Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

1 Program Mission
Accounting Mission Statement
The Division of Accounting, Business and Economics offers an accounting program that is consistent with the mission statement of Central Methodist University by providing professional preparation in accounting and business, and promoting lifelong learning and social responsibility. Within the program, students develop technical, interpersonal, and communication skills. An integrated approach to accounting is used at CMU to emphasis the way businesses operate. Students are better prepared to enter, not only accounting, but also related fields. Accounting information is useful in such diverse areas as financial planning, health care, communications, law, engineering, forensics, actuarial science, and the fine arts. The degree in accounting will prepare the student for graduate school in a number of disciplines. Certifications which students may be able to pursue after an approved course of study would include Certified Public Accountant (CPA), Certified Managerial Accountant (CMA), Certified Internal Auditor (CIA), Certified Fraud Examiner (CFE), Certified Financial Planner (CFP) and Actuary. Requirements for these certifications will vary. For detailed information on certification requirements, contact the sponsoring organizations and the Division.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Communication
a. Actively be able to access and evaluate relevant information and then apply accounting knowledge, technical skills and professional competencies needed in order to make sound decisions. b. Be able to express ideas through a variety of multimodal channels, (including both the written and spoken word) in a professional, engaged manner c. Articulate, explain and compare the organizational elements, structure, performance, terminology, and delivery modalities for the U.S. and global accounting reporting systems.

Action Plan
Establish Presentation Measure for CGES AC-BU480 Currently, there is no measure to assess verbal communication/presentation skills in CGES AC-BU480 courses. We will work to establish a
measure for this for a future reporting period.

1.1.1 **Assessment Measure**

**AC/BU480 Research Paper**

The AC480 research paper is over an individually-chosen topic in the student’s field. See the attached rubric for this measure.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Research Paper - Academic Direct

1.1.1.1 **Benchmark**

75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the AC480 research paper assignment.

**FINDINGS**

**EXFA18:** There was 1 accounting student enrolled in the class. That student scored 82% compared to the target of GE 75%. (Met)

**SP19:** There were 5 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 93%. 100% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

**CGES Data**

**EXFA18:** There were 14 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 84%. 93% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

**EXSP19:** There were 12 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 77%. 83% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

**EXSU19:** There were 7 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 81%. 71% of students had a score GE 75%. (Not Met)

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the Research Paper, focus was placed on the SP19 semester which had a sufficient population of CLAS students to make a comparison. Fayette Campus students’ average score was approximately 16% higher than CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**
1.1.2 **Assessment Measure**

AC/BU480 Research Paper Presentation

Students present their AC480 Research Paper findings. See the attached rubric for this measure.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Presentation - Academic Direct

---

1.1.2.1 **Benchmark**

75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the AC480 research paper presentation.

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**

On the in-class presentation of their research paper in AC480, 75% of the students on the Fayette campus will earn a 75% or greater.

**FINDINGS**

FA18: There was 1 accounting student enrolled in the class. A major-related, research topic was the instrument used to measure this goal. That student scored 95% compared to the target of GE 75%. (Met) SP19: There were 5 accounting students enrolled in the class. A major-related, research topic was the instrument used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 96%. 100% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

This objective’s target was met for Fayette Campus students. See action plan for CGES students.

---

1.2 **Student Learning Outcomes**

**Curiosity**

a) Demonstrate knowledge and create solutions through continuous development of the creative, critical thinking and problem solving skills that are needed within the accounting profession.  
b) Explore career opportunities and critically evaluate principles and practices applied to global accounting solutions.  
c) Analyze records, interpret variance and assess opportunities and risks, in order to make recommendations for action based on accounting/budgetary/financial goals.
Action Plan

In order to achieve more positive achievement results on the Assessment Exam, ABE faculty will continue efforts in identifying areas of course learning objectives where alternate techniques and learning tools may be employed to enhance student understanding and retention.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
AC480 Comprehensive Case Study
Accounting majors will complete a comprehensive case study which will include an examination of the annual report of an international organization and associated case questions. Heavy emphasis will be on comparing and contrasting International Financial Reporting Standards (IFRS) and U.S. GAAP. See the attached rubric for this measure.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Project - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the AC480 Comprehensive Case Study

BENCHMARK
75% of students will earn a summary score of 75% or higher on the comprehensive case study.

FINDINGS
FA18: There was 1 accounting student enrolled in the class. That student scored 96% compared to the target of GE 75%. (Met) SP19: There were 5 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 85%. 80% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) CGES Data EXFA18: There were 14 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 94%. 93% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) EXSP19: There were 12 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 82%. 83% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) EXSU19: There were 7 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 92%. 100% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the Comprehensive Case Study, focus was placed on the SP19 semester which had a sufficient population of CLAS students to make a comparison. Fayette Campus students’ average score was approximately 3% higher than CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested.

IMPROVEMENT
1.2.2 Assessment Measure
Major Field Test
Students complete a major field exam as a division requirement for graduation. Results of the exam are primarily used for program assessment.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Standardized test - Academic Direct

1.2.2.1 Benchmark
Students on the Fayette campus should earn a mean score on the MFT within 10 points of the national mean score. **Met**

BENCHMARK
Students on the Fayette campus should earn a mean score on the MFT within 10 points of the national mean score.

FINDINGS
Accounting students on the Fayette campus had a mean score of 149.5 which is .2 points higher than the national average. It is well within the standard deviation of 7 points of the national mean. This objective’s target of within 10 points of the national mean score was met. High score was 163, and low score was 136. The Fayette average for accounting was 149.5 and all campus average was 151.7. CGES Accounting students had a mean score of 166.3, which was 17 points higher than the national average. It is well within the standard deviation of 7 points of the national mean. This objective’s target of within 10 points of the national mean score was met. CGES Accounting students’ high score was 180.4, and the low score was 157. The online average for accounting was 166.3 compared to the all campus average of 151.7.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
Fayette Campus and CGES Business students reflect similar success ratings in this measure. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested. See 2019 ABE MFT Assessment Updates attached.
\textbf{Assessment Measure}  
\textit{AC 480 Assessment Exam}  
The CMU Division of Accounting, Business, and Economics administers an assessment exam to freshmen and seniors in their program. There are questions from each core course area: accounting, business law, economics, management, and marketing. The results of this exam are used to evaluate the progress students through the course of the program.

\textbf{SOURCE OF EVIDENCE}  
Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct  

\textbf{Benchmark}  
70\% of our accounting seniors will earn a summary score of 70\% or higher on the ABE Assessment Exam. [Partially Met]  

\textbf{FINDINGS}  
FA18: There was 1 accounting student enrolled in the class. That student scored 58\% compared to the target of GE 70\%. (Not Met)  
SP19: There were 5 students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 64\%. 80\% of students scored GE 70\% compared to the target of 70\% of students. (Met)  
CGES Data  
EXFA18: There were 14 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 71\%. 57\% of students had a summary score GE 70\%. (Not Met)  
EXSP19: There were 12 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 72\%. 50\% of students had a summary score GE 70\%. (Not Met)  
EXSU19: There were 7 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 74\%. 57\% of students had a summary score GE 70\%. (Not Met)  

\textbf{ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS}  
In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the ABE Assessment Exam, focus was placed on the SP19 semester which had a sufficient population of CLAS students to make a comparison. Fayette Campus students’ average score was approximately 8\% lower than CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested. See action plan for improving achievement results.
1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Community
a) Show a clear understanding of the microenvironment between the legal, economic, and social environments within the accounting profession. b) Demonstrate knowledge and application of prescribed ethical codes, and behaviors and their value within both the workplace and society. c) Understand team and individual management, organizational skills, supervision and coaching techniques to effectively lead across organization, department, and work group units to meet diverse stakeholder and organizational goals in a variety of accounting environments.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
AC480 Research Paper
The AC480 research paper is over an individually-chosen topic in the student’s field. See the attached rubric for measure.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Research Paper - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the AC480 research paper assignment.

Partial Met

75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the AC480 research paper assignment.

FA18: There was 1 accounting student enrolled in the class. That student scored 82% compared to the target of GE 75%. (Met) SP19: There were 5 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 93%. 100% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) CGES Data EXFA18: There were 14 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 84%. 93% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) EXSP19: There were 12 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 77%. 83% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) EXSU19: There were 7 accounting students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 81%. 71% of students had a score GE 75%. (Not Met)
In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the Research Paper, focus was placed on the SP19 semester which had a sufficient population of CLAS students to make a comparison. Fayette Campus students' average score was approximately 16% higher than CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested.

Project Attachments (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 AC-BU480 Assessment Data.xlsx</td>
<td>35KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 ABE MFT Assessment Updates.xlsx</td>
<td>49KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Presentation Rubric.doc</td>
<td>29KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC480 Comp Case Grading Rubric.xlsx</td>
<td>11KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC480 Research Paper Rubric.xls</td>
<td>31KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. Accountancy Curriculum Map (3-19).xlsx</td>
<td>13KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Biology Mission Statement
This major prepares students for graduate school in the biological sciences. They also prepare students to enter any of the professional fields related to medicine, teaching, and other areas including economic, industrial, and applied biology. Opportunities include environmental studies, genetics, physiology, botany, zoology, microbiology, cellular biology, developmental biology, molecular biology, biochemistry, ecology and entomology, to name a few graduate study specialties. The student has the option of graduating with a Bachelor of Science Degree or with a Bachelor of Arts Degree.

Student Learning Outcomes
Communication of Biological Knowledge and Ability
The well-trained Biology major should be able to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, about biological and environmental concepts.

Action Plan
Action plan for capstone paper evaluations: In our 2017-2018 action plan, we stated that we would start a separate section of SC468 for biology students to address the deficiencies of our SC468 Internship Capstone scores. In May 2019 we added a separate section of SC468 for Biology majors so that they are made aware of the expectations of the written work. When a student signs up for SC468 they are required to fill out paperwork that identifies their placement, supervisor, responsibilities and expectations for a code of conduct while under their internship supervisor. We will make this rubric and the specifications for the written paper available as soon as a student contacts the biology professor about the necessary paperwork (the rubric was not added to the Career Services website, as previously proposed, because it applies only to biology majors). Additionally, we previously said that we would update the rubric as needed after grading capstone papers. We did update the rubric in May 2018, and we will discuss updating the rubric again for May 2020. For the first time since this rubric was created, in the 2019-2020 school year, we will have
capstone internship biology major students in a separate section of the SC468 class taught by a biology professor. We are hoping that this will improve the rubric scores for that type of internship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 1</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action plan for capstone paper evaluations</td>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td>5/31/2021</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.1.1 Assessment Measure

**Science Seminar**

All majors must give an oral presentation of either a research, internship or special problem capstone project in SC425, Interdisciplinary Science Seminar. Biology faculty and other faculty in the Science Division will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments and numerically scoring the presentation using a rubric. The faculty members will evaluate the student’s effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experience.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Presentation - Academic Direct

### 1.1.1.1 Benchmark

All students will receive >75% for their science seminar presentation **Met**

**BENCHMARK**

It is expected that all students will receive > 75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%.

**FINDINGS**

All biology students completing the science seminar final presentation in the 2018-2019 school year scored above the 75% threshold (the lowest grade was 78.4%; the average was 89.63%). Specific grades and science, mathematics, and computer science division faculty feedback are provided in the attached document (called "Science Seminar Grade and Comment Summary 2018").

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

See Finding.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

Academic

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

**IMPROVEMENT N/A**
1.1.2 Assessment Measure
Capstone Paper Evaluations

The capstone papers are used to assess the Biology program Student Learning Outcome #1 (SLO1): Communication of Biological Knowledge and Ability. The papers are written by students who can take one of three capstone classes: Research (SC464), Internship (SC468), or Special Problems (SC460). Biology faculty read the papers and grade all of them using the same rubric that we developed and edit as needed. There are 9 categories in the rubric that we (the biology faculty) use to grade capstone papers (scores assigned 1-10 for each category, 10 being best). We look at the average score for each rubric category after all of the student papers are graded (rather than the average score per student when all of the rubric categories are included). Additionally, we look at the three possibilities for student capstones separately: research, internship, and special problems.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Capstone assignment - Academic Direct

1.1.2.1 Benchmark
At least an average of 80% in each category of the rubric. Partially Met

BENCHMARK
Our benchmark is to score at least an average of 80% in each category (average score of 8).

