

College of **Charleston**

2004 Institutional Effectiveness Summary Report

**The Office of Assessment and Planning
and
The Office of Institutional Research**

Submitted by:
Pamela Isacco Niesslein, Ph.D., Associate Dean
The Office of Assessment and Planning
&
Jennifer Hearn, Professional Services Coordinator
The Office of Assessment and Planning

Michelle L. E. Smith, M.S., Director
The Office of Institutional Research

<http://www.cofc.edu/~oap> (choose "Reports")

July 30, 2004

INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS SUMMARY REPORT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Academic Advising.....	1
Majors or Concentrations	2
Full Reports	
Anthropology	2
English Graduate Program.....	3
Honors Program.....	5
Music.....	5
Physics and Astronomy.....	6
Sociology.....	6
2004 Accreditation Visits	
Athletic Training.....	7
Teacher Education.....	8
Interim Report	
Business and Accounting.....	8
Success of Transfer Students.....	8

INTRODUCTION

Recognizing that assessment is inextricably linked to planning, the College currently joins these processes administratively through the Office of Assessment & Planning in the Division of Strategic Planning and Administration. The success of planning and assessment efforts will always depend, however, upon a campus-wide effort (including faculty, staff, students, and administrators) that supports and sustains a vital planning process that informs the assessment cycle. The College of Charleston has a dynamic planning and assessment process for both academic and administrative departments, which focuses on student outcomes and methods for improving programs and services. All departments are on an annual and three-year planning schedule as well as participating in a three-year assessment cycle wherein departments write an Initial Assessment Document in year one followed by submitting a Data Collection Report in year two and finally an Assessment Report in year three. The process now includes a formal mechanism for requesting waivers and for extending data collection (e.g., for a longitudinal study) in order to obtain adequate useable data to demonstrate student learning outcomes. This report details specific aspects of that process.

ACADEMIC ADVISING

Academic advising at the College of Charleston is regularly assessed according to current trends and practices in place nationally. The results of the assessment efforts are utilized to effect changes and improvements to the policies and procedures that govern the advising system. Personnel in the Center for Academic Advising maintain currency in advising as a discipline via attendance at appropriate conferences and through research in the field of advising and retention of students. The Director of Advising serves on the regional board of directors for NACADA (the National Academic Advising Association) and helps to form policy as well as procedure for the southeast region. His involvement in advising both regionally, nationally, and internationally allows for the most up-to-date information on the theory and practice of advising in the 21st century. Departmental advising is governed by faculty advisors who are trained through the Center for Academic Advising and who receive regular updates from the Center regarding changes to campus advising policies and procedures.

The advising process at the College is evaluated formally or informally each year. The changing student body demands an advising system that is responsive to student need and to the technology available today that enhances the students' advising and registration procedures. The Center for Academic Advising works closely with the academic departments, the Registrar's Office, ACTS (Administrative Computing and Telecommunications Services) and College of Charleston students in order to identify and effect necessary changes to our system. The assessment efforts (including student surveys) in recent years identified a key issue to be addressed: aiding the incoming student (through new student orientation) to become proficient regarding our student information system while becoming familiar with the advising rules and regulations in place. At the same time, students needed to be introduced to the concept of "departmental advising" earlier in their career, establishing a relationship with the department of the intended major as early as possible. Over the past three years, the Center for Academic Advising has instituted a new system for advising incoming students which divides the students into "pods" based on major that are advised through the departments for known majors and through the Center for Academic Advising for undecided students. The pods afford the departments and the Center for Academic Advising the opportunity to get to know incoming students through advising that takes place on site in the department and/or the Center rather than in a central "area" where all students are advised (previous system). At the same time, the students are introduced to the Cougar Trail system (online registration) and are able to enroll themselves using Cougar Trail from their first registration. Based on student evaluations of the orientation advising system from summer 2001, students with no declared major now see an individual advisor (as opposed to group advising) prior to online registration. Also in response to student surveys and focus groups, the Center for Academic Advising has instituted an enhanced advising system whereby entering freshmen with no declared major are assigned to a specific advisor within the Center. With a positive response from students and parents following the initial pilot study fall 2002/spring 2003, the pilot was expanded to include transfer students and currently enrolled non-declared students fall 2003/spring 2004. The pilot is now established and funded as a recurring program that positively impacts student success and first-year retention.

