6. understand a variety of world cultures as well as the richness and complexity of American society; and
7. realize that knowledge and ability carry with them a responsibility for their constructive and ethical use in society.

Intended General Education Student Learning Outcomes: Upon completing the core curriculum, along with certain courses within the program/major and co-curricular learning experiences, University of Mississippi baccalaureate-seeking students should demonstrate the following General Education competencies:

- mathematical reasoning
- written and oral communication

Academic Regulations

- [Overview](#)
- [Classification](#)
- [Registration](#)
- [Examinations](#)
- [Credits & Grades](#)
- [Academic Standing](#)
- [Degree Requirements](#)
- [Honors](#)
- [Conduct](#)
- [Grade Appeal](#)
- [Student Records](#)

The regulations published in the Undergraduate Catalog are a digest of the rules of the institution. Changes may be made in the regulations at any time to promote the best interests of the university and its students. Students are responsible for knowing the published regulations, policies, and standards of the university and of their college or school.

Degree Requirements

The following requirements are established by the university for all undergraduate degrees. The student also must complete additional requirements for each specific degree; these are established by each college and school within the university and are described elsewhere in this catalog.

University Core Curriculum

The core curriculum is a set of 30 hours of course work taken by students. The core includes the following courses required for all entering freshmen students: 6 hours of English composition (Honors students may satisfy English composition requirements by taking Hon 101 and 102), 3 hours of college algebra or quantitative reasoning or statistics (taken from a department of mathematics) or a more advanced mathematics course; 6 hours of natural science; 9 hours of humanities and fine arts, and 6 hours of social or behavioral science courses.

The purpose of the core curriculum, along with course work in the major, electives, and co-curricular learning experiences, is to provide a general education experience for students to enable them to

1. Study the principal domains of knowledge and their methods of inquiry;
2. Integrate knowledge from diverse disciplines;
3. Analyze, synthesize, and evaluate complex and challenging material that stimulates intellectual curiosity, reflection, and capacity for lifelong learning;
4. Communicate qualitative, quantitative, and technological concepts by effective written, oral, numerical, and graphical means;
5. Work individually and collaboratively on projects that require the application of knowledge and skill;
6. Understand a variety of world cultures as well as the richness and complexity of American society; and
7. Realize that knowledge and ability carry with them a responsibility for their constructive and ethical use in society.

Intended General Education Student Learning Outcomes:

Upon completing the core curriculum, along with certain courses within the program/major and co-curricular learning experiences, University of Mississippi baccalaureate-seeking students should demonstrate the following general education competencies:

- Mathematical reasoning
- Written and oral communication
- Analytical reasoning/critical thinking (evaluation and analysis of complex material and sources of information)
- Ethical reasoning/responsibility

Declaring a Major

When entering the university, a student may declare an intended degree program (major) or may declare to be undecided. Students who have completed at least 12 hours at the university and who wish to declare a major or switch majors must have at least a 2.0 overall GPA (resident GPA) on these hours and must have at least a 2.0 GPA on all work attempted at other institutions. Individual degree programs and schools may impose a higher entering resident GPA requirement or selection criteria, and academic deans may approve exceptions to the above GPA requirement. Students must also declare a major upon completion of 45 credit hours.

Minimum Credit Hours

All baccalaureate degree programs require at least 120 semester hours with passing grades. Students who take more than the required number of hours will designate on a Degree Application Form which courses are to be applied towards the degree.

Minimum Grade-point Average

For the award of a bachelor's degree from any school or college of the University of Mississippi, a student must earn a GPA of at least 2.00 on all course work submitted in fulfillment of the course requirements for the degree. In addition, the student must earn a minimum GPA of 2.00 on all course work attempted at the University of Mississippi. Finally, the student must have a minimum 2.00 GPA on all college work attempted at any institution of higher learning.

There may be additional grade requirements for the College of Liberal Arts or the professional schools. It is the **student's responsibility** to check on the requirements applicable to the specific degree for which he or she is a candidate.



3.5.1 College-Level Competencies

The institution identifies college-level general education competencies and the extent to which graduates have attained them.

Compliance Certification
Compliance



Narrative

General Education Competencies

The General Education/Core Curriculum Mission Statement outlines the broad goals of general education and connects those goals to the University's mission and Goals for 2010 as well as the 30-hour Core Curriculum (see the General Education Schematic). The General Education/Core Curriculum Mission Statement then outlines four intended general education competencies that are expected of all baccalaureate-seeking students based upon the completion of the core curriculum along with certain courses within the program/major and co-curricular learning experiences. These competencies are as follows:

- Mathematical reasoning
- Written and oral communication
- Analytical reasoning/critical thinking
- Ethical reasoning/responsibility

The report for SACS Core Requirement 2.7.3 discusses the history of this General Education/Core Curriculum Mission Statement; its review, revision, and dissemination on campus; and its connection with courses and co-curricular learning experiences.

Students are expected to attain collegiate-level performance for these general education competencies. The methods of assessment allow for the faculty to set collegiate-level performance standards for University of Mississippi students. Assessment of general education competencies occurs on the following levels: institution-wide, program-level, and course-specific.

The institution-wide assessment using the Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP) exam purchased from Educational Testing Service (ETS) is designed and calibrated by ETS professionals to assess student proficiency at the collegiate level. The University uses this instrument, as well as other surveys (e.g., NSSE, graduating student, and others) to analyze students' self-evaluation of their general education competencies, particularly as they compare to national norms. The course-embedded assessment and program-level assessment discussed in this report allow faculty to set expectations for general education competency skills that are appropriate for their disciplines and to have more direct feedback-control to make improvements in the teaching/learning process.

This report provides evidence of the institution-wide, program-level, or course-specific procedures used to assess the extent to which students have attained these general education competencies. The first section below describes the assessment methodologies and criteria for success that are referenced throughout the remainder of the report. Thereafter, the report is organized by competency (with separate sections for written communication and oral communication); each competency section summarizes the key findings of the assessment data with particular attention to the most recent findings. The General Education Committee reviewed the 2007–08 general education assessment and made several recommendations for future methods of assessment. Further details, including the historical record of general education assessment, are provided in the general education assessment reports attached at the end of this report.

Sources of Assessment Data

The University utilizes a number of data sources to determine the extent of student attainment of the general education competencies, including a nationally normed general education skills exam (MAPP), institution-wide student/alumni survey data, program-level assessment from certain biennial assessment reports, and course-embedded assessment. The attached General Education Competency Assessment Data table indicates how each source of data has been used to measure the extent of student attainment of the general education competencies. The "X" mark means that the source of data is used to measure that particular general education competency. Each of these sources of assessment data is described below.

MAPP

As shown in the [attached chart](#), the extent of student attainment of the mathematical reasoning, written communication, critical thinking, and ethical reasoning/responsibility competencies is measured by the ETS exam called Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress (MAPP), formerly known as Academic Profile. This standardized general education assessment tool allows for institution-wide evaluation of student learning of certain academic skills and for comparison of University of Mississippi students with those from other institutions. MAPP's norm-referenced scores provide evaluation of college-level reading/critical thinking, writing, and mathematics competencies.

Prior to 2001, the University administered Academic Profile in 1999 and College Base in 2000 to assess general education. After comparison, the General Education Committee recommended in 2001 that the Academic Profile be administered in the future. Following unsuccessful attempts to gain a representative sample of the undergraduates in 2001 and 2002, the Academic Profile was administered in 2003 to 238 students in selected classes from the Schools of Accountancy, Business, Education, and Pharmacy. In the following year, the Academic Profile was administered to 429 students in selected classes from the College of Liberal Arts and the School of Applied Sciences.

The methodology was reviewed again in 2005 by the Associate Provost and the Associate Director of Institutional Research and Assessment, who determined that the (now called) MAPP test would be administered annually in alternating groups of schools. The methodology for alternating groups of schools is supported by ETS on pages 19–27 of the [MAPP User's Guide](#). The selected courses provide a range of different disciplines to gain a more representative sample of the student population over time. In 2006 the MAPP test was administered to 272 students in selected classes from Schools of Accountancy, Business Administration, Education, Engineering, and Pharmacy. In 2007, the MAPP test was administered to 431 students in selected classes from College of Liberal Arts and School of Applied Sciences. In 2008, the MAPP test was administered to 407 students in selected classes from Schools of Accountancy, Business, Education, Engineering, and Pharmacy.

The test results provided in this report will utilize the results for juniors and seniors in the selected courses for the 2007 and 2008 exams. The results from the MAPP exam administered in Spring 2007 and Spring 2008 have been combined to allow for a representative sample that includes students from the College of Liberal Arts and the six pre-professional schools as well as any transfer students in those courses. The University administers the standard MAPP test, which provides two sets of scores. The first score allows for three proficiency classifications (proficient, marginal, and not proficient) at three levels of increasing skill complexity (Levels I, II, and III) as indicated on pages 9–13 of the [MAPP User's Guide](#) (attached above). The second score provides an overall mean for the skill. These MAPP scores allow for comparison of University of Mississippi students with students at other colleges and universities. It is expected that the percentage of University juniors and seniors scoring "proficient" on each skill level will meet or exceed the percentage of national (junior and senior) students' scores. In addition, it is expected that the overall University of Mississippi mean score will meet or exceed the national mean for each skill competency.