FINDINGS
12 capstone papers were scored by 5 of the 6 biology faculty members: 4 SC464 research papers, 5 SC468 internship papers, and 3 SC460 special problems papers. We started using an updated capstone paper rubric in May 2018. The main changes were to add more detail to the directions and split the last organization/editing category into two separate categories, giving us 9 categories total.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
Our research students (SC464) met the benchmark (score above 80%) in all categories.

Our internship students (SC468) did not meet the benchmark on seven of the nine rubric categories. These students have traditionally been tasked with keeping a journal throughout their internship experience and writing a reflective paper for their write-up. In Fall 2016 we added a requirement of a literature-based write-up on some aspect of their internship that would allow us to assess Outcome 1 for Biology students who opt to do an Internship Capstone. In the 2018-2019 school year, the SC468 course was still coordinated by a faculty member in our division who is not a
biology professor, making it difficult for us to clearly communicate our capstone paper requirements to the biology majors. Additionally, sometimes students do not sign up for internships until well into summer and sometimes Biology faculty advisors are not necessarily aware that the internship course was added. This also makes it difficult for us to collect capstone papers from all of the internship students, which is why we only had four to examine for this school year. We did a better job of communicating our expectations to students this year, which is shown by all of the students having a references section and at least attempting to include some literature review. Starting in May 2019, a biology professor took charge of all of the biology majors taking SC468 in a separate biology section of the class. We are hopeful that this will increase the capstone paper category scores next school year.

We had three students who completed a special problems capstone (SC460), and the paper met proficiency level in all but four categories. Each of these students did a special problems capstone project because their internship option fell through or they never looked for other options. The last minute nature of these students’ projects may explain why they did not meet the benchmark in some categories.

In the attached document (“Capstone Paper Results Summary_2018-2019”), you will find the average score for each rubric category (broken down by type of capstone paper: research (SC464), internship (SC468), and special problems (SC460)), assessment summary, and action plan. Raw data and faculty comments on all of the papers are provided in a separate Excel file (“Capstone Paper Results Summary_2018-2019_raw data”).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Action plan created</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the first time since this rubric was created, in the 2019-2020 school year, we will have capstone internship biology major students in a separate section of the SC468 class taught by a biology professor. We are hoping that this will improve the rubric scores for that type of internship.
Student Learning Outcomes
Proficiency in Biological Lab Practices
Proper training in Biology requires laboratory proficiency. Students should be able to be proficient in basic laboratory techniques and collection and analysis of data.

Action Plan
Action plan for the Biology SLO #2 Lab Skills: This was the first year that the Biology Department tried our new way of evaluating SLO2. We are still figuring out how to collect and analyze the data, which means that the benchmarks may change over the next few years. Over the next few years we will discuss options for collecting and analyzing the lab skills data. We also need to set up a rotation schedule for which lab skills will be evaluated in future years.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 1</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action plan for the Biology SLO #2 Lab Skills</td>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td>5/31/2021</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Assessment Measure
Biological Lab Skills
In the spring 2018 semester, the biology faculty met to create a list of five more specific lab skills that will be assessed in biology major lab classes. The five lab skills are: Scientific Method, Observation and Classification, Measurements, Data Analysis, and Data Presentation. We also developed a curriculum assessment map for these that determined which classes had lab skills that would be assessed at the beginner’s level and at an advanced level. We will assess 1-2 of the categories per year and cycle through them. The skills will be assessed in lab classes through the use of assignments and/or exam questions.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Laboratory Work - Academic Direct

Benchmark
"Beginning" level = at least 60%; "Advanced" level = at least 70%

BENCHMARK
Our benchmark for lab skills at the “beginning” level was that at least 60% of the students would be able to successfully complete the skill. In contrast, our benchmark for "advanced" level skills was at least 70%.

FINDINGS
The Biology department previously decided that there are five lab skills we think are important for SLO2: Scientific Method, Observation and Classification, Measurements, Data Analysis, and Data Presentation. For the 2018-2019 school year,
we focused on collecting and analyzing data for only the Scientific Method and Measurements lab skills.

The benchmark was partially met for the Scientific Method and Measurements lab skills. For the Scientific Method skill, the more specific skill of writing hypotheses did not meet the benchmark at the “beginning” or “advanced” level. For the Measurements skill, it appears that the benchmark was met at the “beginning” level, but we only had an average of two assignments that students completed in small groups to analyze. At the “advanced” level, the more specific Measurements skills of using micropipettes, using pH meters, and completing serial dilutions did not meet the benchmark. Individual professors are considering how to improve these specific lab skills in their classes for the 2019-2020 school year.

In the future, the Biology department needs to discuss how to report data in more detail to give us more confidence in our results. We also need to set up a rotation schedule for which lab skills will be evaluated in future years.

See the attached document for more information about the data analysis for these lab skills (“WEAVE_Lab skills_Scientific Method and Measurements_2018_2019”).

### IMPROVEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Action plan created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nothing to report at this time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3 Student Learning Outcomes

#### Knowledge of Biology

The well-prepared Biology major must build a broad base of knowledge in cell biology, genetics, physiology, ecology, zoology, and biochemistry and should be able to integrate knowledge from several biology fields as they specialize in their chosen area.

#### Action Plan

Action plan for the Biology Major Field Test measure: Over the years, MFT scores have fluctuated. As we have identified in the past, a challenge to interpreting the results of the MFT comes from the wide range among students taking the test in both ability and motivation to score well. Over
the next few years we will explore options to address these issues. The discussions will include options such as ways to motivate students and the possibility of developing an in-house exit exam that builds off of our Biology Program Assessment Pre and Post Test. We will also research how other biology departments at our peer institutions conduct exit exams.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 1</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action plan for the Biology Major Field Test measure</td>
<td>12/19/2019</td>
<td>5/31/2021</td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.3.1 Assessment Measure
**Biology Major Field Test (MFT)**

Biology majors are required to take the Major Field Test (MFT) before graduation, preferably during their senior year. At the end of the academic year, the biology faculty will evaluate the senior students’ performance in their capstone Science Seminar presentation and the results of the students’ performance on their MFT scores to determine if adjustments should be made to the curriculum.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Standardized test - Academic Direct

### 1.3.1.1 Benchmark
30th percentile with the goal of the average moving to the 50th percentile. **Not Met**

**BENCHMARK**
The benchmark for success on the MFT is considered to be when 30% of institutional means are below our mean, with the goal of having 50% of institutional means below our mean.

**FINDINGS**
In 2018-2019, 20 biology majors completed the Major Fields Test (MFT). The mean (average) total score was 138.05; this was one of our lowest mean scores since starting to use the MFT in 2004 (only score lower was 135.23 in 2009). Compared to the mean of the 467 institutions taking the MFT in 2017 (mean score was 151.9), 5% of institutions had a mean score less than 138; this means that our benchmark is not met.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
Figure 1 in the attached document shows the mean total score for each year that we have asked students to take the MFT. Over the years, scores have fluctuated. As we have identified in the past, a challenge to interpreting the results of the MFT comes from the wide range among students taking the test in both ability and motivation to score well. Some students taking the MFT are recent transfers to the program from...
Nursing. There was an unusually large number of these students in the 2009 cohort and that is likely part of the explanation of the low average score in that year. In 2016, the cohort of 5 students included several exceptionally talented and conscientious students, and this was reflected in their average score of 156. The unusual group taking the test in 2016 suggests that our best students compare favorably with students of other institutions.

See the attached document for more information, including data comparing our MFT results from 2004 to present ("Major_Field_Test_Analysis_2018_2019").

### IMPROVEMENT

**TYPE** Academic

**DESCRIPTION** Action plan created

**IMPORVEMENT** Nothing to report right now.

#### 1.3.2 Assessment Measure

**Science Seminar**

All majors must give an oral presentation of either a research, internship or special problem capstone project in SC425, Interdisciplinary Science Seminar. Biology faculty and other faculty in the Science Division will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments and numerically scoring the presentation using a rubric. The faculty members will evaluate the student’s effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experience.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Presentation - Academic Direct

#### 1.3.2.1 Benchmark

All students will receive >75% for their science seminar presentation Met

**BENCHMARK** It is expected that all students will receive > 75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%.

**FINDINGS** All biology students completing the science seminar final presentation in the 2018-2019 school year scored above the 75% threshold (the lowest grade was 78.4%; the average was 89.63%). Specific grades and science, mathematics, and computer
science division faculty feedback are provided in the attached document (called "Science Seminar Grade and Comment Summary 2018").

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

See Finding.

Right now, this is exactly the same measure that is used for SLO #1

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

IMPROVEMENT N/A

1.3.3 Assessment Measure

Biology Program Assessment Pre and Post Test Results

The Biology Program Assessment Pre/Post Test was created to assess student knowledge in the required biology courses that all biology majors take: BI101/L, BI102/L, and BI108/L. Ideally these are all taken during a student’s freshman year. This Pre/Post Test will be used to assess the Biology Program Student Learning Outcome: Knowledge of Biology. The Pre/Post-Test was created by Drs. Ashley Lough, Greg Thurmon, and Dana Morris, who teach BI101/L, BI102/L, and BI108/L, respectively. Each professor wrote 10 multiple-choice questions that represented the knowledge from their class (30 questions total on the Pre/Post-Test). Students were given the Pre-Test at the beginning of BI101 and given the Post-Test at the end of BI102. Students were also told that their grade in the class would not be affected by how well they did on the Pre-Test or Post-Test. The mean and standard deviation for the Pre-Test and the Post-Test were calculated using Microsoft Excel. The difference in each students’ score between the two tests was also calculated. Excel was used to calculate the probability associated with the 2-tailed distribution, paired t-test. The statistical null hypothesis used for the t-test was: “There is no difference between the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test.”

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Pre/post test - Academic Direct

1.3.3.1 Benchmark

Significant improvement between the mean scores of the pre- and post-test

For the students who took all three biology courses in the AY18-19, there should be a
significant improvement between the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test.

Out of 10 students that were analyzed, no student got a lower score or equal score on the Post-Test compared to their Pre-Test score. Every student raised their score by at least 2 points (out of 30 points total). A majority of the students had a Post-Test score that was over 5 points higher than their Pre-Test score. The mean Pre-Test score was 11.90 out of 30 points, with a standard deviation of 2.81. The mean Post-Test score was 21.00 out of 30 points with a standard deviation of 3.65. Excel was used to calculate the probability associated with the 2-tailed distribution, paired t-test. The probability calculated by Excel was 0.0000469922. This means that our probability was less than p = 0.01. However, it’s important to emphasize here that our sample size of only 10 students was very small. We can reject the statistical null hypothesis: “There is no difference between the mean score of the pre-test and the post-test.” Our data supports the idea that students scored significantly higher on the Post-Test than on the Pre-Test. However, because our sample size of 10 students was so small, these results are not as meaningful as we would like. We were only able to analyze data for 10 students because the post-test was not given during BI102 (it was done online at the end of finals week instead). Making sure to give the post-test during the BI102 class next year will be a priority to get a larger sample size.

See the attached document summarizing the analysis of the data (“Biology Program Assessment Pre and Post Test Results_2018-2019 school year”). The raw data and statistical analysis are provided in a separate Excel sheet (“Analysis_of_Pre_and_Post_Biology_Assessment_Test_Results_2018_2019”).

**IMPROVEMENT**

**TYPE** Academic

**DESCRIPTION** No Improvements Deemed Necessary

**N/A**

**Assessment Measure**

**BI101/BI101L General Biology I Reflection**

The faculty teaching member General Biology I lecture and lab classes (BI101/BI101L) will record and reflect on progress, performance, and teaching methods for the previous year.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Self-Reflection - Academic Indirect
BENCHMARK

Faculty member will look for student growth through the biology sequence.

FINDINGS

The attached summary document (“WEAVE_BI101 and BI101L_Fall 2018”) includes the BI101/BI101L pre/post-test data and the professor’s reflection on the Fall 2018 semester. The reflection includes observations made by the professor over the course of the semester, student feedback (taken from the course evaluations), and changes that the professor is planning to make for the Fall 2019 semester. Also attached this year is an analysis of survey results about textbooks (“WEAVE_BI101 Fall 2018_Survey about textbooks_results summary”).