MAJORS OR CONCENTRATIONS

As stated above, the College continues to utilize a three-year assessment cycle in order to assure adequate programmatic assessment. The three cycles are: the Initial Assessment Document, Data Collection Report, and final Assessment Report. During the first year of the cycle, each academic and administrative program director submits an Initial Assessment Document that outlines the areas to be assessed. These areas normally focus on student outcomes and are usually identified through the annual/three-year planning process. They represent those items from the plans that a department wants to measure in order to determine effectiveness and to initiate changes and/or improvements to programs or services to enhance student-learning outcomes. The second year of the cycle is devoted to collecting the data required by the Initial Assessment Document, although some departments expand this phase to allow for multi-year or longitudinal studies that provide additional assessment data. At the end of the data collection, the third part of the cycle requires each department to submit a comprehensive report on the results of their assessment efforts, including how the results will be utilized to improve services and/or programs. All phases are submitted to the Office of Assessment and Planning electronically using a standardized format.

The Office of Assessment and Planning distributes a detailed outline of the annual and three-year planning processes as well as the assessment cycles to all administrative and academic offices. In the past, the budgeting process was included in these cycles. Due to current fiscal constraints, budget processing is not currently a mandated part of the planning and assessment cycle. The Office of Assessment and Planning, in cooperation with the Faculty Committee on Institutional Effectiveness, offers training workshops for all department heads, deans, directors, and interested faculty on the planning process and the assessment cycles. Special topics seminars are offered in four areas: 1) Writing the Annual and Three-Year Plans; 2) The Initial Assessment Document; 3) Effective Data Collection; 4) Summarizing the Results: The Assessment Report. The Office of Assessment and Planning now houses all documents pertinent to the planning and assessment process, maintains spreadsheets and calendars detailing where each department is in the cycle and tabulates return of the annual and three-year plans. The Office of Assessment also distributes the annual and three-year plans as well as all assessment documents via CD-Rom to the President, Sr. Vice Presidents, Vice Presidents, Deans, and Department Heads at the completion of each phase (summer). A process is now in place that requires for the Faculty Committee on Institutional Effectiveness (FCIE) and the newly formed Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness (ACIE) to review all Initial Assessment Documents, Data Collection Reports, and Assessment Reports, and to provide feedback as well as make suggestions for improvement to each academic and administrative department. In this way, the institution has been able to integrate the planning and assessment processes, incorporating fiscal planning where appropriate, in order to "close the loop" and create a continuous improvement plan for student-learning outcomes.

The three-year cycle has been divided among the academic and administrative departments so that approximately one-third of the departments are in any one cycle annually. Full reports outlining the assessment efforts for Anthropology, English Graduate Program, Music, Physics and Astronomy, and Sociology have been included below as well as reports on the accreditation efforts of Athletic Training and Teacher Education. The interim report includes details on the assessment efforts of Business/Accounting.

FULL REPORTS

Anthropology

The current cycle for Anthropology evaluates the ethnographic research skills of anthropology majors. In order to determine these skills, the instructor for ANTH 491 (Research Methods) randomly selected, saved, and copied ten interview assignments from sections taught in two different years (a total of twenty interviews). The assignment required students to select someone previously unknown to them who was an expert at making some product or providing some service, interview that person about the manufacturing process, document the process, and discuss the socio-cultural implications of ethnographic research. Student names were removed from the assignments and sent to two external reviewers. Both reviewers are experienced ethnographers. They were asked to read the interview assignments and to respond to four questions about each interview, giving a numerical rating. They also had the opportunity to write comments

about each interview. In addition, each wrote an extensive summary narrative assessing the strengths and weaknesses of the Anthropology students in the area of ethnographic skills and making recommendations regarding programmatic improvement.