Course-Embedded Assessment

Course-embedded assessment is used to evaluate the attainment of mathematical reasoning, written communication, oral communication, and ethical reasoning/responsibility. The Department of Mathematics has evaluated the final exams in several basic mathematics courses every year since 2002. The Department of English has conducted an annual evaluation of student compositions in the basic English composition courses since 1998. There was a course-embedded assessment in Spring 2008 in the three speech courses offered on campus—SPCH 102, 105, and BUS 271. The three above examples of course-embedded assessment allow for evaluation of students' work across all, or, in the case of the speech courses, many degree programs on campus. The departments of mathematics and English and the speech course coordinators have been able to use this data to measure and monitor the extent of student attainment of these competencies.

Additional course-embedded assessments were conducted in 2007-08 in required courses in certain majors to evaluate student attainment of the oral communication and ethical reasoning/responsibility general education competencies as they relate to the discipline. These course-embedded assessments were designed to gather data to supplement the institution-wide general education competency assessment. In each case, the department indicated whether the students met their expectations for competency attainment and whether the faculty members determined any specific use of results based upon those results.

The course-embedded assessment allows for the most direct linkage between the assessment data and use of results, which is not always true for institution-wide assessment exams or surveys.

Program Assessment

Although departments are not required to assess general education competencies as part of their biennial program assessment, some assessment reports included one or more student learning outcomes related to the general education competencies. See report for SACS Comprehensive Standard 3.3.1 for more details about the assessment process and the full reports for all units on campus. This report will use the most recent assessment reports for all undergraduate

programs (either Fall 2006 or Fall 2007) and will provide information about whether the assessment data met the program's criteria for success in attaining the learning outcome, and the use of results to improve the future attainment of the outcome.

Student/Alumni Surveys

An institution-wide although indirect method of assessing whether students attain the general education competencies is through student or alumni surveys, including the Graduating Student Survey (GSS), the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), and the Undergraduate Alumni Survey. This evidence is used only as a secondary means of assessment due to the nature of attitudinal data.

Students cannot complete their degree application without completing the **Graduating Student Survey**

, resulting in a 100% response rate. The current online survey includes a common pool of questions and degree program-specific questions. Questions about student experiences use a five-point Likert scale whereby a rating of five indicates "strongly agree" and a rating of one indicates "strongly disagree." Respondents may choose a "not applicable" category if the question is not applicable to their undergraduate experience. A blank [Graduating Student Survey](#) for the BA in Chemistry is attached as an example.

In the spring of 2006, 2007, and 2008, the University administered the **National Survey of Student Engagement**

(NSSE) to freshmen and seniors to learn how they perceived their undergraduate experience. The NSSE survey provides data on University of Mississippi students and comparative data for Southern University Group (SUG) schools and the University's Carnegie Group schools who participated in the survey. [University of Mississippi response rates](#) were relatively high (32% in 2006 and 26% in 2007), and the respondent population closely resembled that of the overall University of Mississippi population. The survey prompt relevant for general education asked students "To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas...." and then lists several general education skills. Students have a choice from one to four (one = very little; two = some; three = quite a bit; four = very much) as a response. The [2007 results](#) will be used for this report because the 2008 survey results are not yet available.

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment conducted an **[Undergraduate Alumni Survey**

in Spring 2007. This online survey was sent to alumni who received undergraduate degrees from 2002 to 2005. Of the 4,902 email invitations sent out, 2,992 appeared to be delivered to recipients, and 387 (13%) alumni responded. Alumni were asked for their perceptions of their undergraduate experiences and responded using a five-point Likert scale whereby a rating of 5 indicated "strongly agree" and a rating of 1 indicated "strongly disagree." Respondents could choose a "not applicable" category if the question was not applicable to their undergraduate experience. An example of the [Alumni Survey](#) is attached, along with the [2007 Alumni Survey Report](#) prepared by the Office of Institutional Research and Assessment.

Summary of Assessment Methods

The attached [General Education Assessment Methods](#) table provides a list of all undergraduate degree programs and the source of the most current (2007-08) assessment data used to evaluate student attainment of the general education competencies for each degree program. Note that sources of assessment data that are institution-wide are indicated in the first row of the table. The first row of the table provides evidence that all general education competencies are assessed through at least one institution-wide source of data that applies to all degree programs. As supplemental data, course- and program-level data from certain majors provide additional evidence for student attainment of general education competencies. The next five sections of this report will evaluate the extent of student attainment of these general education competencies.

Mathematical Reasoning

Student attainment of the mathematical reasoning competency is demonstrated through the MAPP exam, course-embedded assessment by the Department of Mathematics, program assessment for a few academic programs, and surveys.

Mathematical Reasoning: MAPP

The attached [2007-08 MAPP Proficiency Results](#) table and chart indicate that the percentage of University of Mississippi Juniors and Seniors scoring "proficient" was higher than the national percentage for all three levels of mathematics. The difference between The University of Mississippi and national percentage was 2.48% for Level 1, 5.83% for Level 2, and .93% for Level 3. The difference is most striking for Mathematics Level 2, which, according to ETS, suggests that

students are able to "solve arithmetic problems with some complications, . . . simplify algebraic expressions, perform basic translations, and draw conclusions from algebraic equations and inequalities, . . . interpret a trend represented in a graph, or choose a graph that reflects a trend, . . . and solve problems involving sets." The attached [2008 MAPP Mean Results](#) table and chart show that the University average for Juniors and Seniors (113.7) was equal to the national average (actually 0.02% above). Therefore, MAPP results indicate that in both proficiency levels and mean scores, University of Mississippi students performed at or above the national results in mathematical reasoning.

Mathematical Reasoning: Course-Embedded Assessment

In July 2002, the Department of Mathematics conducted a thorough review of the final exams for College Algebra (Math 121) and Elementary Statistics (Math 115). The department decided to improve student learning in both of these fundamental general education classes. Since Math 121 had larger enrollment the department decided to concentrate its initial efforts there by integrating a computer laboratory component into the algebra course. The department implemented a parallel study to compare the use of two types of learning software with the traditional classroom teaching approach. The department arranged the study to remove as many confounding variables as possible, and looked for success in a significant improvement in students' results on the common cumulative final exam. The results are displayed in the attached [Math Lab Software Comparison](#) chart. The study showed that while one software program provided no significant impact to student learning, the other software program that was tested radically changed student performance. In light of this study the department decided to adopt this software.

The department also redesigned the way in which algebra was taught in the classroom. With the addition of the Computer Assisted Learning in Mathematics Lab (CALM lab), some classroom lecture time was replaced with an active learning component, with students working with the software in a computer laboratory supervised by tutors. Students have two 50 minute classroom lessons each week, and are required to spend at least 50 minutes each week in the lab actively learning to apply their knowledge. After the successful integration of this computer lab requirement with the classroom for the algebra course, the department adopted similar revisions for the statistics course in Fall 2004, and more recently in pre-calculus in 2007. The department is considering similar course revisions for the business calculus sequence.

To assess student learning the department conducts an item analysis of the final exam each semester to determine the percentage of students who correctly answer certain topics. The [Math Lab Assessment Chart](#), while only showing a small number of these topics for the algebra class, is indicative of the way in which these data have unfolded. Students have always been successful with standard techniques, such as solving a linear equation and those data remained strong after the course redesign. However since the course redesign in Fall 2004 the data have shown a steady increase in success in challenging techniques such as solving a rational inequality and solving a logarithmic equation. New items such as solving a rational expression have been added to the assessment list to allow new facets of the course to be examined. Trends in these data are discussed with the course coordinators during the planning for each new semester. One direct result of this assessment is that instructors introduced a statistics project to help students identify the correct measure of center for different data sets.

The above narrative provides evidence that the general education competency of mathematical reasoning has been evaluated systematically using best practices of assessment for many years and that the department has made improvements in the instruction of mathematics and the attainment of mathematical reasoning among many students.

As direct evidence of the extent of student attainment of mathematical reasoning, the attached final exam item analysis tables for the 624 students in the Spring 2008 semester [MATH 121: College Algebra](#) course and 520 students in the [MATH 115: Elementary Statistics](#) course demonstrate that these students clearly have attained collegiate-level mathematical reasoning skills desired by the Department of Mathematics and the University. For the MATH 115 final exam, 86% of the problems had student scores that met the department's criterion for success. For the MATH 121 final exam, 80% of the problems had student scores that met the department's criterion for success.