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Pre/Post-Test results: The average number of correct answers on the Pre-Survey and Post-Survey were compared. The average Pre-Survey score was 13.68 and the average Post-Survey score was 25.43 (these averages are similar to Fall 2016 and Fall 2017). When I used a t-test to compare these, I found that the Post-Survey average score was significantly higher (p < 0.0001). I looked at each student’s improvement from the Pre-Survey to the Post-Survey. All but four students improved their score by at least one correct answer: 90 students improved by at least 6 questions; 63 students improved by at least 11 questions; 28 students improved by at least 16 questions; and 8 students improved by at least 21 questions. These are similar numbers from previous years. I also looked at each of the 35 questions and the percentage of students who answered each of the questions correctly on the Pre-Survey compared to the Post-Survey. For every question, the percent of students who correctly answered the question on the Post-Survey was higher than the Pre-Survey. For 34 of the 35 questions, over 50% of the students correctly answered the Post-Survey question (this is better than was seen in Fall 2017, 2016, 2015, and 2014).

IMPROVEMENT

TYPE

Academic

DESCRIPTION

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

IMPROVEMENT

N/A
1.3.5 Assessment Measure
Upper Level Biology Course Reflections
Faculty that submit course reflections as a part of the assessment process, can store them here.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Self-Reflection - Academic Indirect

1.3.5.1 Benchmark
Reflection on progress: Met

BENCHMARK
Faculty member will look for student growth through the biology sequence.

FINDINGS
See the attached assessment summaries for BI306/BI306L (Spring 2019) and BI320/BI320L (Spring 2019).

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
See the attached assessment summaries for BI306/BI306L (Spring 2019) and BI320/BI320L (Spring 2019).

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
No Improvements Deemed Necessary

IMPROVEMENT
N/A

Project Attachments (12)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement Summary Analysis_2018_2019.pdf</td>
<td>69KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis_of_Pre_and_Post_Biology_Assessment_Test_Results_2018_2019.xlsx</td>
<td>21KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Program Assessment Pre and Post Test Results_2018-2019 school year.pdf</td>
<td>95KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Paper Results Summary_2018-2019.pdf</td>
<td>37KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Paper Results Summary_2018-2019_raw data.xlsx</td>
<td>33KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attachments</td>
<td>File Size</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major_Field_Test_Analysis_2018_2019.pdf</td>
<td>295KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science Seminar Grade and Comment Summary 2018.pdf</td>
<td>99KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAVE_BI101 and BI101L_Fall 2018.pdf</td>
<td>133KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAVE_BI101 Fall 2018_Survey about textbooks_results summary.pdf</td>
<td>296KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAVE_BI306 and BI306L_Spring 2019.pdf</td>
<td>117KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAVE_BI320 and BI320L_Spring 2019.pdf</td>
<td>128KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WEAVE_Lab skills_Scientific Method and Measurements_2018_2019.pdf</td>
<td>211KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission

Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission

Business Major Mission Statement

The Division of Accounting, Business and Economics offers a progressive business program, which combines professional preparation with a liberal arts education. The purpose of this program is to develop the important personal characteristics of confidence in oneself, ability to work with others, written and oral communication skills, technical competence, mathematical skills, moral awareness, and ethical values. The major in business will prepare the student for graduate school (M.B.A. or Law) or for a career in industry, entrepreneurship or public service.

Student Learning Outcomes

Communication

a. Actively be able to access and evaluate relevant information and then apply business knowledge, technical skills and professional competencies needed in order to make sound decisions.

b. Be able to express ideas through a variety of multimodal channels, (including both the written and spoken word) in a professional, engaged manner

c. Articulate, explain and compare the organizational elements, structure, performance, terminology, and delivery modalities for the U.S. and global business systems.

Action Plan

Establish Presentation Measure for CGES AC-BU480 Currently, there is no measure to assess verbal communication/presentation skills in CGES AC-BU480 courses. We will work to establish a measure for this for a future reporting period.

Assessment Measure

AC/BU480 Research Paper

The BU480 research paper is over an individually-chosen topic in the student’s field. See the attached rubric for this measure.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Research Paper - Academic Direct
1.1.1 Benchmark
75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the BU480 research paper assignment.

75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the BU480 research paper assignment.

FINDINGS

FA18: There were 7 business students enrolled in the class. Major-related research papers were the instruments used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 93%. 100% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was met. SP19: There were 12 business students enrolled in the class. Major-related research papers were the instruments used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 90%. 100% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was met.

EXFA18: There were 21 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 89%. 90% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) EXSP19: There were 31 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 85%. 87% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met) EXSU19: There were 16 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 77%. 81% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the Research Paper, Fayette Campus students scored approximately 4% higher than CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested.

IMPROVEMENT

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.1.2 Assessment Measure
AC/BU480 Research Paper Presentation

Students present their BU480 Research Paper findings. See the attached rubric for this measure.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Presentation - Academic Direct
1.1.2.1 Benchmark

75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the BU480 research paper presentation.

**Met**

BENCHMARK

On the in-class presentation of their research paper in BU480, 75% of the students on the Fayette campus will earn a 75% or greater.

FINDINGS

FA18: There were 7 business students enrolled in the class. A major-related, research topic was the instrument used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 88%. 100% of students earned GE 70% on the instrument. SP19: There were 12 business students enrolled in the class. Major-related research papers were the instruments used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 88%. 100% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was met.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

This objective’s target was met for Fayette Campus students. See Action Plan for CGES students.

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Curiosity

a. Demonstrate knowledge and create solutions through continuous development of the creative, critical thinking and problem solving skills that are needed within the business profession.
b. Explore career opportunities and critically evaluate principles and practices applied to global business solutions.
c. Analyze records, interpret variance and assess opportunities and risks, in order to make recommendations for action based on organizational goals.

Action Plan

In order to achieve more positive achievement results on the Assessment Exam, ABE faculty will continue efforts in identifying areas of course learning objectives where alternate techniques and learning tools may be employed to enhance student understanding and retention.
1.2.1 **Assessment Measure**

**ABE Assessment Exam**

The CMU Division of Accounting, Business, and Economics administers an assessment exam to freshmen and seniors in their program. There are questions from each core course area: accounting, business law, economics, management, and marketing. The results of this exam are used to evaluate the progress students through the course of the program.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 **Benchmark**

70% of our business seniors will earn a summary score of 70% or higher on the ABE Assessment Exam. **Partially Met**

**BENCHMARK**

70% of our business seniors will earn a summary score of 70% or higher on the ABE Assessment Exam.

**FINDINGS**

FA18: There were 7 students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 60%. 57% of students scored GE 70% compared to the target of 70% of students. (Not Met) SP19: There were 12 students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 68%. 75% of students scored GE 70% compared to the target of 70% of students. (Met) EXFA18: There were 21 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 64%. 38% of students had a summary score GE 70%. (Not Met) EXSP19: There were 31 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 58%. 29% of students had a summary score GE 70%. (Not Met) EXSU19: There were 16 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this exam was 57%. 44% of students had a summary score GE 70%. (Not Met)

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the ABE Assessment Exam, Fayette Campus students scored higher than CGES students. Although there is similarity in class averages, a higher percent of Fayette class students had more positive results than their CGES counterparts. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested. See action plan for improving achievement results.
**1.2.2 Assessment Measure**

**Major Field Test**

Students complete a major field exam as a division requirement for graduation. Results of the exam are primarily used for program assessment.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Standardized test - Academic Direct

---

**1.2.2.1 Benchmark**

Students on the Fayette campus should earn a mean score on the MFT within 10 points of the national mean score. **Met**

**BENCHMARK**

Students on the Fayette campus should earn a mean score on the MFT within 10 points of the national mean score.

**FINDINGS**

Business students on the Fayette campus had a mean score of 145.3, which was 4 points lower than the national average. It is well within the standard deviation of 7 points of the national mean. This objective's target of within 10 points of the national mean score was met. High score was 176, and low score was 130. The Fayette average for business was 146.2 and all campus average was 147.2. CGES Business students had a mean score of 147.4, which was 1.9 points lower than the national average. It is well within the standard deviation of 7 points of the national mean. This objective's target of within 10 points of the national mean score was met. CGES Business students' high score was 180, and the low score was 126. The online average for business was 148.8 compared to the all campus average of 147.2.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

Fayette Campus and CGES Business students reflect similar success ratings in this measure. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested. See 2019 ABE MFT Assessment Updates attached.
1.2.3 **Assessment Measure**  
**AC/BU480 Comprehensive Case Study**  
Business majors will complete a comprehensive study which will include an examination of marketing/management issues of a major corporation. They will complete associated analysis-based case questions. Areas of analysis may include strategic vision, competitive strategy, company values, social responsibility, leadership and financial performance. See the attached rubric for this measure.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**  
Project - Academic Direct

1.2.3.1 **Benchmark**  
**75% of students will earn a summary score of 75% or higher on the comprehensive case study.**  
**Partially Met**

**BENCHMARK**  
75% of students will earn a summary score of 75% or higher on the comprehensive case study.

**FINDINGS**  
FA18: There were 7 business students enrolled in the class. A major-related, comprehensive case study was the instrument used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 87%. 86% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was met.  
SP19: There were 12 business students enrolled in the class. A major-related, comprehensive case study was the instrument used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 75%. 58% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was not met.  
EXFA18: There were 21 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 80%. 62% of students had a score GE 75%. (Not Met)  
EXSP19: There were 31 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 81%. 71% of students had a score GE 75%. (Not Met)  
EXSU19: There were 16 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 75%. 56% of students had a score GE 75%. (Not Met)

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**  
In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the Comprehensive Case Study, Fayette Campus students had scores similar to CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested.
1.3 **Student Learning Outcomes**

**Community**

a. Show a clear understanding of the microenvironment between the legal, economic, and social environments within the business profession.
b. Demonstrate knowledge and application of prescribed ethical codes, and behaviors and their value within both the workplace and society.
c. Understand team and individual management, organizational skills, supervision and coaching techniques to effectively lead across organization, department, and work group units to meet diverse stakeholder and organizational goals in a variety of business environments.

1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**

**AC/BU480 Research Paper**

The BU480 research paper is over an individually-chosen topic in the student’s field. See the attached rubric for this measure.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Research Paper - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**

75% of students will earn a 75% or higher on the BU480 research paper assignment.

**Met**

**FINDINGS**

FA18: There were 7 business students enrolled in the class. Major-related research papers were the instruments used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 93%. 100% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was met.

SP19: There were 12 business students enrolled in the class. Major-related research papers were the instruments used to measure this goal. Class average for this assignment was 90%. 100% of students earned GE 75% on the instrument. This objective’s target was met.

EXFA18: There were 21 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 89%. 90% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

EXSP19: There were 31 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 85%. 87% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)

EXSU19: There were 16 business students enrolled in the class. Class average on this assignment was 77%. 81% of students had a score GE 75%. (Met)
In comparing Fayette Campus and CGES results of the Research Paper, Fayette Campus students scored approximately 4% higher than CGES students. We will continue to analyze future results to see if a trend is indicated and/or intervention suggested.

Project Attachments (6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2018-2019 AC-BU480 Assessment Data.xlsx</td>
<td>35KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019 ABE MFT Assessment Updates.xlsx</td>
<td>49KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABE Presentation Rubric.doc</td>
<td>29KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.S. Business Curriculum Map (3-19).xlsx</td>
<td>13KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU480 Comp Case Study Grading Rubric.docx</td>
<td>14KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BU480 Management Topic Research Paper Rubric.xls</td>
<td>31KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Chemistry Program Mission
Chemistry is the study of matter and the changes in matter that occur during physical changes and chemical reactions. The major in chemistry is intended to prepare students for employment in industrial and government laboratories, teaching at the middle and high school level, study in various medical professions, and advanced study in major areas of chemistry including analytical, clinical, environmental, forensic, inorganic, organic, physical and biochemistry. Chemistry majors will receive theoretical training in classes and obtain practical hands-on experience through lab exercises and research. The successful chemistry graduate will have a deeper knowledge of chemistry along with the ability to design and safely execute chemical experiments and appropriately communicate chemical information.

Student Learning Outcomes
Knowledge and Critical Thinking
Chemistry majors should have a thorough knowledge of the fundamental chemical concepts and scientific theories and should be able to apply this knowledge to think critically and analytically in solving both theoretical and experimental problems in the areas of General, Organic, Analytical, and Physical Chemistry.