The students scored at scale mid-point or above on all the skills being considered. Collectively, they were judged to be very good writers who excelled at detailed description. In their narratives, the reviewers encouraged greater use of visual and digital technology as a way for students to present their work and noted that a few students were already quite skilled at doing this.

Students showed more variability and, collectively, less expertise, at being able to place the product and process in a socio-cultural context. In their comments on the individual interviews and in their narrative, both reviewers expressed concern that some students did not seem to have a good grasp of the anthropological definition of "culture", and that they interpreted "socio-cultural implications" to mean providing biographical information about the person being interviewed. The reviewers both felt that the students rated very good/good in overall field research skills. There was concern voiced, however, over the students' ability to grasp the difference between journalism and anthropology.

The anthropology faculty will use the assessment results and the suggestions of the reviewers as a part of re-evaluating the research methods component of the major. In particular, they will consider the place of ethnographic method in the overall training of the majors and where and how in the curriculum to best deliver this training. The faculty will also decide how to better incorporate visual and digital technology into student data collection and presentation, and how to integrate theory into student research projects. Recently hired faculty who specialize in qualitative research techniques as well as the acquisition of equipment will record and digitize interviews to help ensure these student learning outcomes for Anthropology majors.

English: Graduate Program

The M.A. in English is a degree that was originally conceived to serve working, certified teachers (i.e., fully employed teachers who are part-time students), with limited need for extra-curricular structures. Twelve years later it is clear that local teachers are no longer the primary constituency. In light of a new student body, recent assessment efforts focused on two areas: the make up of the current student body and how well or poorly the career goals of students are being served. The assessment used data analysis of enrollment and retention data provided by Institutional Research as well as surveys of alumni and current students completed in early Fall 2004 by eleven graduates and twenty currently enrolled students (66% of current enrollment).

The student survey reports that 50% of the students are full-time, while another 20% are full-time in some semesters. The alumni survey is similar: 73% of students were full-time or mixed full/part-time, while only 27% were solely part-time. For alumni, the median age at graduation was 29, which will most likely decrease as a new (younger) cohort begins graduating. Demographically, more students are women and are almost exclusively white. Every student survey respondent is employed, 30% as graduate assistants, the rest in some other capacity. Seventy-five percent work more than twenty hours each week. This is higher than the alumni, who indicated that 33% work more than 20 hours per week, and one of eleven respondents was not employed. By a large margin, the students pay in-state tuition: 27 of 30 in the fall of 2003. But this figure disguises the reliance on out-of-state students. Nine of those 30 came to the College from out-of-state, and in the last few years, far more applications from out-of-state students than from in-state have been received.

Upon arriving at the Graduate School, 30% of the students have only vaguely formed plans for post-graduation careers. At matriculation, 80% of the candidates have some idea of going on to a Ph. D. in order to teach at the college-level. Given the increasingly competitive nature of the profession (and an average GRE score of 1100—fairly low for most Ph. D. programs) it is unlikely that 80% of our graduates will be able to pursue the Ph.D.

Clearly the department needs to decide to what degree the program wants to define itself as a non-terminal M. A. Another key factor indicated by the survey results is that the number of students expecting to achieve the Ph.D. decreases as they go through the program, with fewer than half of the current "upper-level" students having identified a Ph. D. as their post-graduation career goal. Nearly half of these students

identified teaching at the junior college level as a goal (a terminal M. A. is sufficient credentials for this position). Nearly half also identified publishing as a career choice. Fifteen percent identified secondary teaching as a goal. Only one of twenty respondents plans for another professional degree, such as law.