Mathematical Reasoning: Program Assessment

Ten program assessment outcomes from nine degree programs (or 13% of all undergraduate programs) included mathematical reasoning as part of their program outcomes evaluated on their most recent biennial assessment report. The following are examples of these outcomes:

- "Graduates from the Civil Engineering Program at the University of Mississippi must demonstrate that they have an ability to apply knowledge of mathematics and science to engineering." (BS in Civil Engineering)
- "Graduates will have knowledge of basic quantitative methods in economics." (BA/BBA in Economics)
- "Graduates will understand how to calculate and interpret financial ratios." (BBA in Managerial Finance)

Of those ten assessment outcomes, five indicated that students met the criterion for success, three indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success, and two outcomes had mixed results whereby one method of assessment was successful and the other method was not. The attached [Program Assessment for Mathematical Reasoning](#) spreadsheet provides more specific information about how the faculty determined to use these results for

improvement of student learning by presenting the outcome statement, indication of whether criteria for success were met, and summary of use of results section(s). The departments indicated a use of results when appropriate, including creation of a new course, change in prerequisites for certain courses, revision of course content, more coordination among instructors across different sections, and revisions of assessment methods.

Mathematical Reasoning: Student/Alumni Surveys

The 2007

National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) survey included the following prompt: "To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following area: analyzing quantitative problems." From the scale of 1-4, the average for seniors was 3.17, indicating that they believed "quite a bit" that they attained mathematical reasoning skills. The University of Mississippi result for seniors was higher than for seniors in the Southern University Group (3.09) and peer Carnegie Group (3.05).

The 2007

Alumni Survey

included three questions concerning quantitative reasoning. The results below are the percentage of alumni who responded that they "strongly agree" or "agree" to the following prompts: "While attending the University of Mississippi, I developed the ability to: analyze and interpret data (85.7%), demonstrate quantitative literacy (80.6%), and define and solve problems (91.1%)." The highly positive responses for those three statements indicate that University of Mississippi graduates believe that they were adequately prepared in mathematical reasoning skills.

Extent of Student Attainment of the Mathematical Reasoning Competency

The above section provides multiple sources and different kinds of assessment data to measure the extent to which University of Mississippi students have attained the mathematical reasoning competency. The MAPP exam and course-embedded assessment in the Department of Mathematics provide the most significant, direct evidence that University of Mississippi students have attained a satisfactory level of competence in mathematical reasoning. The General Education Committee's future plans for assessing mathematical reasoning are to continue the current assessment methods with a few modifications. The course-embedded assessment (and course redesign) in the Department of Mathematics will expand to include the business calculus sequence, thus widening the net of students whose mathematical reasoning skills will be systematically assessed by that department. Also, the committee recommended that the Department of Mathematics begin systematic assessment of the final exams in MATH 261 (Calculus I) and MATH 267 (Business Calculus). With the addition of those two courses, even more students would be evaluated in at least one of those mathematics courses.

Based on evidence, University of Mississippi students demonstrate competency in mathematical reasoning.

Written Communication

Student attainment of the written communication competency is demonstrated through the MAPP exam, course-embedded assessment by the Department of English, program assessment for certain academic programs, and surveys.

Written Communication: MAPP

The attached 2007-08 MAPP Proficiency Results table and chart indicate that the percentage of University of Mississippi students scoring "proficient" was lower than the national percentage for Levels 1 and 3. The difference was -3.02% for Level 1, 1.97% for Level 2, and -1.23% for Level 3. The attached MAPP Mean Results table and chart illustrates the overall University of Mississippi mean (114.3) was slightly higher than the national mean (114.2) for written communication skills. Therefore, MAPP results indicate that in one of the three proficiency levels and in mean scores, University of Mississippi students performed at or above the national results.

Written Communication: Course-Embedded Assessment

The systematic assessment of writing skills of first-year students was initiated in 1998 and has been ongoing on a yearly basis from 1998 to the present. The assessment team provides a report of its results and recommendations to the Department of English for the purpose of improvements in course instruction and/or assessment methods. The assessment methods changed significantly over time and continue to be refined. While the details of the earlier assessment efforts are found in the attached general education assessment reports, this text will summarize the most recent assessment efforts and results.

A writing prompt is administered in English composition courses (English 101, 102 and Liberal Arts 102) at the beginning and the end of the semester. After collecting all essays during the first and second rounds of the assessment in each

course section, the team pulls every fifth exam, thereby creating a random sample of student essays. For the Fall 2007 semester, 350 (14%) end-of-the-semester essays were evaluated from an approximate 2,435 student population in the basic English composition courses. For the Spring 2008 semester, 287 (15%) end-of-the-semester essays were evaluated from an approximate 1,930 student population in the basic English composition courses. Using a holistic rubric, a team of evaluators score each essay on a 1–6 scale, with a score of one indicating an essay that is fundamentally deficient and a score of 6 indicating an essay that exhibits a high degree of competence. The table below provides the percentage of student essays scored at each point of the assessment scale for the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters.

	Scale					
	1	2	3	4	5	6
Fall 2007	4%	29%	51%	11%	4%	0
Spring 2008	3%	25%	52%	17%	4%	0

These results indicate that by the end of the semester, half of the student essays scored three ("some competence") on the 6-point scale, which is characterized as an essay that: states or implies some stable position; organizes and develops ideas; supports its position with adequate examples; contains somewhat relevant ideas and details; and may contain grammatical errors. Overall, the results suggest that not enough of the University's students have reached satisfactory levels of competence as determined by the evaluation team. The evaluation team has revised the rubric used for the assessment of composition in 2008-09 to allow for evaluation of three separate aspects of each essay: response to passage, style, and mechanics. Further revisions to the teaching and assessment of freshman composition are discussed below.

Written Communication: Program Assessment

Nineteen academic programs (or 27% of all undergraduate programs) included written communication as part of their program outcomes evaluated on their most recent biennial assessment report. The following are examples of these outcomes:

- "Students completing the degree will be proficient in relating technical concepts through written communication." (BSCS/BA in Computer Science)
- "Criminal Justice majors will develop the ability to write analytically and clearly while applying core concepts from their course-work." (BS in Criminal Justice)
- "Students will acquire writing experience and demonstrate their written organizational skills." (BA in Psychology)

Of those nineteen assessment outcomes, thirteen indicated that students met the criterion for success, three indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success, and three reports had mixed results whereby one method of assessment was successful and the other method was not. The attached Program Assessment for Written Communication spreadsheet provides more specific information about how the faculty have determined to use these results for improvement by presenting the outcome statement, whether the criteria for success were met, and summary of use of results section. The departments indicated a use of results when appropriate, including adjustments in course pedagogy, greater emphasis on writing in course assignments, and curriculum changes to provide additional writing courses in the major.

Written Communication: Student/Alumni Surveys

The 2008

Graduating Student Survey

states, "Within my undergraduate degree program or because of my experiences at Ole Miss, I developed the ability to write effectively." Eighty-one percent of respondents believe that they developed written communication skills by selecting strongly agree or agree on the survey.

The 2007

National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) survey included the following prompt: "To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following area: writing clearly and effectively." From the scale of 1–4, the average for seniors was 3.20, indicating that they believed "quite a bit" that they attained written communication skills. The University of Mississippi result for seniors was higher than for seniors in the Southern University Group (3.01) and Carnegie Group (3.03).

The 2007

Alumni Survey

states, "While attending The University of Mississippi, I developed the ability to write effectively." Eighty percent of alumni indicated that they "strongly agree" or "agree" that they developed the ability to write effectively.

Extent of Student Attainment of the Written Communication Competency

The different sources of data reported above provide mixed results for the current assessment of student attainment of the written communication competency. The MAPP results suggest that the writing skills of University of Mississippi students are not as well developed as their peers in other institutions. The assessment of student essays in English composition indicates room for improvement in writing skills and assessment of writing skills. The survey information indicates that students do not perceive a large concern about their ability to write effectively and that University of Mississippi students had greater confidence in their writing skills than their NSSE peers. The General Education Committee's future plans for written communication assessment will continue to include MAPP and evaluation of student essays in first-year composition courses. For the 2008-09 year, the committee supports the modification of composition assessment to include an analytic rubric instead of a holistic rubric. The future evaluation of English composition essays will be significantly enhanced by the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP), which focuses on improving student writing and the evaluation of writing. Because the QEP proposes portfolio-based composition courses, a broader array of student writing will become available for assessment. This updated method is consistent with best practices in the field of writing assessment. The University of Mississippi's QEP proposes to introduce portfolios into the first-year writing curriculum and will thereby improve both writing instruction and writing assessment in the coming years. Finally, the General Education Committee supports the implementation of pilot projects in some majors that include systematic assessment of writing as related to the major.

Based on evidence, University of Mississippi students demonstrate some competency in written communications, but deficiencies are being addressed in a variety of ways, particularly with the upcoming implementation of the QEP.

Oral Communication

Student attainment of the oral communication competency is demonstrated through the course-embedded assessment of speech courses, course-embedded assessment within courses in the College majors, program assessment for a few academic programs, and surveys.

Oral Communication: Course-Embedded Assessment

The combination of speech course assessment and the course-embedded assessment in College of Liberal Arts incorporated students from 50 (70%) undergraduate degree programs.

There are three dedicated speech courses on campus—SPCH 102: Fundamentals of Public Speaking, SPCH 105: Business and Professional Speech, and BUS 271: Business Communication. Either one or some combination of these courses is required by 20 (or 28%) undergraduate degree programs on campus, mostly in the pre-professional schools. The Spring 2008 courses had 715 students enrolled. The course-embedded assessment from these courses provides the tally of evaluation scores for the final speech to indicate which areas of oral communication were strongest and which areas were weaker among the students.