Assessment Measure
ACS Chemistry Exam
The American Chemical Society – ACS – provides final exams for all major courses in chemistry. Currently, we use those exams as our final exams in all classes for which they are available (General, Organic, Analytical and Physical Chemistry). However, they are designed to be taken primarily by chemistry majors.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Standardized test - Academic Direct

Benchmark
Average Goal of 30th percentile

Partially Met
Currently, we have set an average goal of the 30th percentile for the General, Organic, and Analytical Chem classes.

ACS General Chemistry - This year the overall class averaged in the 20th percentile while chemistry majors averaged in the 33rd percentile. Over the past 5 years, the overall class averaged in the 20th percentile while the chemistry majors averaged in the 39th percentile. ACS Organic Chemistry - This year the overall class averaged in the 14th percentile while the chemistry majors averaged in the 42nd percentile. Over the past 5 years, the overall class averaged in the 11th percentile while chemistry majors averaged in the 20th percentile. ACS Analytical Chemistry - The class averaged in the 26th percentile.

For the Gen Chem and Organic Chem exams we have compared the current year and 5-year average percentiles for chemistry majors versus the overall class. In both cases, we find that the chemistry majors do substantially better than the class as a whole which is to be expected as they have a more vested interest in the material that students from other majors. While the Organic percentiles might appear low, they have steadily and markedly increased especially for chemistry majors from a low of the 8th percentile 4 years ago to a high of 42nd percentile this year. In both cases, the 5-year average is probably a better indicator as there is such a small number of majors in any given year.

For the ACS Analytical exam, only the overall class average was considered because the majority of the class (8 of 10) were chemistry majors with one chem ed. This year’s class had a mix a very strong students (2 of the chem majors scored at the 58th percentile and one scored at the 93rd percentile) along with several much poorer students who may not persist as chemistry majors.

While the MFT does give us useful information, we have considered producing our own in-house pre/post test that all freshman chemistry and senior chemistry majors. This might give us a better indicator of the gains of students within our particular program.
1.1.2 **Assessment Measure**  
**Chemistry Major Field Test**  
The Major Field Exam in Chemistry is a comprehensive exam for students in all areas of chemistry - inorganic, organic, physical, and analytical.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**  
Standardized test - Academic Direct

1.1.2.1 **Benchmark**  
**Average at or about 50th percentile on the MFT** - Met

**BENCHMARK**  
The benchmark is for the students on average to score at or above the 50th percentile on the MFT.

**FINDINGS**  
This year the three chem majors scored on average in the 5th percentile. Over the past 5 years, chemistry majors have averaged in the 21st percentile.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**  
This year’s average was very disappointing given that two very good students took the exam. Even over the past 5 years, the students aren’t scoring close to the benchmark. The number of students in the past 5 years is still small - only 9. So, drawing conclusions is difficult. One potential issue is that there really is no academic cost to students when they take the test. A minimum score is not required in order for them to graduate. So, without any "teeth" it may not be taken as seriously for those students who have begun to think more about what they are transitioning to than finishing up at CMU.

While the MFT does give us useful information, we have considered producing our own in-house pre/post test that all freshman chemistry and senior chemistry majors. This might give us a better indicator of the gains of students within our particular program.
1.2 **Student Learning Outcomes**  
Qualitative and Quantitative Laboratory Skills  
Chemistry majors should be able to safely design and conduct an experiment using appropriate labware and instrumentation, collect and analyze data, properly document procedures and data, identify sources of error, interpret results and make relevant connections to other areas in chemistry and other science disciplines.

1.2.1 **Assessment Measure**  
Lab Average Score  
Currently we look at the average labs scores in individual classes and look for any with an average < 60%

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**  
Laboratory Work - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 **Benchmark**  
All Chemistry majors will achieve a 60% of higher lab score  
Currently we look at the average labs scores in individual classes and look for any with an average < 60%.  
There were no labs in which the average percentage was below 60%.  
An average score of less than 60% would indicate either a serious problem with the lab procedure or student ability. Our results indicate that neither of those is a problem.

However, my observations are that our chemistry majors could take more time to be more thorough in recording data/observations into their lab journals. We continue to battle their wanting to keep information in places other than the lab journal.

We also need to do more with exposing students more often to analytical instrumentation. Many schools have an instrumental analysis class which might be of benefit to us. Students to get limited exposure to a wide range of spectroscopic and chromatographic instrumentation. A greater exposure would be very beneficial to them.
1.2.2 Assessment Measure
Senior Research Project

Every chemistry major must complete a senior research project either at CMU under the direction of a CMU science faculty member or during a summer REU (research experience for undergraduates) which is a nationally funded program by the National Science Foundation. Other projects may be approved at the discretion of the chemistry faculty. The students are required to submit a final formal lab report for their project.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.2.2.1 Benchmark
Grade for the Research Class Met

Benchmark

Grade for the Research Class

Met

BENCHMARK

Demonstrated the ability to design, implement, and analyzing data from a research project as seen by earning an A or B in the research class.

FINDINGS

The two chemistry majors this year both did successful research projects through REU programs at other universities. Both earned an A in the research class.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Both of the chemistry majors this year had proposals accepted to present their research in a poster format at the National American Chemical Society meeting in Orlando in the Spring 2019. Our third chemistry major is actually a chemistry education student. The Chem Ed students are not required to do a senior research project because of their time commitments for student teaching.

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes

Communication

Chemistry majors should be able to clearly articulate experimental and theoretical chemical
concepts and conclusions in both written and oral format.

### 1.3.1 Assessment Measure

**Science Capstone**

Each chemistry major must make an oral presentation at Science Seminar over their senior research project. This presentation is made in the presence of other students from the division as well as faculty member so of the division.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

### 1.3.1.1 Benchmark

**Average Score of at least 80%**

- **BENCHMARK**: Average score of at least 80% on the presentations as graded by the rubric provided in the course.

- **FINDINGS**: Both chemistry majors this year scored well over 80% on their presentations.

- **ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**: Very little oral presentation of information is done formally until the capstone seminar presentation. Perhaps oral presentations could be tied in some way to formal lab reports. Students could be asked to produce a research-grade poster of their lab experience and present to the class or a larger audience. Poster presentations are very common at professional meetings. This process could help them learn to distill down their information for the visual presentation on the poster along with helping them develop oral presentation skills.

Written communication of information occurs in a rather limited way in each lab course in which a lab notebook/journal/reports are used. However, a very limited number of formal reports are written within the curriculum until the capstone research project.

At least one formal lab report could be required in each lab course. Perhaps this writing can be limited to courses above General Chemistry due to the small class sizes and greater time available to have a good writing assignment.

Another possible idea is to institute a sophomore level Major Reading class in which students are immersed into the process of reading chemistry journal articles, writing critical abstracts of the papers and making oral presentations. We had a major reading class many years ago, but it was at the senior level. Students really couldn’t
use it to help them mature in reading, writing, and presenting before they were involved in their capstone research project. Having a dedicated course at the sophomore level could take some of the pressure off of determining class and/or lab time during other classes to do the writing and presenting. Writing formal lab reports and making presentations could certainly happen in other classes, but it could perhaps be less frequent if this course were instituted.

### Project Attachments (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="#" alt="Chemistry Curriculum Map.xlsx" /></td>
<td>26KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="#" alt="Chemistry Mission.docx" /></td>
<td>14KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="#" alt="Chemistry Program Review Information.docx" /></td>
<td>18KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission

Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission

Communications Mission Statement.

It is the mission of the Department of Communication of Central Methodist University to provide each student with a high-quality individualized education. Students develop effective communication skills to enhance their academic, personal, and professional lives. Student-centered instruction focuses on the development of critical thinking skills and ethical discourse. Students are empowered with communication skills that allow them to be successful in a wide range of careers such as public relations, journalism, and other media related occupations.

Student Learning Outcomes

Effective Communication

Students will demonstrate effective communication, through written, verbal, organizational, logical, and critical thinking communication skills.

Assessment Measure

Senior Thesis Rubrics

The mean score will be 80 or higher on the senior thesis grading rubric (out of 100).

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Research Paper - Academic Direct
1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Ethical Communication
Students will learn to communicate ethically.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Ethical Quality Scale
Benchmark: The mean score will be 5 or above on the EQ scale (7-point scale). Note: Outside evaluation of ethical communication is a more reliable measure than self-report measures as they tend to be skewed.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
Benchmark: The mean score will be 5 or above on the EQ scale (7-point scale). Note: Outside evaluation of ethical communication is a more reliable measure than self-report measures as they tend to be skewed. Nothing Entered

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Confident Communication
Students will be confident in their communication skills.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
Personal Report of Communication Apprehension
Benchmark: The mean score will be below 70 (120 max score, above 72 is considered...
BENCHMARK

**Benchmark:** The mean score will be below 70 (120 max score, above 72 is considered apprehensive).

**FINDINGS**

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

---

**1.4 Student Learning Outcomes**

**Professional Placement**

Students will be prepared for jobs in communication-related fields.

**1.4.1 Assessment Measure**

**Job Placement Rates**

Benchmark: 70% of students will be working in a communication-related field, or attending graduate school, 6 months post-graduation.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Placement data - Academic Indirect

---

**1.4.1.1 Benchmark**

Benchmark: 70% of students will be working in a communication-related field, or attending graduate school, 6 months post-graduation. **Nothing Entered**
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Comparative Religion and Philosophy Mission
A major Comparative Religion and Philosophy will enable students to understand and critically engage the diverse worldviews that shape human life.

Student Learning Outcomes
Articulate
Articulate and support their own positions in written and oral formats.

Assessment Measure
RL/PL490 Capstone Project
Rubric scored capstone project
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Direct - Internal - Academic Direct

Benchmark
Rubrics scores of... Met

FINDINGS
Both students completing the capstone in the major received scores of 3 out of 4 on the departmental rubric.
1.2 **Student Learning Outcomes**

Evaluate

Critically evaluate systems of belief and practice.

1.2.1 **Assessment Measure**

RL/PL490 Capstone

Rubric scored capstone project

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Direct - Internal - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 **Benchmark**

Rubric Score of ___ Met

BENCHMARK

Students completing the capstone for the major should achieve a score of at least ___ on the capstone rubric for each outcome.

FINDINGS

Both students completing the capstone in the major received scores of 3 out of 4 on the departmental rubric.

Analyse of Findings

Improvement Type

Improvement Description

Improvement

1.3 **Student Learning Outcomes**

Engage

Responsibly and respectfully engage different philosophical and religious worldviews.

1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**

RL/PL490 Capstone

Rubric for capstone project.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Direct - Internal - Academic Direct
BENCHMARK

FINDINGS

Both students completing the capstone in the major received scores of 3 out of 4 on the departmental rubric.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT

TYPE

IMPROVEMENT

DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

Project Attachments (2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>StudentA- Capstone Rubric_CRP_Spring 2019.pdf</td>
<td>61KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>StudentB_Capstone Rubric_CRP_Fall 2019.pdf</td>
<td>60KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Computer Science Mission Statement
This major combines professional preparation with a liberal education. A student completing this major is qualified for employment in business or industry in entry-level positions requiring application programming, working knowledge of computing systems, and use of commercial software packages. The student has the option of graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree or with a Bachelor of Arts degree. Additionally, graduates will possess a solid foundation for success in a graduate program in Computer Science.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Problem-solving and Critical Thinking
Students will develop problem-solving and critical thinking skills and use these skills to solve complex computing problems.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
CS480 Major project
All computer science majors are required to perform a major project in their senior year: (CS480). A project proposal is submitted by the student for department approval. The proposal explains the purpose of the project, and has a timeline of the primary elements required for completion. Our criteria for success for each student are how well they: 1. Meet the completion timeline of each element in the proposal. A success rate of 80% is the benchmark. Failure to meet this benchmark requires an update of the proposed timeline. 2. The research methods of each student are monitored to determine weakness in our department’s classroom presentation of research skills. 3. A final presentation of the project results (in SC425) is monitored to determine a level of professionalism. A failure to meet a reasonable level of presentation, results in a second formal presentation of the project results.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
A success rate of 80% is the benchmark. Failure to meet this benchmark requires an update of the proposed timeline. A final presentation of the project results by the...
update of the proposed timeline. A final presentation of the project results by the student is monitored to determine a level of professionalism. A failure to meet a reasonable level of presentation, results in a second formal presentation of the project results.