Obviously, students' expectations for their careers change while they're in the program. The current data indicate that more students shift their goals after they've finished 27 hours than at any other stage in their progress through the degree. A quarter of students shift their goals in the first 9 hours while another fifth shift in the second 9 hours. Interestingly, no one changed career goals in the third 9 hours of their program of study. That so many students shift their plans on the eve of graduation is a matter of concern. What this assessment indicates is that part of the department's job is to educate students about the reality of their post-graduation careers: the department needs to help students who are not viable Ph. D. candidates discover that fact early on in their course of study so they can begin orienting themselves to more realistic career goals. Likewise, clarification regarding what an M.A. in English can do for the student needs to be offered.

Additionally, as data indicate that a majority of the alumni working in the field are employed in the technical/junior college system, the main function of the program today is becoming training students to enter this employment situation. Neither the curriculum nor the extra-curricular structures have been designed with this outcome in mind and the department needs to do a much better job of preparing students for their post-graduation careers (current students identified poor career preparation as the second biggest weakness in the program). If students are to be placed in teaching, writing careers and in the publishing industry, the department must determine the best method through which the program can aid a student in pursuit of those careers. Also, if the primary career path the graduates are going to choose is junior-college teaching, program orientation should help students achieve this goal.

On the positive side, ten of eleven graduates think that the M. A. prepared them well or very well for their jobs. Likewise, all five respondents who pursued education beyond their M. A. reported that the program prepared them very well for those studies, indicating that the department is not in the position of trying to fix a program that is crucially flawed. Improvements must be made carefully so not to undermine the solid basis that already exists in the curriculum.

The surveys indicated the following program strengths: high-quality teachers, small classes, teacher/student interaction, the (small) size of the program, and leadership. The following areas were identified as areas needing further study: course selection, course scheduling (both timing across the day as well as availability of courses scheduled), internships, creative writing opportunities (perhaps as a concentration within the M.A.), the need for more rhetoric and composition courses, lack of interest in the African American concentration, the comprehensive exam as a beneficial component of the program, the language requirement, The Citadel/College of Charleston partnership and its impact on the students, career preparation, and extra-curricular life.

Recommended actions resulting from this assessment call for the English department to conduct a strategic planning retreat for the M. A. program (May 2004). Additional recommendations to be discussed by the entire department are: 1. Identify two primary constituencies for the program (terminal MA students and potential PhD candidates); 2. Increase the support for the "traditional" full-time student (offer day classes, provide social opportunities geared towards younger students, provide departmental activities/better involve graduate students in current activities); 3. Develop recruitment strategies that increase the number of minority students in the program, target out-of-state students, and increase the student body to 45 degree-seeking students; and, 4. Modify the curriculum to offer seven courses each semester (four by the College), develop internship opportunities, ensure the success of the African American literature concentration, develop a rhetoric/composition concentration, and develop a creative writing concentration. Additionally, other recommendations will be to give students a Spring Break (by negotiating with The Citadel to find a schedule that would accommodate this), and to expand career-oriented workshops for the students.

Honors Program

The Honors Program assessment attempted to determine the efficacy of their program in fulfilling students intellectual potential, how well the program is recruiting highly qualified applicants, and how well the program is retaining students in the Honors Program. Their assessment measurements included a review of the Honors classes and Bachelor's Essays, as well as collection and examination of recruitment and retention data for the Honors students. When evaluating the coursework for the Honors program, it was apparent that the number of courses had increased over the past three years. Data from exit interviews also demonstrated a 90% satisfaction rating in course offerings from graduates of the program. The data on the Bachelor's Essays reflected an even stronger increase, with all students graduating from the program completing their essay. This was a significant improvement considering that the average number of graduates was 75% higher than in the past three years. In an effort to determine if the program was recruiting highly qualified applicants, the Honors program assessed recruitment data from the last six years. The figures provided evidence that not only has there been an increase in the size of the Honors program (35% growth), but there has also been an increase in the SAT scores of the Honors students (e.g., 2003=1320) recruited when compared to the average at the College of Charleston (e.g., 2003=1206). A review of the retention rates of the Honors program pointed out that the graduation rates of Honors students (e.g., 1999 cohort=50% four-year graduation rate) continue to surpass the graduation rates of the College of Charleston students in general (e.g., 1999 cohort=43% four-year graduation rate); however, there has not been an increase in the Honors graduation rates over the past four years. The results of the Honors assessment will be used to maintain current practices in preparing course offerings, maintain the current recruitment policy with a new emphasis on minority recruitment, and explore new ways to improve retention. During the evaluation it became apparent that the limited records from past years hindered the program's ability to develop reliable statistical reports beyond four years. As a result of this, a new record system has been established to better track student data and will eventually culminate in comparative reports for the Honors program.