The SPCH 102 and SPCH 105 evaluation forms provided a score of 1-20 for five categories of oral communication skills. The criterion for success was that 70% of student scores would be ranked 15 or higher on each category on the evaluation form. The SPCH 102 and 105 Evaluation Results table gives the number of student scores at each point in the 1-20 scale for each element of the evaluation form. The results indicate that student scores met the criterion for success for four of the five elements on the evaluation form - verbal elements (97%), vocal elements (93%), evidence/verbal support (84%), and organization (96%). The target was not met for the visual elements (55%). The SPCH 102 and 105 coordinator has shared the results with the instructors and plans to incorporate additional discussion about teaching visual elements in the course orientation for the 2008-2009 year. Overall, these results certainly suggest that the SPCH 102 and SPCH 105 students attain a satisfactory level of oral communication skills.

The BUS 271 evaluation form used a 1-4 ranking, with four being the best score. The evaluation form included 25 separate items to score that were combined into six categories—visual elements, verbal elements, vocal elements, evidence/reasoning elements, organizational elements, visual aids elements. The criterion for success was that at least 70% of student scores for each category would be ranked three or four on the scale. The attached BUS 271 Final Speech Evaluation table indicates that the criterion for success was met for all six categories: visual elements (86%), verbal elements (95%), vocal elements (91%), evidence/reasoning elements (90%), organizational elements (92%), and visual aids elements (93%). These results suggest strongly that the BUS 271 students attain a satisfactory level of oral communication skills. Even if the 25 rubric items are analyzed separately using the same 70% criterion for success, all items meet the criterion for success.

In addition to the above assessment of speech courses, 30 degree programs in the College of Liberal Arts provided an oral communication assessment out of required courses or examinations for the majors in the Spring 2008. The attached

Course-Embedded Oral Communication spreadsheet provides a summary of the assessment methods, results, whether the results met the criteria for success, and any use of results for the degree programs that participated in this oral communication assessment. The interesting variety of assessment methods for oral communication can be seen across the College, including oral explanations of art work to research presentations to oral proficiency exams in modern languages. From these reports, 22 (73%) reports indicated that students met the criterion for success set by the faculty, five indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success, and three reports had mixed results whereby one method of assessment was successful and the other was not.

Oral Communication: Program Assessment

Thirteen academic programs (or 18% of all undergraduate programs) included oral communication as part of their program outcomes evaluated on their most recent biennial assessment reports. Examples of these outcomes include the following:

- "Students completing a BBA in Marketing Communications will be able to present a marketing communications proposal effectively." (BBA in Marketing Communications)
- "Chemistry graduates will demonstrate effective oral communication skills in chemistry." (BS in Chemistry)
- "Students completing the BA/BS program will be able to demonstrate an ability to communicate mathematics in both written and oral form." (BA/BS in Mathematics)

Of those 13 assessment outcomes, 9 (69%) indicated that students met the criterion for success set by the department faculty and 4 indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success. The attached Program Assessment for Oral Communication spreadsheet provides more specific information about how the faculty have determined to use these results for improvement, including outcome statement, whether criteria for success were met, and summary of use of results section. The departments indicated a use of results when appropriate, including revisions in course content and course pedagogy.

Oral Communication: Student/Alumni Surveys

The 2008

Graduating Student Survey

states, "Within my undergraduate degree program or because of my experiences at Ole Miss, I developed the ability to express myself effectively through speaking." Seventy-nine percent of respondents believe that they developed oral communication skills by selecting strongly agree or agree on the survey.

The 2007

National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) survey included the following prompt: "To what extent has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following area: speaking clearly and effectively." From the scale of 1-4, the average for seniors was 3.11. The University of Mississippi result for seniors was higher than the Southern University Group (2.88) and Carnegie Group (2.92).

The 2007

Alumni Survey

included two statements relating to oral communication skills. First, 76% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that "While attending The University of Mississippi, I developed the ability to express myself effectively through speaking." Second, a higher percentage, 83% agreed or strongly agreed that they developed "good presentation skills."

Extent of Student Attainment of the Oral Communication Competency

The different sources of data reported above give positive results for current assessment of student attainment of the oral communication competency. The course-embedded assessment provides the strongest evidence that University of Mississippi students have attained a satisfactory level of oral communication competency. For the SPCH 102 and 105 course assessment, four of the five categories of oral communication assessment met the criterion for success and the BUS 271 students met the criterion for success for all aspects of the evaluation rubric. The course-embedded assessment in the College of Liberal Arts provides additional results of student attainment of this competency. The future plans for oral communication assessment will continue to include course-embedded assessment in the speech courses and to incorporate oral communication into the English composition courses of ENGL 101 using a common evaluation form. Thus, oral communication assessment incorporated into ENGL 101 will be influenced by revisions planned for English composition courses as part of the QEP. General Education Committee has recommended that those degree programs without a speech course requirement (SPCH 102, 105, BUS 271) submit an assessment plan in Fall 2008 for oral communication as related to the major on a schedule coordinated with program assessment. In addition, the General Education Committee has requested that each department submit an assessment plan to the committee in Fall

2008 for future assessment of critical thinking skills as related to the major on a schedule coordinated with program assessment. This program-level assessment can provide evidence of the achievement of this competency in each major relevant to the discipline.

Based on evidence, University of Mississippi students demonstrate competency in oral communications.

Analytical Reasoning/Critical Thinking

Student attainment of the analytical reasoning/critical thinking competency is demonstrated through the MAPP exam, program assessment for more than half of the academic programs, and surveys.

Analytical Reasoning/Critical Thinking: MAPP

The 2007-08 MAPP Proficiency Results table and charts for juniors and seniors indicate that the percentage of students scoring proficient at each level was higher than the national percentages. The difference was 4.12% for Reading Level 1, 6.68% for Reading Level 2, and 3.41% for Critical Thinking Level 3. The difference was largest for Reading Level 2, which, according to ETS, suggests that students are able to "... synthesize material from different sections of a passage; recognize valid inferences derived from material in the passage; identify accurate summaries of a passage or of significant sections of the passage; understand and interpret figurative language; and discern the main idea, purpose, or focus of a passage or a significant portion of the passage." As the attached 2007-08 MAPP Mean Results table and chart show, the University's average score was the same as the national average score for both reading levels, and the University's average score on Critical Thinking (112.7) was slightly higher than the national average (111.8). These results meet expectations of being at or above the national average.

Analytical Reasoning/Critical Thinking: Program Assessment

Thirty-seven academic programs (or 52% of all undergraduate programs) included a total of 47 outcomes related to critical thinking/analytical reasoning as part of their program outcomes evaluated on their most recent biennial assessment reports. While very few outcomes used the term "critical thinking," they indicated an expectation for students to analyze or interpret information, apply theories or methods, solve problems, etc. Examples of these outcomes include the following:

- "Graduates of the program can apply basic principles of math, science and engineering, and particularly of advanced chemistry, to identify, analyze, formulate and solve a wide variety of engineering problems." (BSChE in Chemical Engineering)
- "History students in History 400 or History 450 will have the ability to choose relevant sources for their research topics and be able to distinguish between primary and secondary sources." (BA in History)
- "Graduates are able to conduct a market analysis as part of a feasibility study." (BBA in Real Estate)
- "Candidates demonstrate proficiency in assessing student performance." (BAE in Secondary Education)

Of those 47 assessment outcomes, 28 (60%) indicated that students met the criterion for success set by the department faculty, 15 indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success, and 4 reports had mixed results whereby one method of assessment was successful and the other method was not. The attached Program Assessment for Critical Thinking spreadsheet provides more specific information about how the faculty have determined to use these results for improvement, including outcome statement, whether criteria for success were met, and summary of use of results section. The departments indicated a use of results when appropriate, including revisions in course content and pedagogy, curriculum revisions, and changes in assessment methodology.

Analytical Reasoning/Critical Thinking: Student/Alumni Surveys

The 2007

National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) survey included the following prompt: "To what extent your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following area: thinking critically and analytically." From the scale of 1-4, the average for seniors was 3.43, indicating that they believed "quite a bit" that they attained critical thinking skills. The University of Mississippi result for seniors was higher than for seniors in the Southern University Group (3.34) and Carnegie Group (3.32).

The second relevant prompt asked whether students thought their experience at the University contributed to their ability to "solve complex real-world problems." The average for seniors was 2.86, indicating that they believed "some" that they attained critical thinking skills. The University of Mississippi result for seniors was higher than the Southern University Group (2.79) and Carnegie Group (2.74).

The 2007

Alumni Survey

included two questions that relate to critical thinking. For the question, "While attending The University of Mississippi, I developed the ability to analyze and evaluate contradictory points of view," 86.3% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed. A slightly lower percentage (80.8%) of the respondents agreed or strongly agreed to the statement. In addition, 90.1% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement that they developed the "ability to define and solve problems."