A success rate of 80% is the benchmark.

**Assessment Measure**

In House Comprehensive Exam

A comprehensive exam covering all the core material in the CS program. The same exam will be administered 3 times. As a freshman, at end of Sophomore year, and before graduation.

**Benchmark**

Students will show a proficiency in computer science, based on major field test scores.

Students will show a proficiency in computer science, based on major field test scores.
1.2 **Student Learning Outcomes**
Theoretical Foundations
Students will acquire a working knowledge of theoretical foundations of computer science.

1.2.1 **Assessment Measure**
**CS480 Major project**
All computer science majors are required to perform a major project in their senior year: (CS480). A project proposal is submitted by the student for department approval. The proposal explains the purpose of the project, and has a timeline of the primary elements required for completion. Our criteria for success for each student are how well they: 1. Meet the completion timeline of each element in the proposal. A success rate of 80% is the benchmark. Failure to meet this benchmark requires an update of the proposed timeline. 2. The research methods of each student are monitored to determine weakness in our department’s classroom presentation of research skills. 3. A final presentation of the project results (in SC425) is monitored to determine a level of professionalism. A failure to meet a reasonable level of presentation, results in a second formal presentation of the project results.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.2.2 **Assessment Measure**
**In-house Comprehensive Exam**

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.2.2.1 **Benchmark**
The in-house comprehensive exam will gauge each student's growth in the theoretical foundations of computer science. **Nothing Entered**

BENCHMARK
The in-house comprehensive exam will gauge each student's growth in the theoretical foundations of computer science.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Professional Practice
Students will acquire both a working knowledge and a theoretical understanding of the professional practice and formal methodologies of development of software projects.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
Employment and Placement Data
Computer Science graduates will locate employment in areas directly related to their field of study.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
80% of graduates will find employment in a computer science related field.

BENCHMARK
80% of graduates will find employment in a computer science related field.

FINDINGS
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.4 Student Learning Outcomes
Communication and Interpersonal Skills
Students will acquire communication and interpersonal skills necessary to perform effectively in technical environments.

1.4.1 Assessment Measure
CS480 Major project
All computer science majors are required to perform a major project in their senior year: (CS480). A project proposal is submitted by the student for department approval. The proposal explains the purpose of the project, and has a timeline of the primary elements required for completion. Our criteria for success for each student are how well they: 1. Meet
the completion timeline of each element in the proposal. A success rate of 80% is the benchmark. Failure to meet this benchmark requires an update of the proposed timeline. 2. The research methods of each student are monitored to determine weakness in our department's classroom presentation of research skills. 3. A final presentation of the project results (in SC425) is monitored to determine a level of professionalism. A failure to meet a reasonable level of presentation, results in a second formal presentation of the project results.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.4.1 Benchmark
All students getting a 4 year degree from CMU must take CS480 and then present their work in Science Seminar. The CS department considers there to be a problem if not at least 90% of students pass SC425.

BENCHMARK
All students getting a 4 year degree from CMU must take CS480 and then present their work in Science Seminar. The CS department considers there to be a problem if not at least 90% of students pass SC425.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.4.2 Assessment Measure
Employment and Placement Data
Computer Science graduates will locate employment in areas directly related to their field of study.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.4.2.1 Benchmark
To be successful in finding and keeping a job, students must have communication and interpersonal skills. The placement rate is a direct indicator of how students are able to interact with employers. We want 80% of graduates to find employment (or go on to graduate school) within their field of study.

BENCHMARK
We want 80% of graduates to find employment (or go on to graduate school) within
their field of study.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT
Institutional Mission
Program Mission
The English major educates students in writing, language, literature, and influential dialogue of both the past and present. You will gain skills not only in these areas, but in information fluency, interaction, and verbal and written expression. As you closely examine literary movements, trends and ideas, you will become prepared for a variety of career paths.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Participate in Discourse
Students will recognize and participate in discourses within the field of English.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
English Capstone
EN410 capstone course. Students in EN410 also research a poem, short story, or play not assigned in classes, writing a research paper on that literary piece and then defending their ideas in an oral examination at the end of the semester. We examine each student’s competencies in writing about, analyzing, and discussing literature, and we discuss a composite of our graduates to determine whether our English curriculum demonstrably supports our missions and goals.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Portfolio - Academic Direct

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
English Major Portfolio: Discourses in English
Exceeded

BENCHMARK
Achieves "meets expectations" for the programmatic outcome "Students will recognize and participate in discourses within the field of English."

FINDINGS
During the 2018-2019 academic year, two English majors completed capstone projects. Both students exceeded expectations in their creative thesis projects.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
Student A: Exceeded expectations in a creative thesis project: a 38-page comedy pilot script that examined familial relationships in a church.
Student B: Exceeded expectations in a creative thesis project: an 85-page spec script that took, as it’s source material, The Unforgiven, and imagined a prequel for Munny’s character.

Students both excelled at screenplay format, structure, character development, style, and in summarizing and understanding screenwriting terminologies.

### 1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

**Periods, Movements, and Genres**

Students will draw on periods, movements, and genres to create new knowledge.

### Action Plan

Over the next year, we plan to discuss the possibility of a common portfolio assignment like the one adopted for our composition classes. The portfolio would include a reflection essay component that would ask students to address the concepts assessed in the VALUE rubric and used evidence from their portfolio to demonstrate their understanding and engagement with those concepts. While the above data offers a useful overview of student learning and development, we believe that the process of building a portfolio and producing a reflection will provide us with more information on students’ levels of self-awareness about the development, achievements, and the learning process as a whole. The portfolio and reflection may also raise the average scores above a ”2” more consistently.

### 1.2.1 Assessment Measure

**English Capstone**

EN410 capstone course. Students in EN410 also research a poem, short story, or play not assigned in classes, writing a research paper on that literary piece and then defending their ideas in an oral examination at the end of the semester. We examine each student’s competencies in writing about, analyzing, and discussing literature, and we discuss a composite of our graduates to determine whether our English curriculum demonstrably
Benchmark
English Major Portfolio: Periods, Movements, and Genre Considerations

BENCHMARK
Achieves "meets expectations" for the programmatic outcome "Students will draw on periods, movements, and genres to create new knowledge."

FINDINGS
During the 2018-2019 academic year, two English majors completed capstone projects. Both students exceeded expectations.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
Student A: Exceeded expectations in a comprehensive English Major portfolio.
Clearly, throughout the student’s experience at CMU, the student engaged historical analysis, genre analysis, applied historical knowledge to class projects, synthesized content through creative means, and developed novel solutions for genre problems.

Student A: Exceeded expectations in a comprehensive English Major portfolio.
Clearly, throughout the student’s experience at CMU, the student engaged historical analysis, genre analysis, applied historical knowledge to class projects, synthesized content through creative means, and developed novel solutions for genre problems.

Assessment Measure
EN222 Reading VALUE Rubric Scores
For the 2018-19 academic year, the English Department used the AAC&U’s Reading VALUE Rubric for assessing students enrolled in EN222: Introduction to Literature. Introduction to Literature is a general education course required by CMU. The prerequisite for the course is the completion of Composition II. The Reading VALUE Rubric (included below) assesses students’ development in six key areas: Comprehension, Genres, Relationship to Text, Analysis, Interpretation, and Reader’s Voice. These developmental areas overlap with the two
General Education Competencies for the Humanities outlined in the Course Catalog—that is, understanding historical, cultural, and social contexts and articulating critical responses.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
AACU Value Rubric - Writing - Academic Direct

1.2.2.1 Benchmark

BENCHMARK

Achieve an average score of "2" on each area of the AACU Reading Rubric

FINDINGS

The Reading VALUE Rubric is built around a 4-point scale in which each numerical value corresponds to a student’s year in college. For example, the "4" is understood as a "Capstone" score, a developmental level appropriate for graduating seniors who have mastered a particular skill. The "1" operates as a "Benchmark," a basic level of competency educators might expect from their first-year students. For a course like EN222 whose students are typically first- and second-year college students, it is appropriate that students aspire to achieve a "2," a level the AAU&P describes as a "Milestone" in cognitive development. Our assessment concentrates on a random sample of 20% of the students enrolled in EN222 during the 2018-19 academic year. The average score for each developmental area is as follows: Comprehension: 2.1
Genres: 2.2 Relationship to Text: 2.1 Analysis: 2.3 Interpretation: 1.9 Reader’s Voice: 1.9

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Based on the above average scores and our experiences reading student writing, we offer the following observations and conclusions.

• Based on the raw scores, no one received a "4" (Capstone) in any of the categories, though students did receive a "3" (Milestone) in several categories. Students enrolled in EN222 include all credit levels (freshman to senior), but typically the highest percentage is sophomore-level students.

• The average scores are largely where we expect them to be (i.e. 1.9-2.3), though we would like to see those averages in Interpretation and Reader’s Voice further approach and/or exceed our aspirational "Over the next year, we plan to discuss the possibility of a common portfolio assignment like the one adopted for our composition classes. The portfolio would include a reflection essay component that would ask students to address the concepts assessed in the VALUE rubric and used evidence from their portfolio to demonstrate their understanding and engagement with those concepts. While the above data offers a useful overview of student
learning and development, we believe that the process of building a portfolio and producing a reflection will provide us with more information on students’ levels of self-awareness about the development, achievements, and the learning process as a whole. The portfolio and reflection may also raise the average scores above a "2" more consistently.

**Improvement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Process Modifications</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment Method Revised</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Student Learning Outcomes

**Language**

Students will analyze and evaluate language.

#### Assessment Measure

**English Capstone**

EN410 capstone course. Students in EN410 also research a poem, short story, or play not assigned in classes, writing a research paper on that literary piece and then defending their ideas in an oral examination at the end of the semester. We examine each student’s competencies in writing about, analyzing, and discussing literature, and we discuss a composite of our graduates to determine whether our English curriculum demonstrably supports our missions and goals.

**Source of Evidence**

#### Benchmark

**English Major Portfolio: Analyze and Evaluate Language**

Achieves "meets expectations" for the programmatic outcome.

**FINDINGS**

During the 2018-2019 academic year, two English majors completed capstone projects. Both students exceeded expectations in their creative thesis projects.

**Analysis of FINDINGS**

Student A: exceeded expectations through close readings, reflections, text analysis, and effective language use in the capstone project. Similarly, throughout Student A’s CMU courses, the student demonstrated not only awareness but also exceeded expectations while using core English disciplinary terms, definitions, employing...
effective evaluative language and effective interpretations.

Student B: exceeded expectations through close readings, reflections, text analysis, and effective language use in the capstone project. Similarly, throughout Student B’s CMU courses, the student demonstrated not only awareness but also exceeded expectations while using core English disciplinary terms, definitions, employing effective evaluative language and effective interpretations.

**Assessment Measure**

**EN222 Reading VALUE Rubric Scores**

For the 2018-19 academic year, the English Department used the AAC&U’s Reading VALUE Rubric for assessing students enrolled in EN222: Introduction to Literature. Introduction to Literature is a general education course required by CMU. The prerequisite for the course is the completion of Composition II. The Reading VALUE Rubric (included below) assesses students’ development in six key areas: Comprehension, Genres, Relationship to Text, Analysis, Interpretation, and Reader’s Voice. These developmental areas overlap with the two General Education Competencies for the Humanities outlined in the Course Catalog—that is, understanding historical, cultural, and social contexts and articulating critical responses.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

AACU Value Rubric - Writing - Academic Direct

**Benchmark**

**AACU Value Reading Rubric Scores**

Average scores on each rubric area will be a “2” or higher

**FINDINGS**

The Reading VALUE Rubric is built around a 4-point scale in which each numerical value corresponds to a student’s year in college. For example, the “4” is understood as a “Capstone” score, a developmental level appropriate for graduating seniors who have mastered a particular skill. The “1” operates as a “Benchmark,” a basic level of competency educators might expect from their first-year students. For a course like
EN222 whose students are typically first- and second-year college students, it is appropriate that students aspire to achieve a "2," a level the AAU&P describes as a "Milestone" in cognitive development. Our assessment concentrates on a random sample of 20% of the students enrolled in EN222 during the 2018-19 academic year. The average score for each developmental area is as follows: Comprehension: 2.1 Genres: 2.2 Relationship to Text: 2.1 Analysis: 2.3 Interpretation: 1.9 Reader’s Voice: 1.9

Based on the above average scores and our experiences reading student writing, we offer the following observations and conclusions.