Music

During their assessment cycle, the Music Department focused on evaluating whether or not the graduates of the program were prepared to enter accredited graduate programs in music, and the ability for music graduates to perform at the professional level. The program used juried performances, senior recitals, outside evaluations by guest artists, regional and national competitions, and graduate surveys over the past three years (2001-2004) to assess the quality of the Music program. After collecting data on 125 students who completed a juried performance, the grade breakdown provided evidence that a large portion of students were performing at the high level (e.g., A=74 students, B=26 students, C=18 students, 6=incomplete due to illness). A review was also done for 54 senior recitals which are public and at the professional level. During the recitals, a minimum of five faculty members graded these recitals with 80% of the students being awarded an A and 12% awarded a B. These percentages display the growth of knowledge and skill of students as they complete the program. In addition, the Music department had 39 guest artists/evaluators visit to critique the music students and give them new perspectives and to better prepare them to perform professionally. Data collected and analyzed from regional and national competitions reflected that the mission of a "conservatory level" program is being met, with 21 students winning in competitions. The graduate surveys and follow-up provided valuable information for the department as well, with 65% of 54 graduates responding. The survey pointed out areas of concern such as the theory sequence (22% responding expressed concern) and lack of facilities. The survey also gathered information on the current state of the program's alumni. It was discovered that 24 of the 54 graduates were in graduate programs and 12 out of 54 (mostly jazz majors) are currently employed as performers (as 23% of the respondents are in graduate programs—a significant number—the department will conduct a follow-up survey to determine what percent this is of those who wanted to attend good schools, but were rejected). As a result of the program's assessment, a committee has been set up to review the theory sequence, especially during the freshmen year. The department also found that there should be regular meetings between the choral/vocal and instrumental areas to better facilitate performance scheduling. Currently, the Music department is planning the addition of a new wing which will address the lack of facilities and provide more practice rooms for the students.

Physics and Astronomy

The Department of Physics and Astronomy focused their assessment on a determination of the effectiveness and consistency of the general education sequence in Astronomy. This sequence is composed of Physics 129 and Physics 130 and the corresponding laboratories for each course. The Department looked at attitudes towards and learning outcomes of students taking the astronomy sequence of Physics 129 and 130. Since the courses are not linked to specific sections of a lab, and many of the labs are taught by adjunct faculty, the department was concerned about the consistency of course delivery for the astronomy educational experience. Another assessment objective was to determine if the existing course sequence effectively delivered the concepts and nature of astronomy to the students. One year of data was collected in the process of assessing the introductory sequence.

A departmental committee reviewed course materials (syllabi, exams, samples of student work, etc.) from lecture and lab sections as well as chronological lists of labs actually performed in lab sections. Additionally, the committee developed pre- and post-test for students in Physics 129 and 130 for an academic year. The test was based in part on similar ones developed by the American Astronomical Society, the Astronomical Society of the Pacific, and the National Institute for Science Education.

Results from these assessment measures indicated that topics covered in the introductory course sequence are generally consistent from one to the other, with some instructors providing more detail on some subjects than others. This was not the case in the lab section, where greater coordination is obviously needed, especially between roster and adjunct faculty members. The survey results indicated that students had difficulty in Physics 129 with five topics. The survey, however, did not adequately test the topic of "planetary science," which is approximately half of the course content for Physics 129. Physics 130 students had problems in nine areas. It was determined that some of these areas of weakness were due to the timing of the post-test, wherein some topics were covered after the test was administered due to scheduling necessities.