Extent of Student Attainment of the Analytical Reasoning/Critical Thinking Competency

The data reported above give very positive results for student attainment of the critical thinking/analytical reasoning competency. The MAPP exam and program assessment reports provide the strongest evidence that University of Mississippi students have attained the critical thinking competency. Future plans for assessment are to continue the existing use of MAPP, which provides a campus-wide measurement of this competency. In addition, the General Education Committee has requested that each department submit an assessment plan to the committee in the Fall 2008 for future assessment of critical thinking skills as related to the major on a schedule coordinated with program assessment. This program-level assessment can provide evidence of the achievement of this competency in each major relevant to the discipline.

Based on evidence, University of Mississippi students demonstrate competency in critical thinking.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility

Student attainment of the ethical reasoning/responsibility competency is demonstrated through questions on the 2008 MAPP exam, course-embedded assessment within one of the freshman composition courses, course-embedded assessment within various majors across campus, program assessment for a few academic programs, questions regarding the University Creed, the AlcoholEdu Program, and surveys.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility: MAPP

To assess student understanding of plagiarism, a question was embedded in the Spring 2008 MAPP exam regarding what constitutes plagiarism. The expectation was that 70% of the students would correctly answer the question. Forty-six percent of students answered the multiple choice question correctly. Because 23% of students did not recognize that using their previous work as the basis for a new assignment without citing the original work constitutes plagiarism, this concept has been incorporated into the instructor orientation for freshman writing courses. Other ethics-related questions included on the Spring 2008 MAPP exam are discussed below with the University Creed.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility: Course-Embedded Assessment

University of Mississippi students receive instruction in ethical responsibility during their very first semester of college from the Department of English. English composition course instructors introduce the importance of academic honesty by devoting instructional time to discussions of plagiarism. With this in mind, the Department of English developed ten-question plagiarism quizzes for the Fall 2007 and Spring 2008 semesters. These quizzes were designed to determine whether or not students developed knowledge of plagiarism. LIBA 102 was chosen as the venue for this assessment because LIBA 102 is the most common second half of the six hours of English composition requirement in the core curriculum. The plagiarism test was administered to 419 students in LIBA 102 in the Fall 2007 and 609 students in LIBA 102 in the Spring 2008 semester. The criterion for success is that the 70% of student scores on each question will be correct. All questions had at least 70% correct answers for the Fall 2008 semester quiz and all questions had at least 70% correct answers for the Spring 2008 semester quiz. The criterion for success was met for both semesters. For those three questions that had the lowest percentage of correct answers—between 80% and 90% correct answers—the Department has incorporated an emphasis on these particular issues into instructor orientation.

Lessons in ethical reasoning/responsibility extend beyond plagiarism and beyond the freshman year. Indeed, as students move through the core curriculum, they encounter various interpretations of this competency. All disciplines at the University share a commitment to ethical reasoning, but each discipline emphasizes this competency in relation to its own practices and priorities. Note the variety in the following list of ethical reasoning outcomes in different disciplines:

- Proper appropriation of art and copyright issues (Department of Art)
- Analysis of complex and ethically ambiguous business situations (School of Business Administration)
- Local and national codes of scientific conduct (Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry)
- Professional ethics in engineering (Department of Civil Engineering)
- Economic contexts of social conflicts (Department of Economics)
- Ethical considerations for living in a foreign land (Department of Modern Languages)
- Kantian Ethics (Department of Philosophy and Religion)
- Ethical treatment of human research subjects (Department of Psychology)

Clearly, ethical reasoning/responsibility is a competency that permeates The University of Mississippi curriculum, one that finds expression and emphasis in a rich variety of settings and subjects. Not surprisingly, when designing and implementing assessments of ethical reasoning/responsibility, departments have varied in their methodologies. During 2007–08, 54 (76%) undergraduate degree programs across campus provided an assessment of ethical reasoning or ethical responsibility out of required courses or examinations for the majors. The attached Course-Embedded Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility spreadsheet provides a summary of the assessment methods, results, whether the results met the criteria for success, and any use of results. There was an interesting variety of methods for assessing ethics, the most common method being a quiz or exam. From these reports, 29 (54%) reports indicated that students met the criterion for success set by the faculty, 12 indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success, and 13 reports had mixed results whereby one method of assessment was successful and the other was not.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility: Program Assessment

Four academic programs (or 6% of all undergraduate programs) included a total of six outcomes related to ethical reasoning/responsibility as part of their program outcomes evaluated on their most recent (Fall 2006 or Fall 2007) biennial assessment reports. Examples of these outcomes include the following:

- "Students will understand the value base of the profession and its ethical standards and principles, and practice accordingly." (BSW in Social Work)
- "Graduates of the Bachelor of Science Electrical Engineering program will have an understanding of professional and ethical responsibility." (BSEE in Electrical Engineering)
- "Students will be able to define ethical principles as a basis for conduct in personal and professional settings." (BS in Pharmaceutical Sciences)

Of those six assessment outcomes, assessment data analysis for three (50%) indicated that students met the criterion for success set by the department, two indicated that students did not meet the criterion for success, and one outcome had mixed results whereby one method of assessment was successful and the other method was not. The attached Program Assessment for Ethical Reasoning spreadsheet provides more specific information about how the faculty determined to use these results for improvement by presenting the outcome statement, indication of whether criteria for success were met, and summary of use of results section(s). The departments indicated a use of results when appropriate, including revisions in course content and assessment methodology.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility: University of Mississippi Creed

The teaching and the assessment of ethical reasoning take place not only in the classroom but also within the larger campus community. The University recognizes and actively assumes its distinct responsibility for teaching students to model ethical behavior. The cornerstone of ethical responsibility for the entire campus community is The University of Mississippi Creed.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MISSISSIPPI CREED

The University of Mississippi is a community of learning dedicated to nurturing excellence in intellectual inquiry and personal character in an open and diverse environment. As a voluntary member of this community: I believe in respect for the dignity of each person I believe in fairness and civility I believe in personal and professional integrity I believe in academic honesty I believe in academic freedom I believe in good stewardship of our resources I pledge to uphold these values and encourage others to follow my example.

The Creed has permeated the entire University culture. A large plaque containing the Creed is installed on the campus, new students recite the Creed during orientation, and faculty and staff often refer to it during presentations. The Creed is published in the online Policy Directory, in the student handbook, and on numerous University Web pages. It also appears on many faculty and staff business cards. The following five questions regarding the application of the University Creed within the classroom have been incorporated into the Course Evaluation Survey completed online by students for every course. The results indicate the percent of students in upper-division courses (junior- and senior-level courses) who marked "strongly agree" and "mostly agree" for the Fall 2007 ("F") and Spring 2008 ("S") course evaluations. The percentages are given next to the survey prompt below.

- The students and the instructor treated each other with dignity and respect. (F = 89%; S = 89%)
- The instructor(s) displayed personal and professional integrity at all times. (F = 91%; S = 90%)
- All students, including myself, practiced academic honesty at all times. (F = 92%; S = 92%)
- The students were allowed to express different points of view (e.g., exercise academic freedom) without fear of recourse from the instructor. (F = 85%; S = 86%)
- The ideals of the University Creed were upheld. (F = 91%; S = 92%)

The responses to these five questions overwhelmingly indicate that the tenets of the Creed are being upheld and modeled in the classroom. In addition to the course evaluation survey by students, several questions regarding the

University Creed were embedded in the MAPP exam administered in Spring 2008. The results showed that 57% of students indicated that the University Creed was discussed at a time other than new student orientation, and 54% correctly answered a multiple-choice question about the concepts included in the Creed.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility: AlcoholEdu Program

AlcoholEdu, a campus-wide initiative related to ethics addresses student alcohol consumption, has the following mission: "To establish a culture that does not tolerate alcohol abuse or violation of alcohol laws and that creates an environment of personal responsibility, respect for the safety and well-being of others, and a healthy society." To that end, Chancellor Khayat convoked an Alcohol Task Force in 2006 to deal with the problems of illegal and abusive alcohol consumption among students. Among the many actions that were taken as a result of the 2006 Task Force was a mandatory alcohol education program called AlcoholEdu. This program is an online training program designed specifically for college students that includes a pre-test and post-test. Major findings from the 2007-08 administration of the program are as follows:

- There was a 49% increase in the mean exam score between the pre-test and the exam.
- 31% of drinkers reported that the course changed the way they thought about their previous use of alcohol. Specifically, these students reported that they "probably had a higher BAC when drinking" than they thought before.
- 91% of students reported that AlcoholEdu prepared them to help in situations where they have identified an alcohol overdose.

Results from this program have been used to create prevention activities and programming on campus that are intentional, planned, and reinforce the previous learning. While this program is relatively new, initial results are encouraging concerning this important aspect of ethical responsibility of students.

Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility: Student/Alumni Surveys

The 2008

Graduating Student Survey

states, "Within my undergraduate degree program or because of my experiences at Ole Miss, I gained an appreciation of the professional ethics of my discipline." Eighty-seven percent of respondents believe that they developed ethical reasoning/responsibility by selecting strongly agree or agree on the survey.

The 2007

National Survey of Student Engagement

(NSSE) survey included the following prompt: "To what extent your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following area: developing a personal code of values and ethics." From the scale of 1-4, the average for seniors was 3.11, indicating that they believed "quite a bit" that they developed a code of ethics. The University of Mississippi result for seniors was higher than for seniors in the Southern University Group (2.88) and Carnegie Group (2.92).