• Based on the raw scores, no one received a "4" (Capstone) in any of the categories, though students did receive a "3" (Milestone) in several categories. Students enrolled in EN222 include all credit levels (freshman to senior), but typically the highest percentage is sophomore-level students.

• The average scores are largely where we expect them to be (i.e. 1.9-2.3), though we would like to see those averages in Interpretation and Reader’s Voice further approach and/or exceed our aspirational "2".

• Over the next year, we plan to discuss the possibility of a common portfolio assignment like the one adopted for our composition classes. The portfolio would include a reflection essay component that would ask students to address the concepts assessed in the VALUE rubric and used evidence from their portfolio to demonstrate their understanding and engagement with those concepts. While the above data offers a useful overview of student learning and development, we believe that the process of building a portfolio and producing a reflection will provide us with more information on students’ levels of self-awareness about the development, achievements, and the learning process as a whole. The portfolio and reflection may also raise the average scores above a "2" more consistently.
1.4 Student Learning Outcomes
Composing Texts
Students will compose effective texts in multiple modalities.

1.4.1 Assessment Measure
Common Final Writing Examination
To measure the efficacy of our writing courses (lower-level and upper-level), we administer a common essay-writing examination for all our EN110/111, EN120, EN305, and EN306 students at semester’s end. We use the scores from this double-read examination to determine whether students are capable of writing competently; each essay is measured against a rubric that the department’s faculty devise and agree upon.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.4.1.1 Benchmark
Achieve "meets expectations" is each of five categories, thesis/focus; development and support; organization, structure, and coherence; language; and mechanics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>Achieve &quot;meets expectations&quot; is each of five categories, thesis/focus; development and support; organization, structure, and coherence; language; and mechanics.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>The holistic score average (the average score for each of those areas) in Academic Year 2018-2019 (CLAS and CGES) was 3.04 on a four point scale.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS</td>
<td>With the English Common Assessment, we use a shared essay prompt and a common scoring rubric to assess student writing in five areas: thesis/focus; development and support; organization, structure, and coherence; language; and mechanics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The holistic score average (the average score for each of those areas) in Academic Year 2018-2019 (CLAS and CGES) was 3.04 on a four-point scale. This score "meets expectations" of our 3.0 out of 4.0 benchmark and is slightly higher than holistic averages from AY2016-2017 and AY2017-2018.

The holistic average for AY2018-2019 was 3.04; AY 2017-2018 was 2.87; AY 2016-2017 was 3.01; AY 2015-2016 was 3.16, and AY 2013-2014 was 2.93.

Below are our AY2018-2019 results compared to the AY 2017-2018, AY2016-2017, AY2015-2016, and AY2014-2015 scores:


It should be noted that during the 2017-2018 academic year, English engaged in a lengthy process of revising the outcomes and assessments for writing courses and began discussing moving to a portfolio-based assessment model (see below). We finally passed the assessment measure, along with curricular changes in 110/111 via faculty vote in AY2018-2019. While the common assessment essay has allowed us to collect data from multiple sites and platforms, there were concerns that the method posed challenges related to grade-norming and that a reporting of numerical scores, especially those represented down to two decimal places, without conversation or collaboration in the scoring gave an illusion of accuracy to the evaluation of writing that does not fully represent the complex dynamics between reader, writer, writing situation, process, reflection, purpose, and genre. Furthermore, students dislike the assessment measure and faculty rarely find it meaningful for their writing themes, content developments, and topics of interest. From the preliminary collection of pilot portfolios, where instructors collaborated on collecting, analyzing, and evaluating portfolios, we have seen a wider view of the writing process, including pre-writing, drafting, revision, and post-writing reflections.

The proposed changes to writing assessment, for AY2020-2021, are below:

EN110/111: Instructor Guidelines for the Composition Portfolio and Final Reflection
Overview

At the end of the semester, each student will submit a portfolio that includes written work and a reflection essay. While a portfolio and reflection essay are required components, instructors have some discretion as to what students collect in their portfolio and what topics students reflect on in their essays. Instructors have complete control over how the portfolio/reflection essay is graded and how it is weighted within their composition courses.

Instructors are required, though, to submit their students’ portfolios to the Composition Program Director. Each year, a random sample of student portfolios will be assessed blindly using the AAC&U VALUE Written Communication Rubric (see pages 3-4). Please note that the VALUE rubric is designed to measure students throughout their college careers. For students completing the College Composition sequence, we aim for 110 students to meet the “Benchmark” status and 111 students to cross over into the “Milestone” status. The portfolio assessment procedure will be used to track program strengths and determine trends in student writing, both challenges and successes. The portfolio is NOT an assessment of individual instructors or their students.

Portfolio Components:
To satisfy the minimum requirements of the portfolio, each student should include selections of artifacts that demonstrate the writing process as well as completed, polished written work. As noted above, the exact components of the student portfolio are left to instructor discretion and interest.

The portfolio may include the following examples of the writing process:
? Prewriting documents
? Research
? Drafts
? Process Reflections
? In-class writing
? Discussion forum posts
? Revisions of written work
? Multimodal/multimedia work
Final Course Reflection Essay:
The final course reflection gives each student a chance to reflect on their progress throughout the semester. Instructors should feel free to revise and adapt the following questions to fit the design of their individual composition courses. Still, the reflection essay should include these two essential parts:

Part 1: Challenges and Successes in Writing
Questions may include the following examples:
? What have you learned about writing?
? What aspects of your writing have improved over the semester?
? What challenges do you still face?
? To what extent has this course has helped prepare you for future writing tasks?

Part 2: The Writing and Revision Process
Questions may include the following examples:
? How has your approach to writing changed throughout the semester?
? How did the instructor and/or peer feedback affect your revision process?
? What specific steps did you take to revise your work?
? Identify and explain a particular section of at least one final draft that you revised.
? How has your writing improved this semester?<br>

Assessment Measure
English Capstone
EN410 capstone course. Students in EN410 also research a poem, short story, or play not assigned in classes, writing a research paper on that literary piece and then defending their ideas in an oral examination at the end of the semester. We examine each student’s competencies in writing about, analyzing, and discussing literature, and we discuss a composite of our graduates to determine whether our English curriculum demonstrably supports our missions and goals.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
1.4.2.1 Benchmark

English Major Portfolio: Compose Effective Texts

**Exceeded**

**BENCHMARK**

Achieve "meets expectations" for the programmatic outcome "Students will compose effective texts in multiple modalities."

**FINDINGS**

During the 2018-2019 academic year, two English majors completed capstone projects. Both students exceeded expectations in their creative thesis projects.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

Student A: Exceeded expectations in creating an original, 38-page comedy pilot episode script, along with regular, thoughtful reflections/analysis of genre, process, and purpose.

Student B: Exceeded expectations in creating an original, 85-page revisionist western spec script, along with regular, thoughtful reflections/analysis of genre, process, and purpose.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**Project Attachments (4)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capstone Portfolio</td>
<td>2MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Reflection</td>
<td>1MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Major Portfolio</td>
<td>39MB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Major Portfolio</td>
<td>57MB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission

Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission

The Environmental Science major is intended for students preparing for environmentally related professional careers. The course work includes a basic foundation in biological and physical sciences with emphasis on chemistry, ecology and industrial applications. Job opportunities are available in environmental consulting firms, public utility companies, municipalities and federal environmental agencies. The curriculum provides a good foundation for those planning to pursue graduate studies in environmental science, industrial hygiene, pollution control or waste management.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes

Knowledge of Environmental Science
The well-prepared ES major must build a broad base of knowledge in cell biology, genetics, physiology, ecology, zoology, biochemistry, chemistry, physics and possibly geology. The major should be able to integrate knowledge from several basic sciences as they specialize in their chosen area.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure

Major Field Test
Environmental Science majors are required to take the (Major Field Test) MFT in Biology before graduation, preferably during their senior year. The test is in biology because that is the closest related field offering a nationally normed exam and most of the envir. science majors are interested in biological areas.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.1.1.1 Benchmark

The benchmark for success on the MFT is considered to be the 30th percentile with the goal of the average moving to the 50th percentile.

BENCHMARK

The benchmark for success on the MFT is considered to be the 30th percentile with the goal of the average moving to the 50th percentile.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF
1.1.2 Assessment Measure
Science seminar
All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship or special problems experience in SC 425, Science Seminar. Faculty from the Division of Math, Science, and Computer Science will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments and numerically scoring the presentation. The faculty members will evaluate the students’ effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experiences.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.1.2.1 Benchmark
It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%. Areas of particular interest include adequate preparation from existing coursework, lab facilities to carry out this research and use of appropriate technology in the research and the presentation. Nothing Entered

Benchmark
It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar.
1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Proficiency in ES Lab Practices
Proper training in ES requires laboratory proficiency. Students should be able to be proficient in basic laboratory techniques and collection and analysis of data.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Science Seminar
All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship or special problems experience in SC 425, Science Seminar. Faculty from the Division of Math, Science, and Computer Science will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments and numerically scoring the presentation. The faculty members will evaluate the students’ effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experiences.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%. Areas of particular interest include adequate preparation from existing course work, lab facilities to carry out this research and use of appropriate technology in the research and the presentation.

BENCHMARK
It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.2.2 Assessment Measure
Lab Practices
Periodically, all labs will be assessed for their effectiveness

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
1.2.3 **Assessment Measure**

Any lab for which the yearly average is < 60% will be re-evaluated for its effectiveness and how it can be improved to become a better teaching instrument.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.2.3.1 **Benchmark**

Any lab for which the yearly average is < 60% will be re-evaluated for its effectiveness and how it can be improved to become a better teaching instrument.

**Nothing Entered**

---

1.3 **Student Learning Outcomes**

**Communication of ES Knowledge and Ability**

The well-trained ES major should be able to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, about environmental concepts.

1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**

**Science Seminar**

All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship or special problems experience in SC 425, Science Seminar. Faculty from the Division of Math, Science, and Computer Science will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments and numerically scoring the presentation. The faculty members will evaluate the students’ effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experiences.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**

It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%. **Met**
Institutional Mission

Program Mission
General Education Mission
General Education at Central Methodist University provides a foundation of knowledge and skills that prepares graduates to be successful and reflective citizens and leaders, and to make a difference in local and global communities. General Education incorporates core courses that focus on our University Learning Principles of Communication, Curiosity, and Community to build the groundwork for an educational experience that will empower students within a culture of engaged learning.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Articulate
Students are articulate, able to speak and write clearly and effectively.

Action Plan

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Composition Common Final
To measure the efficacy of our writing courses (lower-level and upper-level), we administer a common essay-writing examination for all our EN110/111, EN120, EN305, and EN306 students at semester’s end. We use the scores from this double-read examination to determine whether students are capable of writing competently; each essay is measured against a rubric that the department’s faculty devise and agree upon.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Written assignment - Academic Direct

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
Rubric Score Met

BENCHMARK
Achieve “meets expectations” is each of five categories, thesis/focus; development and support; organization, structure, and coherence; language; and mechanics.

FINDINGS
The holistic score average (the average score for each of those areas) in Academic Year 2018-2019 (CLAS and CGES) was 3.04 on a four point scale.
With the English Common Assessment, we use a shared essay prompt and a common scoring rubric to assess student writing in five areas: thesis/focus; development and support; organization, structure, and coherence; language; and mechanics.

The holistic score average (the average score for each of those areas) in Academic Year 2018-2019 (CLAS and CGES) was 3.04 on a four-point scale. This score "meets expectations" of our 3.0 out of 4.0 benchmark and is slightly higher than holistic averages from AY2016-2017 and AY2017-2018.

The holistic average for AY2018-2019 was 3.04; AY 2017-2018 was 2.87; AY 2016-2017 was 3.01; AY 2015-2016 was 3.16, and AY 2013-2014 was 2.93.