The department plans to revise the test for Physics 129 in order to more adequately reflect course goals and content so that a clearer determination of student output may be measured. The department will also seek better coordination among laboratory instructors for a more consistent delivery of course content and a more shared learning experience with actual labs undertaken. The Physics 130 test will also be reviewed and revised for testing content. The timing of the exam will be examined, and changes to course content for both courses will be evaluated and implemented. This assessment will be ongoing in order to achieve our original assessment goals of determining that student learning opportunities are available to all Physics 129 and 130 students and that learning outcomes are indeed being achieved.

Sociology

In the current assessment phase, the sociology program examined the required research methods sequence (SOCY 271—Introduction to Social Research; and SOCY 371—Research Practicum) to determine if these courses provided students with adequate understanding of the methods by which sociologists gather, access, analyze (using statistical methodology and program), and correctly interpret data, as well as being able to use information retrieval techniques to locate and evaluate sociological literature and data.

The Department used three measurements in their assessment: tracking student progress and performing grade comparisons, surveying students in the Sociology Capstone class regarding the impact of their coursework on their experience as a Sociology major, and data analysis regarding professional presentations by students at sociological meetings and conferences.

The grade comparison indicated that grades in SOCY 371 are higher than grades in SOCY 271, indicating that students may indeed improve in their understanding and use of sociological research methods through the two-course sequence. Also of note is that a majority of the students taking only SOCY 271 are sociology minors who take the course later in their College career than do the majors, and who have usually taken a research methodology course in their major prior to enrolling in SOCY 271. The grades of these students (the minors) are usually higher for SOCY 271 than those of the majors, primarily due to the point in their coursework when the course is taken (Sophomore year for majors and Junior/Senior year for minors) and whether or not they have previously taken a methodology course in their major. Data collected while tracking student performance indicated that the single predictor of lower grades was the number of absences

a student had in the course—the higher the number of absences, the lower the course grade. Other factors noted were prior student GPA, the number of hours a student had previously taken, and the number of math courses a student took before taking SOCY 271/SOCY 371. The department has been advising students to take the same professor for both courses, but this was found to have no effect on the final grade in SOCY 371.

Students in the Sociology Capstone Course (n=92) were asked to identify courses in the major that were particularly valuable, relevant, or important to them; to single out an assignment that was particularly meaningful; and to provide recommendations for improving the Sociology major. No other guidelines were provided. From these students, 20% chose SOCY 271, SOCY 371 or the “sociology methods sequence” as their most meaningful course, with 14% listing the research project from SOCY 371 as the most relevant assignment. Considering the dread with which students view the research component of the major, and that they chose these courses randomly from their experience, the Department was pleased with these responses. Some suggestions for improvement of the major included offering a more narrowly defined SOCY 371 (applied research, qualitative research, etc.), reducing the research methods course to SOCY 271 only, using MATH 104 (Statistics) as a pre- or co-requisite for SOCY 271, an earlier instruction to SPSS (a statistical program used by the Department), a two-semester required course sequence, and offering SOCY 271/371 as a one-semester, six-hour course.

Another measure of the effectiveness of the research methods sequence is the number of students whose papers are accepted for presentation at professional meetings. Since fall 2001, twenty-two students have presented either their research paper from SOCY 371 or independent research using the skills learned in the two-course sequence. A majority of these students presented at the Southern Sociological Society meetings in 2003 and 2004. Another student used SPSS statistical methodology, in collaboration with other authors, to produce two research posters for the National Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center used at the professional meetings of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy. The Department is also aware anecdotally of three students in the past two years who have received research positions upon graduation due to their skill using SPSS; positions usually filled by candidates holding the Master's Degree.