The 2007

Alumni Survey

included a prompt relating to ethical responsibility. "While attending The University of Mississippi, I developed an increased awareness of ethical responsibility." The percentage of responses "agree" or "strongly agree" was 79.6%.

Summary of Student Attainment of the Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility Competency

The different sources of data reported above give positive results for student attainment of the ethical reasoning/responsibility competency. The General Education Committee decided to continue to embed questions related to ethics on future MAPP exams administered on campus, as well as continue to assess plagiarism in ENGL 101 and LIBA 102. The committee has supported the proposal by the Information Literacy Committee to adopt an online plagiarism tutorial to incorporate in selected courses on campus. In addition, the General Education Committee has requested that each department submit an assessment plan to the committee in the Fall 2008 for future assessment of ethical reasoning/responsibility as related to the major on a schedule coordinated with program assessment. This program-level assessment can provide evidence of the achievement of this competency in each major relevant to the discipline.

Based on evidence, University of Mississippi students demonstrate competency in ethical reasoning/responsibility.

Historical Assessment Reports for General Education

A collection of assessment reports from 2000 through 2008 that address the general education competencies are provided through the links below. These reports use the same format as the assessment reports found in 3.3.1. The first form of each report provides a linkage to the University mission and goals and a listing of general education competencies. A set of forms (Form C) presents the assessment data for each competency. The reports for general education are submitted biennially to the Office of the Provost.

[2000-2002 General Education Assessment Reports](#)

[2002-2004 General Education Assessment Reports](#)

[2004-2006 General Education Assessment Reports](#)

[2006-2008 General Education Assessment Reports](#)

Conclusion

The evidence presented in this report illustrates the following:

- The University of Mississippi clearly identifies its general education competencies;
- The University of Mississippi has established that its general education competencies are college-level competencies; and
- The University of Mississippi uses a variety of direct and indirect methodologies at the course, program, and institutional level to assess the extent to which these competencies are being attained by its students.

Documentation

<u>Description</u>	<u>File</u>
2000-2002 Gen Ed Assessment Reports	<u>2000-2002 Gen Ed Assessment Reports.doc</u>
2002-2004 Gen Ed Assessment Reports	<u>2002-2004 Gen Ed Assessment Reports.doc</u>
2004-2006 Gen Ed Assessment Reports	<u>2004-2006 Gen Ed Assessment Reports.doc</u>
2006-08 Gen Ed Assessment Reports	<u>2006-2008 Gen Ed Assessment Reports.doc</u>
Course-Embedded Ethics Assessment	<u>2007-08 Ethical Reasoning Assessment.pdf</u>
Course Embedded Oral Communication Assessment, Spring 2008	<u>2007-08 Oral Communication Assessment.pdf</u>
MAPP Mean Scores	<u>2007-2008 MAPP Mean Scores for Juniors and Seniors.pdf</u>
MAPP Proficiency Results	<u>2007-2008 MAPP Proficient Juniors and Seniors.pdf</u>
2007 Alumni Survey	<u>2007 Alumni Survey.pdf</u>
2007 Alumni Survey Report	<u>2007 Alumni Survey Report.pdf</u>
2007 NSSE	<u>2007 NSSE.pdf</u>
BA in Chemistry Graduating Student Survey	<u>BA in Chemistry Graduating Student Survey.pdf</u>
BUS 271 Evaluation Form	<u>BUS 271 Evaluation Form.pdf</u>
BUS 271 Business Communication Speech Evaluation Totals	<u>BUS 271 Evaluation Sheet Totals.pdf</u>
BUS 271 Evaluation Sheet Totals 2	<u>BUS 271 Evaluation Sheet Totals 2.pdf</u>
Core Curriculum in Catalog	<u>Core Curriculum in Catalog.pdf</u>
General Education Assessment Data Sources	<u>Gen Ed Assessment Data Table.pdf</u>
General Education/Core Curriculum Mission Statement	<u>General Education-Core Curriculum Mission Statement.pdf</u>
General Education Assessment Data Sources, 2007-08	<u>General Education Assessment Data Sources.pdf</u>
General Education Committee July 2008 minutes	<u>General Education Committee July 2008 minutes.pdf</u>
General Education Schematic	<u>General Education Schematic.pdf</u>
Graduating Student Survey 2006-07	<u>Graduating Student Survey 2006-07.pdf</u>
Graduating Student Survey 2007-08	<u>Graduating Student Survey 2007-08.pdf</u>
Information Literacy Online Tutorial Presentation	<u>Information Literacy Online Tutorial.pdf</u>
MAPP Embedded Question on Plagiarism	<u>MAPP Question on Plagiarism.pdf</u>
MAPP Questions on Creed	<u>MAPP Questions on Creed.pdf</u>
MAPP Results for Ethics Questions	<u>MAPP Results re Ethics Questions Spring 2007-08.xls</u>
MAPP User's Guide	<u>MAPP Users Guide.pdf</u>
Math 115 Final Exam Item Analysis, Spring 2008	<u>Math 115 Item Analysis, Spring 2008.pdf</u>
Math 121 Item Analysis, Spring 2008	<u>MATH 121 Item Analysis, Spring 08.pdf</u>
Math Lab Assessment Chart	<u>Math Lab assessment.pdf</u>
Math Lab Software Comparison	<u>Math Lab Software Comparison.pdf</u>
NSSE Response Rates	<u>NSSE Response Rates.pdf</u>
Participant Demographics for MAPP 2002-2008	<u>Population Demographics for 02-08 MAPP-AP Analysis.pdf</u>
Program Assessment for Critical Thinking	<u>Program Assessment for Critical Thinking.pdf</u>

Program Assessment for Ethics	Program Assessment for Ethical Reasoning.pdf
Program Assessment for Mathematical Reasoning	Program assessment for Mathematical Reasoning.pdf
Program Assessment for Oral Communication	Program Assessment For Oral Communication.pdf
Program Assessment for Written Communication	Program Assessment for Written Communication.pdf
Rubric for the Assessment of Freshman Writing	Rubric for the Assessment of Freshman Writing.pdf
SPCH 102 Evaluation Totals	SPCH 102 Evaluations.pdf
SPCH 102 Evaluation Form	Speech 102 Evaluation Form.pdf
UM Goals for 2010	UM Goals for 2010.pdf
Undergraduate Alumni Survey 2007	Undergraduate Alumni Survey 2007.pdf

Sources of 2007-08 General Education Competency Assessment Data

General Education Competency	Institution-Wide				Program-Level	Course-Level					
	MAPP	NSSE	GSS	Alumni Survey	Alcohol/EU program	Creed survey questions	Biennial Assessment Report Outcomes	English composition courses	public MATH courses	speech courses	in certain majors
	Mathematical Reasoning	X	X		X			X		X	
Written Communication	X	X	X	X			X				
Oral Communication		X	X	X			X			X	X
Analytical Reasoning/Critical Thinking	X	X		X			X				
Ethical Reasoning/Responsibility	X	X	X	X	X	X	X				X

MAPP = Measures of Academic Proficiency and Progress
 NSSE = National Survey of Student Engagement
 GSS = Graduating Student Survey

Assessment of General Education Outcomes

Mathematical reasoning

Students will demonstrate effective mathematical skills.

- Direct: Some program-level outcomes are related to mathematical reasoning, including:
 - Anthropology BA, Banking & Finance BBA, Biochemistry BA, Chemical Engineering BSChE, Chemistry BS, Civil Engineering BSCE, Electrical Engineering BSEE, Engineering Science BE, General Education, Geological Engineering BSGE, Managerial Finance BBA Multi-site, Mathematics BA/BS, Political Science BA, Sociology BA,
- Direct: Common final exams for MATH 125, MATH 121 & MATH 125 are given to students. Subscale/item analyses are used to identify relative areas of strength.
 - Math 115 - In Spring 2014, at least 60% of students answered 47 of the 50 questions correctly. The three items below criterion were: Applications of Empirical Rule (34%), Applying the Country Rule to find the total outcomes of an experiment (58%), and Given data set, matching relative histograms (32%).
 - MATH 121 - During Fall 2010, at least 60% of the students responded correctly to 39 of the 50 question types. Item types not meeting the criterion include: solving linear equation containing fractions, evaluate the difference quotient of a function, find the domain of a radical function, find the inverse of a polynomial function, find the x-intercepts of a quadratic function, find the y-intercepts of a quadratic function, find zeros of a polynomial function given one zero, find the equation of slate (oblique) asymptote of a rational function, use properties of logarithms to expand, solve an exponential equation (taking logs), and solve a logarithmic equation using properties.
 - Math 125 - Spring 2014. For 38 items, the criterion was met. The two items below criterion were: 9. Solve a radical equation - 57% 15. State the domain of a radical function - 52%
- Direct: The ETS-Proficiency Profile test is administered to first year students and students who are juniors and seniors, the test includes a section for mathematical skills.
 - During Spring 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011, 269 students with more than 90 hours took the ETS- Proficiency Profile. For mathematics, the confidence intervals for these students mathematics were 114-166 and the national mean for research universities was 114.98. Criterion met. For mathematics level 1, 64% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 57% at all institutions). For mathematics level 2, 38% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 32% at all institutions). For mathematics level 3, 11% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 10% at all institutions).
- Indirect: The University of Mississippi participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement. All first year students and graduating seniors are asked to participate in the survey. Items related to mathematical skills are included.
 - In Spring 2013, 1,086 seniors participated in the NSSE. For " How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in: Analyzing numerical and statistical information", the mean for our students was 2.86 compared to the participating SUG average of 2.98 and a Carnegie average of 2.87. The difference between the UM mean and the SUG mean was statistically significant ($p < .001$, 2-tailed). The difference between the UM mean and the Carnegie mean was not statistically significant.