Below are our AY2018-2019 results compared to the AY 2017-2018, AY2016-2017, AY2015-2016, and AY2014-2015 scores:


It should be noted that during the 2017-2018 academic year, English engaged in a lengthy process of revising the outcomes and assessments for writing courses and began discussing moving to a portfolio-based assessment model (see below). We finally passed the assessment measure, along with curricular changes in 110/111 via faculty vote in AY2018-2019. While the common assessment essay has allowed us to collect data from multiple sites and platforms, there were concerns that the method posed challenges related to grade-norming and that a reporting of numerical scores, especially those represented down to two decimal places, without conversation or collaboration in the scoring gave an illusion of accuracy to the evaluation of writing that does not fully represent the complex dynamics between reader, writer, writing situation, process, reflection, purpose, and genre. Furthermore, students dislike the assessment measure and faculty rarely find it meaningful for their writing themes, content developments, and topics of interest. From the preliminary collection of pilot portfolios, where instructors collaborated on collecting, analyzing, and evaluating portfolios, we have seen a wider view of the writing process, including pre-writing, drafting, revision, and post-writing reflections.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>Action plan created</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed changes to writing assessment, for AY2020-2021, are below: EN110/111: Instructor Guidelines for the Composition Portfolio and Final Reflection Overview At the end of the semester, each student will submit a portfolio that includes written work and a reflection essay. While a portfolio and reflection essay are required components, instructors have some discretion as to what students collect in their portfolio and what topics students reflect on in their essays. Instructors have complete control over how the portfolio/reflection essay is graded and how it is weighted within their composition courses. Instructors are required, though, to
submit their students’ portfolios to the Composition Program Director. Each year, a random sample of student portfolios will be assessed blindly using the AAC&U VALUE Written Communication Rubric (see pages 3-4). Please note that the VALUE rubric is designed to measure students throughout their college careers. For students completing the College Composition sequence, we aim for 110 students to meet the “Benchmark” status and 111 students to cross over into the “Milestone” status. The portfolio assessment procedure will be used to track program strengths and determine trends in student writing, both challenges and successes. The portfolio is NOT an assessment of individual instructors or their students. Portfolio Components: To satisfy the minimum requirements of the portfolio, each student should include selections of artifacts that demonstrate the writing process as well as completed, polished written work. As noted above, the exact components of the student portfolio are left to instructor discretion and interest. The portfolio may include the following examples of the writing process: ? Prewriting documents ? Research ? Drafts ? Process Reflections ? In-class writing ? Discussion forum posts ? Revisions of written work ? Multimodal/multimedia work Final Course Reflection Essay: The final course reflection gives each student a chance to reflect on their progress throughout the semester. Instructors should feel free to revise and adapt the following questions to fit the design of their individual composition courses. Still, the reflection essay should include these two essential parts: Part 1: Challenges and Successes in Writing Questions may include the following examples: ? What have you learned about writing? ? What aspects of your writing have improved over the semester? ? What challenges do you still face? ? To what extent has this course helped prepare you for future writing tasks? Part 2: The Writing and Revision Process Questions may include the following examples: ? How has your approach to writing changed throughout the semester? ? How did the instructor and/or peer feedback affect your revision process? ? What specific steps did you take to revise your work? ? Identify and explain a particular section of at least one final draft that you revised. ? How has your writing improved this semester?

1.1.2 Assessment Measure
CT101 Speech Rubrics
A common rubric scored out of 200 points is used for all sections of CT101.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Rubric Scored Assignments - Academic Direct
### Benchmark

**Average Rubric Score** Partially Met

**Benchmark**

All sections will score an average of 80% or higher on the common rubric.

**Findings**

Dual Credit sections of CT101 scored an average of 91.7% on the common rubric, exceeding expectations. Results were not submitted for CLAS sections.

**Analysis of Findings**

Students perform well on the final speech in CT101 and meet the expectations, however, more scores from the CLAS campus are needed.

### Assessment Measure

**Source of Evidence**

### Student Learning Outcomes

**Multimodal**

Students are multimodal, able to interpret and express ideas through multiple modes of communication.

### Assessment Measure

**Project SAILS**

Project SAILS test is a nationally-recognized assessment of information literacy skills. This library skills test determines how well students can navigate the complex world of information. Using the SAILS information literacy test allows you to identify strengths and weaknesses of your students’ information literacy skills and will provide direction to better develop the skills of your students.

**Source of Evidence**

Multiple Choice Exam - Academic Direct
**1.2.1.1 Benchmark**

**Average scores** Met

**BENCHMARK**

Students will perform at or above peer institutions in each area of the Project Sails test.

**FINDINGS**

Students scored above the peer benchmark for all areas.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

CGES locations do not take the Project SAILS exam. The highest scoring area overall was “Crafting a Research Strategy” and the lowest was “Legal and Ethical Uses of Information,” though all scores were above the benchmark. The results were consistent with past years.

**IMPROVEMENT**

**TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**

---

**1.3 Student Learning Outcomes**

**Discover**

Students can discover, explore, and seek solutions based on accumulated knowledge and current research.

**1.3.1 Assessment Measure**

**MOGEA Scores - Reading and Writing**

Education students must achieve a passing score on the MOGEA as a pre-license exam. These students come from a wide swath of majors, so their performance can be used as a gauge for general education success.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Licensure exam - Academic Direct

**1.3.1.1 Benchmark**

**Passing scores of 220 or better** Met

**BENCHMARK**

The average score on the reading and writing sections of the MOGEA should be above the passing score: 220 for Reading and 193 for Writing.

**FINDINGS**

Students met and exceeded the benchmark in both areas: 233.99 average score in
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Students perform well on the measure, however the population taking the MOGEA will shift in the 19/20 academic year, so a new measure may be needed.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

1.3.2 **Assessment Measure**

**EN222 Rubrics**

For the 2018-19 academic year, the English Department used the AAC&U’s Reading VALUE Rubric for assessing students enrolled in EN222: Introduction to Literature. Introduction to Literature is a general education course required by CMU. The prerequisite for the course is the completion of Composition II. The Reading VALUE Rubric (included below) assesses students’ development in six key areas: Comprehension, Genres, Relationship to Text, Analysis, Interpretation, and Reader’s Voice. These developmental areas overlap with the two General Education Competencies for the Humanities outlined in the Course Catalog—that is, understanding historical, cultural, and social contexts and articulating critical responses.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

AACU Value Rubric - Writing - Academic Direct

1.3.2.1 **Benchmark Rubric Scores**

**Partially Met**

**BENCHMARK**

Students will achieve an average score of "2" on each area of the rubric.

**FINDINGS**

The Reading VALUE Rubric is built around a 4-point scale in which each numerical value corresponds to a student’s year in college. For example, the "4" is understood as a "Capstone" score, a developmental level appropriate for graduating seniors who have mastered a particular skill. The "1" operates as a "Benchmark," a basic level of competency educators might expect from their first-year students. For a course like EN222 whose students are typically first- and second-year college students, it is appropriate that students aspire to achieve a "2," a level the AAU&P describes as a "Milestone" in cognitive development. Our assessment concentrates on a random sample of 20% of the students enrolled in EN222 during the 2018-19 academic year.
The average score for each developmental area is as follows: Comprehension: 2.1 Genres: 2.2 Relationship to Text: 2.1 Analysis: 2.3 Interpretation: 1.9 Reader’s Voice: 1.9

Based on the above average scores and our experiences reading student writing, we offer the following observations and conclusions. • Based on the raw scores, no one received a ”4” (Capstone) in any of the categories, though students did receive a ”3” (Milestone) in several categories. Students enrolled in EN222 include all credit levels (freshman to senior) , but typically the highest percentage is sophomore-level students. • The average scores are largely where we expect them to be (i.e. 1.9-2.3), though we would like to see those averages in Interpretation and Reader’s Voice further approach and/or exceed our aspirational ”

### Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IMPROVEMENT TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Student Learning Outcomes</td>
<td>Analyze Students can analyze, evaluate, interpret, and summarize data.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4.1 Assessment Measure</td>
<td>MOGEA Math Education students must achieve a passing score on the MOGEA as a pre-license exam. These students come from a wide swath of majors, so their performance can be used a a gauge for general education success.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Source of Evidence

Licensure exam - Academic Direct

### Benchmark

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average score above passing of 220</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

BENCHMARK Students will score an average above the passing score needed for the math section of the MOGEA.

FINDINGS Students met and exceeded the benchmark in math: 246.69 average, with a passing score of 220 required.
Students perform well on the measure, however the population taking the MOGEA will shift in the 19/20 academic year, so a new measure may be needed.

1.4.2 Assessment Measure
Chemistry 111 Common Final
A common assessment of given to all students taking Chemistry 111, on the CMU campus and through Dual Credit Courses.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

1.4.2.1 Benchmark
Students will achieve an average score of 50%. Partially Met

FINDINGS
CMU CLAS students achieved an average score of 41.9, while Dual Credit students achieved an average score of 33.9

1.5 Student Learning Outcomes
Respect
Students will understand and respect diversity, including others’ viewpoints, positions, and beliefs.
### 1.5.1 Assessment Measure

**RL122 Data**

RL122 Common Assessment exam

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

#### 1.5.1.1 Benchmark

**Exam results**  

**Benchmark**

**Exam results**

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**  

Students will score in the "Thoroughly (4)" or "Adequately (3)" section of the RL122 common assessment.

**FINDINGS**

The majority of students met the benchmark. See attached document.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**

### 1.5.2 Assessment Measure

**NSSE Valuing Questions**

The National Survey of Student Engagement asks students to report behavioral activities, including "discussions with diverse others" during their time at CMU.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Survey - Academic Indirect

#### 1.5.2.1 Benchmark

**NSSE Respect and Diversity Questions**

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**

Students will report quality interactions with "diverse others" at or above students at peer institutions.

**FINDINGS**

During the AY18-19 period, the majority of students reported conversing with people with differing backgrounds and viewpoints, at a rate higher than peer institutions.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

See full NSSE Results.
1.6 Student Learning Outcomes
Serve
Students will serve others and be ethical and informed citizens,

1.6.1 Assessment Measure
Constitution Exam
A multiple choice exam is given to all students in HI117 & 118, through CLAS, Dual Credit, and Online.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Multiple Choice Exam - Academic Direct

1.6.1.1 Benchmark
Students will achieve an average score of 75% or better. Partly Met

BENCHMARK
All sections of HI117/118 and PS101 give a common Constitution exam. The benchmark is set at all sections achieving a 75% or better score.

FINDINGS
Overall, CLAS sections achieve an average score of 78.12. 3/4 sections met the benchmark, with one falling slightly below. Dual Credit scores averaged 81.34, with all sections meeting the 75% or better benchmark.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
Overall, students continue to perform at the benchmark level.
1.6.2 **Assessment Measure**

Wellness Exam

A wellness survey is given to all students in PE111. The results are used to inform training and programming offered to students.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Survey - Academic Indirect

1.6.2.1 **Benchmark**

Survey Completion and analysis. Survey can be found here: https://forms.gle/Q2nXRyUwrGxav1pw5

**BENCHMARK**

Students in PE111 will complete the survey

**FINDINGS**

95 students completed the survey in AY2018-19. Stress and financial considerations were the biggest reported concerns.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

See attached report.

**IMPROVEMENT**

**DESCRIPTION**

Project Attachments (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assessment_RL122 Community[4266].pdf</td>
<td>127KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMU Wellness Survey 2018_2019 (Responses).xlsx</td>
<td>21KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSSEComplied2013-19Complete.xlsx</td>
<td>35KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission

Program Mission
Health Care Administration Mission Statement
The mission of the Healthcare Administrative program is to prepare students and foster healthcare leaders who are able to create and apply evidence-based knowledge in order to enhance the health of individuals and communities worldwide. The program combines professional preparation with a liberal arts education to develop students who will cultivate an environment that will make a difference in their world though ethical service leadership and social responsibility.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Communication
a) Actively be able to access and evaluate information and then apply the knowledge, technical skills and professional competencies that are needed in order to make sound business/healthcare decisions.
b) Be able to express ideas through a variety of multimodal channels, (including both the written and spoken word) in a professional, engaged manner.
c) Articulate, explain and compare the organizational elements, structure, performance, terminology, and delivery modalities for the U.S. and global healthcare systems.