As a result of this assessment, the Department of Sociology will research the recommendations listed above, specifically concentrating on a required two-semester sequence for the SOCY 271/SOCY 371 courses, making MATH 104 a prerequisite for SOCY 271, dropping the SOCY 271 requirement for sociology minors who are majoring in another social science (and thus have a research methods course in their major), and looking at alternatives to SOCY 371 to ensure course content that is relevant to the career goals of all sociology majors. One change that has already been implemented is the addition of a social statistics course as a requirement for the major in order to provide students with sociologically oriented statistics and SPSS programming prior to taking more advanced coursework that require the understanding and/or use of quantitative techniques.

2004-2005 ACCREDITATION VISITS

Athletic Training

The Standards and Guidelines for CAAHEP accreditation for Athletic Training can be found at the following website:

http://www.caahep.org/caahep/accredit.asp?doc=AT_SG_2001

The Department of Physical Education and Health has been complying with these standards in order to assess the entire Athletic Training Program. Results of the accreditation will be included in the 2005 Institutional Effectiveness Summary Report.

The initial accreditation was received in October 2000 and expires October 2005. The self-study will be submitted on September 1, 2004. Depending on the schedule of site visitors, the on-campus visit may be in February, March, or even April of 2005. The on-campus visit will be confirmed in November 2004.

Teacher Education

The following is the website that lists the Standards and Guidelines for NCATE accreditation for Teacher Education:

<http://www.ncate.org>

The NCATE team visit is scheduled for October 30-November 3, 2004. In preparation for this visit, every teacher education program submitted a program review in September 2003. Most of the programs have been nationally accredited and three are in rejoinder. The visiting team will make its recommendation regarding reaccreditation to the NCATE Unit Accrediting Board (UAB) at its meeting following the visit in spring 2005. The UAB reviews the visiting team's report and makes the final recommendation regarding reaccreditation; however, the recommendations from the visiting team play the major role in determining reaccreditation. Currently, the NCATE approved cycle for review is every seven years. South Carolina (SC Department of Education and CHE), however, has a state partnership with NCATE and the current approved cycle is every five years. The SC Board of Education is hearing the first reading of the proposal to go to a seven year cycle next Wednesday, July 21, 2004. The second reading of this proposal will be in August. It will not be determined until August or later whether the College will continue with a five-year cycle or change to a seven-year cycle. The School's contacts on the SC Board and at the SC Department of Education believe it will be changed to a seven-year cycle. Results of the accreditation visit, including recommendations for improvement, will be presented in the 2005 Institutional Effectiveness Summary Report.

INTERIM REPORT

Business/Accounting

The Accounting and Legal Studies Department is in the initial phase of the assessment cycle and has planned their assessment for the upcoming three years. Their goals include: ensuring coursework and materials that are responsive to changing student needs; reviewing general education requirements in business and for the professional education of students, including internships, so that optimum offerings are available; enhancing written and oral communication skills and technological skills of their majors; and recruiting, retaining and placing students who will succeed in an academically rigorous environment as well as hiring faculty and staff adequate to the needs of the school and college. A few of the measurements that will be utilized include student and teaching portfolios, feedback from the Accounting Advisory Board, data analysis of student profiles (e.g., the number of student internships, student failure rates, etc.), analyzing scores on the accounting exit exam offered by AACSB (the accrediting body for the School of Business and Economics); and student opinion and satisfaction surveys as well as employer and faculty surveys conducted regularly to determine areas of improvement.

Additionally, the School of Business and Economics is using course portfolios, student surveys, enrollment and retention data, student advising, and other methodology to ensure a high-quality education for all its business students. Specifically, they are looking to enhance the technical skills of their students, selectively reduce class size, design and approve admission requirements for majors, increase student retention, improve placement opportunities for graduates, increase faculty development and research productivity, acquire additional space, and maintain AACSB standards. All areas of the School of Business and Economics, including Business Administration and International Business, are included in these efforts.

Data will be collected for all assessment efforts on an on-going basis and an assessment report detailing the results and use of findings is expected in May 2006.

SUCCESS OF TRANSFER STUDENTS

Following the reporting guidelines received on April 8, 2004, the report on transfer students was submitted on June 1, 2004.