Written and oral communication:

Students will demonstrate effective writing skills.

- Direct: Some program-level outcomes are related to writing skills, including:
 - African American Studies BA, Anthropology BA, Art History BA, Chemistry BA, Chinese BA, Classics BA, Computer Science BA/BSCS, Criminal Justice BSCJ Multi-site, English BA, General Education, Geological Engineering BSGE, Geology BS, History BA, Insurance & Risk Management BBA, Integrated Marketing Communications BS - Multi-site, International Studies BA, Liberal Studies BA Multi-site, Mathematics BA/BS, Paralegal Studies BPS Multi-site, Pharmaceutical Sciences BS, Political Science BA, Social Work BSW Multi-site, Sociology BA, Southern Studies BA,
- Direct: Student papers from first-year writing courses are assessed using a standard rubric. A committee of composition course instructors evaluates a sample of these papers.
 - See QEP outcomes summary
- Direct: The ETS-Proficiency Profile test is administered to first year students and students who are juniors and seniors, the test includes a section for writing skills.
 - During Spring 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011, 269 students with more than 90 hours took the ETS-Proficiency Profile. For writing, the confidence intervals for these students mathematics were 115-116 and the national mean for research universities was 115.01. Criterion met. For writing level 1, 73% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 66% at all institutions). For writing level 2, 32% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 22% at all institutions). For mathematics level 3, 14% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 9% at all institutions)
- Indirect: The University of Mississippi participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement. All first year students and graduating seniors are asked to participate in the survey. Items related to writing skills are included.
 - In Spring 2013, the University participated in the Writing Experiences extra module for NSSE. For the first year students, there were 4 significant differences between UM responses and others completing the survey. For each of these, UM had higher mean responses. For the seniors there were 2 significant differences between UM responses and others completing the survey. For each of these, UM had higher mean responses.
 - In Spring 2013, 1,086 seniors participated in the NSSE. For "How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in: Writing clearly and effectively", the mean for our students was 3.10 compared to the participating SUG average of 2.98 and a Carnegie average of 2.96. The differences between the UM mean and the comparison means were statistically significant ($p < .001$, 2-tailed).
- Indirect: While applying for graduation, students are presented with a graduating student survey. This survey includes a question about developing the ability to write effectively.
 - Developed the ability to write effectively. AY: 2004-2005 80% AY: 2005-2006 82% AY: 2006-2007 80% AY: 2007-2008 81% AY: 2008-2009 81% AY: 2009-2010 81% AY: 2010-2011 83% AY: 2011-2012 84% AY: 2012-2013 84% AY: 2013-2014 84%

Students will demonstrate effective oral communication skills.

- Direct: Some program-level outcomes are related to oral communication, including:
 - Anthropology BA, Art BFA, Classics BA, Economics BA/BBA, General Education, Geological Engineering BSGE, International Studies BA, Marketing and Corporate Relations BBA, Mathematics BA/BS, Mechanical Engineering BSME, Pharmaceutical Sciences BS, Physics BA/BS, Political Science BA, Social Work BSW Multi-site, Sociology BA, Southern Studies BA,
- Indirect: The University of Mississippi participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement. All first year students and graduating seniors are asked to participate in the survey. Items related to oral communication skills are included.
 - In Spring 2013, 1086 seniors participated in the NSSE. For "How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas?: Speaking clearly and effectively", the mean for our students was 2.99 compared to the participating SUG average of 2.97 and a Carnegie average of 287. The difference between the UM mean and the SUG mean was not statistically significant. The difference between the UM mean and the Carnegie mean was statistically significant ($p < .001$, 2-tailed)
- Indirect: While applying for graduation, students are presented with a graduating student survey. This survey includes a question about developing the ability to communicate effectively.
 - Developed the ability to express myself effectively through speaking. AY: 2004-2005 80% AY: 2005-2006 81% AY: 2006-2007 82% AY: 2007-2008 82% AY: 2008-2009 82% AY: 2009-2010 82% AY: 2010-2011 84% AY: 2011-2012 83% AY: 2012-2013 84% AY: 2013-2014 83%

Analytical reasoning/critical thinking

Students will demonstrate the ability to evaluate and analyze complex material from a variety of disciplines.

- Direct: Some program-level outcomes are related to critical thinking, including:
 - African American Studies BA, Banking & Finance BBA, Biochemistry BA, Chemical Engineering BSChE, Chemistry BA, Chemistry BS, Classics BA, Economics BA/BBA, English BA, French BA, General Education, General Studies BGS Multi-site, Geology BS, Hospitality Management BS, Integrated Marketing Communications BS - Multi-site, International Studies BA, Liberal Studies BA Multi-site, Marketing and Corporate Relations BBA, Mathematics BA/BS, Pharmaceutical Sciences BS, Philosophy BA, Political Science BA, Public Policy Leadership BA, Social Work BSW Multi-site, Theatre Arts BA, Theatre Arts BFA,
- Direct: The ETS-Proficiency Profile test is administered to first year students and students who are juniors and seniors, the test includes a section for critical thinking skills.
 - During Spring 2008, 2009, 2010 & 2011, 269 students with more than 90 hours took the ETS-Proficiency Profile. For critical thinking, the confidence intervals for these students were 113-115 and the national mean for research universities was 112.91. For reading, the confidence intervals for these students were 119-121 and the national mean for research universities was 119.02. Criterion met. For reading level 1, 72% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 69% at all institutions - see http://www.ets.org/s/proficiencyprofile/pdf/CredS_CarnA_AllTabs.pdf). For reading level 2, 47% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 41% at all institutions). For Critical thinking, 11% of the students scored in the proficient range (compared to 8% at all institutions).
- Indirect: The University of Mississippi participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement. All first year students and graduating seniors are asked to participate in the survey. Items related to critical thinking skills are included.
 - In Spring 2013, 1,086 seniors participated in the NSSE. For "How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in: Thinking critically and analytically", the mean for our students was 3.35 compared to the participating SUG average of 3.35 and a Carnegie average of 3.29. The difference between the UM mean and the Carnegie average was statistically significant ($p < .05$, 2-tailed).
- Indirect: While applying for graduation, students are presented with a graduating student survey. This survey includes a question about developing the ability to critical thinking and a question about writing process the involves critical thinking.
 - Developed a personal writing process that involves brainstorming, drafting, and revising AY: 2010-2011 71% AY: 2011-2012 71% AY: 2012-2013 71% AY: 2013-2014 74%
 - Learned to evaluate the reliability of printed and electronic sources AY: 2009-2010 82% AY: 2010-2011 82% AY: 2011-2012 83% AY: 2012-2013 84% AY: 2013-2014 83%

Ethical reasoning/responsibility

Students will demonstrate ethical reasoning/responsibility in their discipline.

- Direct: The University of Mississippi developed a plagiarism tutorial that includes a video and assessment of 8 student learning outcomes related to ethical use of information.
 - Define intellectual property: 89% correct, Define plagiarism, according to the UM plagiarism policy: 89%, Identify when to document print and electronic sources: common knowledge: 64%, Understanding the relationship between plagiarism and academic honesty in the UM Creed: 84%, Identify UM consequences of plagiarism: 76%, Identify ethical and legal consequences of plagiarism: 97%, Identify when to document print and electronic sources: integrate sources into scholarly work/research: 80%, Identify appropriate resources for assistance with scholarly work: 95%,
- Indirect: The University of Mississippi participates in the National Survey of Student Engagement. All first year students and graduating seniors are asked to participate in the
 - In Spring 2013, 1,186 seniors participated in the NSSE. For "How much has your experience at this institution contributed to your knowledge, skills, and personal development in the following areas: developing a personal code of values and ethics", the mean for our students was 2.98 compared to the participating SUG average of 2.82 and a Carnegie average of 2.75. The differences between the UM mean and comparison mean were statistically significant ($p < .001$, 2-tailed). Please note: The previously available question about contributing to the welfare of your community was removed.
- Indirect: Student evaluations of instruction are conducted each semester, and approximately every 6 years these include questions about unethical academic behavior.
 - Available from IT

Percent of student that indicated one of the two strongest responses on the Graduating Student Survey

	2004- 2005	2005- 2006	2006- 2007	2007- 2008	2008- 2009	2009- 2010	2010- 2011	2011- 2012	2012- 2013	2013- 2014
Acquired a basic knowledge in the liberal arts (humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences)	83%	84%	85%	84%	82%	83%	84%	86%	85%	84%
Developed a personal writing process that involves brainstorming, drafting, and revising						71%	71%	71%	71%	74%
Developed multicultural and global perspectives	71%	74%	73%	72%	73%	74%	77%	77%	76%	76%
Developed the ability to express myself effectively through speaking	80%	81%	82%	82%	82%	82%	84%	83%	84%	83%
Developed the ability to write effectively	80%	82%	80%	81%	81%	81%	83%	84%	84%	84%
Learned to evaluate the reliability of printed and electronic sources							82%	82%	83%	84%
Recognition and promotion of cultural diversity	35%	43%	42%	42%	45%	44%	42%	42%	43%	43%
Was prepared to assume the responsibilities of my chosen profession	81%	82%	83%	83%	83%	83%	82%	83%	85%	83%
Was pleased with the overall quality of academic experience	87%	89%	90%	88%	88%	89%	89%	89%	90%	88%
Felt academically challenged	88%	89%	89%	89%	89%	89%	90%	90%	90%	90%

Entering First Year Students

UM and comparison group information

- UM n = 2696 enrolled in EDHE 105, September 2011 & 2012
- Frequency distribution comparison Group n = 17388 at Doctoral High & Very High Research Institutions, January 2006-June 2011
- Norm-referenced scores comparison group n = 17 Doctoral High & Very High Research Institutions, January 2006-June 2011

Frequency Distribution of Criterion-Referenced Proficiency Scores

Percent of students who scored:	Proficient		Marginal		Not Proficient	
	UM	Comparison	UM	Comparison	UM	Comparison
Reading Level 1	52%	57%	25%	22%	22%	21%
Reading Level 2	20%	30%	20%	15%	59%	53%
Critical Thinking	1%	5%	7%	14%	91%	81%
Writing Level 1	56%	59%	31%	28%	13%	13%
Writing Level 2	14%	18%	33%	33%	53%	49%
Writing Level 3	6%	7%	19%	24%	76%	68%
Mathematics, 1	46%	49%	27%	25%	26%	26%
Mathematics, 2	18%	25%	28%	24%	55%	52%
Mathematics, 3	3%	7%	10%	14%	87%	79%

Summary of Norm-Referenced Total and Sub-scores

	Mean Score	95% Confidence Limits	Comparison Group Mean
Total Score (possible range 400-500)	437.50	437 to 438	442.02
Skills Sub-scores (possible range 100-130)			
Critical Thinking	109.48	109 to 110	110.93
Reading	115.80	115 to 116	116.86
Writing	113.56	113 to 114	114.08
Mathematics	111.86	111 to 113	113.11
Context-Based Sub-scores (possible range 100-130)			
Humanities	112.94	112 to 114	113.91
Social Sciences	111.56	111 to 112	112.64
Natural Sciences	113.40	113 to 114	114.45

Using the criteria described on page 1, blue indicates UM students performed better than comparisons. Red indicates UM students performed more poorly than the comparisons.

Students with more than 90 hours (Seniors)

- UM n = 269 enrolled in various classes across campus, Spring 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011
- Frequency distribution comparison group n = 17374 at Doctoral High & Very High Research Institutions, January 2006-June 2011 (n.b. our data are included in the comparisons)
- Norm-referenced scores comparison group n = 43 Doctoral High & Very High Research Institutions, January 2006-June 2011 (n.b. UM is included)

Frequency Distribution of Criterion-Referenced Proficiency Scores

Percent of students who scored:	Proficient		Marginal		Not Proficient	
	UM	Comparison	UM	Comparison	UM	Comparison
Reading Level 1	72%	73%	22%	16%	6%	12%
Reading Level 2	47%	46%	17%	18%	36%	36%
Critical Thinking	11%	11%	22%	21%	67%	67%
Writing Level 1	73%	70%	21%	22%	6%	9%
Writing Level 2	32%	26%	34%	37%	34%	37%
Writing Level 3	14%	11%	33%	38%	53%	59%
Mathematics, 1	64%	65%	24%	19%	12%	16%
Mathematics, 2	38%	41%	26%	23%	36%	36%
Mathematics, 3	11%	15%	23%	21%	67%	64%

Summary of Norm-Referenced Total and Sub-scores

	Mean Score	95% Confidence Limits	Comparison Group Mean
Total Score (possible range 400-500)	450.96	449 to 453	449.11
Skills Sub-scores (possible range 100-130)			
Critical Thinking	113.68	113 to 115	112.91
Reading	119.70	119 to 121	119.02
Writing	115.54	115 to 116	115.01
Mathematics	114.74	114 to 116	114.98
Context-Based Sub-scores (possible range 100-130)			
Humanities	116.38	115 to 117	115.70
Social Sciences	114.90	114 to 116	114.57
Natural Sciences	117.03	116 to 118	116.10

Using the criteria described on page 1, blue indicates UM students performed better than comparisons. Red indicates UM students performed more poorly than the comparisons.



The University of Mississippi

Interoffice Memorandum

Center for Writing and Rhetoric

University, MS 38677

Phone: (662) 915-1989 Fax: (662) 915-2122

Email: cummings@olemiss.edu

TO: General Education Committee

FROM: Robert Cummings

DATE: 2 October 2014

SUBJECT: QEP Current Status

Our QEP Impact Report is part of our Fifth-year Interim Report, which will be due to SACS in March of 2015. The QEP impact report is limited to no more than ten pages, and is required to address the following:

1. a succinct list of the initial goals and intended outcomes of the Quality Enhancement Plan;
2. a discussion of changes made to the QEP and the reasons for making those changes;
3. a description of the QEP's impact on student learning and/or the environment supporting student learning, as appropriate to the design of the QEP. This description should include the achievement of identified goals and outcomes, and any unanticipated outcomes of the QEP; and
4. a reflection on what the institution has learned as a result of the QEP experience.

I will present our first draft of the QEP Impact report to the QEP Steering Committee on 21, 22, or 23 October (the meeting is currently being arranged). However, I can report the following summary of our status.

- All of the major QEP goals to which we originally committed, but for one, have been met;
- The one goal which we did not meet (moving DS 098 to the Dept. Of Writing & Rhetoric) was not possible due to our subsequent interpretation of state law, i.e., we have a compelling reason for not completing this one goal;
- Most of the major QEP goals to which we committed we have surpassed;
- Some of the major goals we have surpassed in substantial ways.

Our writing Assessments are overall in good shape. The QEP calls on us to make multiple assessments:

- Course level assessments;
- Community-based assessment;
- Pre/mid/post assessment;
- Information literacy assessment;
- National standardized test;
- NSSE;
- Evaluation of instruction survey;
- Graduating student survey; and
- The undergraduate alumni survey.

We will report on the status of these assessments of these surveys in the fifth-year interim report. In it I will report as follows:

- Course level assessments, Community-based assessment, Pre/mid/post assessment

The course level assessments, community-based assessments, and pre/mid/post assessments have all been conducted on regular, annual basis since 2009. However, I did make several design changes to alter these projects. Some of the design changes were based upon the growth of our wisdom over the years, some were made based upon the feedback of writing assessment experts (chiefly Dr. Brian Huot), some were made based on the feedback of our QEP reviewer (Dr. Michael Neal). Some changes were based on the improvements to the proposed design, which relied too heavily on LIBA 102 writing samples, which we were not able to adequately collect and were also less affected by QEP curriculum changes. But overall these direct assessments demonstrate improvement in student writing and a consistent, earnest fulfilment of the QEP.

- Information literacy assessment

These assessments are made through the plagiarism tutorial, and Dr. Kellum's Office recently compiled the information for us. The data are still raw but the QEP target is for at least 60% of the plagiarism tutorial quiz questions to be answered correctly. We have consistently administered the assessment during the QEP and have met the standard.

- National standardized test

The University began collecting these data through MAPP, but switched to the ETS Proficiency Profile which is administered every other year to freshmen and seniors. Writing skills are grouped in to three levels, and our goal is for the percentage of our students at level 3 to be at or above the national comparison percentage. The latest results indicate that we have 6% of our students at level 3, and that the national comparison percentage is 7%.

- NSSE

The QEP requires us to administer the survey and to compare our responses to SUG. The University has changed its question set over time, as well as the frequency of the administration. Beyond administering NSSE the QEP requires that the QEP Steering Committee examine the data produced, and I will share results at the next meeting.

- Evaluation of instruction survey

Because of technical difficulties (we could not administer writing questions to only QEP courses), we have not yet administered this survey. However, we will begin a compromise plan at the conclusion of Fall 2014 by administering four survey questions to all undergraduate courses about the type and amount of writing encountered in the class.

- Graduating student survey

Though we have conducted this survey, realizing useful interpretations is severely limited by a design flaw. Our most recent data is from 2013-2014 graduates. Of this population, only those who graduated in four years, and who enrolled in a QEP pilot curriculum course in 2009, would have been recorded. Even though we will not have mature data for the Fifth-year Interim Report, we will report what we have.

- Undergraduate alumni survey

Here we face a design challenge similar to the graduating student survey. Students who participated in the 2009 pilot curriculum will not take this survey until 2017.