Action Plan
Action note: For this reporting period, the HIPAA training video was updated, as was the quiz due to new federal guidelines.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
HS 420 HIPAA Training Exam
In HS420 students are required to view a HIPPA training video and online materials created for this training by HHS.gov, and take the online quiz located on mycmu. Though the post test was written by CMU faculty, it follows the same guidelines and principles as those given in the U.S. HCA industry.
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Licensure exam - Academic Direct
1.1.1.1 Benchmark
Test Performance Met

BENCHMARK
Benchmark targets are 75% or above on the HIPAA exam

FINDINGS
Fall 2018: 11 students were enrolled in the class, the average score for the training was 95.5%, with all students earning 86% or above. 4 students achieved 100%. The divisions target was met. Spring 2019: 9 students were enrolled in the class, the average score for the training was 95.8%. All students scored well above our benchmark. The Division’s target was met.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
See completed action plan item for this outcome.

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Curiosity
a) Demonstrate knowledge and create solutions through continuous development of the creative, critical thinking and problem solving skills that are needed within the business/healthcare major/profession.
b) Explore career opportunities and critically evaluate principles and practices applied to global business solutions.
c) Analyze records, interpret variance and assess opportunities and risks, in order to make recommendations for action based on organizational goals.

Action Plan
Regarding the HCA/Business case study measure, as complete follow-through and following directions is extremely important in the health care field, the main instructor for this course is currently writing an instrument that will address the importance of following directions, critical thinking and problem solving. Current research is also being done, to see how other institutions are addressing these problems in their HCA programs. It is planned to also introduce an instrument such as what was just described in the introduction class to hopefully build upon these concepts throughout the program.
1.2.1 Assessment Measure
HS420: HCA/Business Case Study Analysis & Presentation
Students are required to complete a full analysis of a HCA/Business case study in order to
demonstrate competency in communication, the material learned in their major and complex
problem solving. This assignment requires both a written component, and a presentation. As
this is an online course, students are given the option of either doing a ppt, with verbal
narration, or completing a video.
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Research Paper - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
Performance benchmark Partially Met

BENCHMARK
A major-related, (HCA/Business) comprehensive case study and presentation was
the instrument used to measure this goal. The target is set at 75%.

FINDINGS
Fall 2018: 11 students were enrolled; five met the target of 75%+, (these students
scored above 85%). 6 students did not meet the target of 75%. The students who did
not meet the target chose not to complete the required presentation, chose not to
complete all of the required segments of the assignment, or chose not to complete
the assignment at all. The target was not met. Spring 2019: 9 students were enrolled.
8 students met the target of 75%+ (with an average score of 84.8%). One student
chose not to complete the assignment. The target was met.

ANALYSIS OF
FINDINGS
Within this assignment (and others in the course of the term) students are choosing
to “cherry pick” the sections they wish to cover, and are “figuring” the minimum
grade they need to “pass the class”. Some elected to not create a presentation, some
elected not to do the required additional research, and some refused to follow the
assignment directions. See action plan regarding this measure.

IMPROVEMENT
TYPE

IMPROVEMENT
DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT
1.2.2.1 Benchmark
MFT Performance **Not Met**

**BENCHMARK**

Students on the Fayette campus should earn a mean score on the MFT within 10 points of the national mean score.

**FINDINGS**

A single HCA student on the Fayette campus had a mean score of 134, which was 15.3 points lower than the national average. It is outside the standard deviation of 7 points of the national mean. This objective's benchmark of within 10 points of the national mean score was not met. The Fayette average for HCA (1 student) was 134 and all campus average was 142. A single CGES HCA student had a mean score of 126, which was 23.3 points lower than the national average. It, too, is outside the standard deviation of 7 points of the national mean. This objective's benchmark of within 10 points of the national mean score was not met. The online average for HCA (1 student) was 126 compared to the all campus average of 142.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

As the HCA program is relatively new, the reporting period data pool is very small and results may or may not be typical. We will continue to track future data to identify trends and formulate action plans as necessary. See 2019 ABE MFT Assessment Updates attached.

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Community

a) Show a clear understanding of the microenvironment between the legal, economic, and social environments within the business of healthcare
b) Demonstrate knowledge and
application of prescribed ethical codes, and behaviors and their value within both the workplace and society. c) Understand team and individual management, organizational skills, supervision and coaching techniques to effectively lead across organization, department, and work group units to meet diverse stakeholder and organizational goals in a variety of healthcare environments

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
HS420 Comprehensive Final exam
As the concepts throughout this program build upon one another, a comprehensive final exam is given in HS420. This exam consists of 75 (from a question pool) multiple choice questions

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
Test performance Partially Met

BENCHMARK
All students should score a 75% or better in the final exam.

FINDINGS
Fall 2018: 11 students were enrolled in the class. The final exam had an average score of 88.8%, and 8 of the students received 75% or better (with one 100%). 1 student elected to not take the exam, 1 student achieved a score of 73.3% (slightly below our benchmark), and one student achieved only 60%. 80% of the students who took the exam, met the division's target. Spring 2019: 9 students were enrolled in the class. The final exam had an average score of 95.8% with one student who elected to not take the exam. The 8 students who took the exam, all achieved 90% or higher, the divisions target was met.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT
## Project Attachments (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2019 ABE MFT Assessment Updates.xlsx</td>
<td>49KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS in HCA curricular map 4.21.19.docx</td>
<td>33KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 420 HIPPA Training.docx</td>
<td>12KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HS 420Final Case study and ppt rubric.docx</td>
<td>18KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission

1 Program Mission
History Department Mission
The History major is designed to familiarize students with the basic facts of both American and world history. In addition, the curriculum is designed to foster and develop critical thinking skills, research proficiency, and oral and written communications skills. By the end of the senior year, students will be well-prepared for both teaching and research at the professional or graduate school level. As historians primarily evaluate and present evidence connected with the past, History has always been an attractive pre-law major. However, the skills associated with a History degree are widely sought-after in a wide variety of different fields and disciplines, including business, academia, and other professions.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Written Communication
Students will demonstrate the ability to write clearly and objectively

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Senior Thesis
Objectives 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 will be assessed during the required senior thesis and oral defense in HI480. Theses are evaluated on a 3 point scale (not defensible, pass, pass with distinction).

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
Thesis Score
Not Reported this Period

BENCHMARK
Thesis comments and grades, maintained by students’ advisors, are reviewed by faculty to ascertain the efficacy of the curriculum in developing abilities in goals 3-5. Students will score 85% or better on all subscore and overall.

FINDINGS
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.
1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Oral Communication
Students will demonstrate the ability to explain a research question and results in an oral presentation.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Senior Thesis
Objectives 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 will be assessed during the required senior thesis and oral defense in HI480. Theses are evaluated on a 3 point scale (not defensible, pass, pass with distinction).

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
Thesis Score
Not Reported this Period

BENCHMARK
Thesis comments and grades, maintained by students' advisors, are reviewed by faculty to ascertain the efficacy of the curriculum in developing abilities in goals 3-5. Students will score 85% or better on all subscore and overall.

FINDINGS
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.
1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Historical Methodology and Critical Analysis
Students will demonstrate a mastery of historical methodology and critical analysis.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
Senior Thesis
Objectives 1.1, 1.2, and 1.3 will be assessed during the required senior thesis and oral defense in HI480. Theses are evaluated on a 3 point scale (not defensible, pass, pass with distinction).

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
Thesis scores [Not Reported this Period]

BENCHMARK
Thesis comments and grades, maintained by students' advisors, are reviewed by faculty to ascertain the efficacy of the curriculum in developing abilities in goals 3-5. Students will score 85% or better on all subscore and overall.

FINDINGS
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.

1.4 Student Learning Outcomes
American History
Students will demonstrate an understanding of the concepts, theories and general knowledge in American history.

1.4.1 Assessment Measure
History Exit Exm
The History Exit Exam was created in 2010-11 by CMU History faculty. It was designed to replace the deactivated national history exam. It is a multiple choice question test with 100 questions. Questions one through nineteen cover HI 101, the first part of the world History survey. Questions twenty through forty cover HI 102, the second part of the world History...
survey. Questions forty-one through fifty cover HI 205, the world Geography class. Questions fifty-one through seventy-five cover HI 117, the first part of the American History survey. Questions seventy-six through one hundred cover HI 118, the second part of the American history survey. Together, all of the questions should test students on the material learned in the entry level History classes offered at CMU.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.4.1.1 Benchmark</th>
<th>Exam Score - American History</th>
<th>Not Reported this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BENCHMARK**

The target for American history scores is an average of 80% on questions relating to HI 117 and HI 118.

**FINDINGS**

There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5 Student Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>World History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students will demonstrate an understanding of the concepts, theories and general knowledge in world history</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5.1 Assessment Measure</th>
<th>History Exit Exam</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The History Exit Exam was created in 2010-11 by CMU History faculty. It was designed to replace the deactivated national history exam. It is a multiple choice question test with 100 questions. Questions one through nineteen cover HI 101, the first part of the world History survey. Questions twenty through forty cover HI 102, the second part of the world History survey. Questions forty-one through fifty cover HI 205, the world Geography class. Questions fifty-one through seventy-five cover HI 117, the first part of the American History survey.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Methodist University
Questions seventy-six through one hundred cover HI 118, the second part of the American history survey. Together, all of the questions should test students on the material learned in the entry level History classes offered at CMU.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benchmark</th>
<th>Exam score</th>
<th>Not Reported this Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**BENCHMARK**
The target for world history is to score 80% or higher on questions related to HI 101, HI 102, and HI 205.

**FINDINGS**
There were no graduating seniors this year to measure.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT**

**TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**
Program Mission
Honors Program Mission
The Purpose of the Honors program is to allow exceptional students to self-actualize and pursue their areas of study in more depth. The process culminates in the writing and defense of an Honors thesis which is defended before the entire school and then placed on reserve in the library.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Student Involvement
A goal of the Honors is to have at least five per cent of the student body taking Honors classes or doing Honors work each semester.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Student enrollment data
The Honors program should have student participation in the program totaling at least 5% of the total student population.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Enrollment Records - Administrative

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
5% student enrollment

BENCHMARK
Five per cent of total student population should participate in the Honors program.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT
1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Research Skills
The goal is to have students successfully completing the Honors senior thesis score an average of 30 points out of forty on the research skills section of the thesis rubric completed by the committee.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Senior thesis
The goal is to have students successfully completing the Honors senior thesis score an average of 30 points out of forty on the research skills section of the thesis rubric completed by the committee.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
30/40 point total Met

BENCHMARK
The goal is to have students successfully completing the Honors senior thesis score an average of 30 points out of forty on the research skills section of the thesis rubric completed by the committee.

FINDINGS
All honors students met or exceeded the desired rubric score.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Oral Communication Skills
The student should be able to orally present Honors research in a thesis defense before a faculty committee. The student should also be able to successfully answer faculty questions during this public defense.
1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**
Senior Thesis
The student should be able to orally present Honors research in a thesis defense before a faculty committee. The student should also be able to successfully answer faculty questions during this public defense.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**
7/10 Met

**BENCHMARK**
The objective is to have students successfully completing the Honors senior thesis score and average of 7 out of 10 on the oral communications component of the thesis rubric prepared by the committee.

**FINDINGS**
All honors students met or exceeded the desired rubric score.

1.4 **Student Learning Outcomes**
Writing Skills
The objective was to have students score an average of thirty-five points on points one through three on the writing sections of the Honors senior thesis rubric completed by the faculty committee at the end of the defense. 1. "Topic properly narrowed and appropriate--thesis clearly stated. (Original?) 0-10 2. Paper is well-edited with no major mechanical problems? 0-10 3. The paper is logically structured, i.e., it asks a clear question and organizes and presents research that is relevant to answering that question. 0-30

1.4.1 **Assessment Measure**
Senior Thesis
The objective is to have students score an average of thirty-five points on points one through three on the writing sections of the Honors senior thesis rubric completed by the faculty
committee at the end of the defense. 1. "Topic properly narrowed and appropriate--thesis clearly stated. (Original?) 0-10 2. Paper is well-edited with no major mechanical problems? 0-10 3. The paper is logically structured, i.e., it asks a clear question and organizes and presents research that is relevant to answering that question. 0-30

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.4.1.1 Benchmark
Average Score Met

BENCHMARK
The objective was to have students score an average of thirty-five points on points one through three on the writing sections of the Honors senior thesis rubric completed by the faculty committee at the end of the defense.

FINDINGS
All honors students met or exceeded the desired rubric score.
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
This major prepares students for graduate school in marine biology or to work as a marine biologist. Opportunities include research in aquaculture, biodiversity, ecology, education, fisheries, pathology, invertebrate zoology, mammalogy, and toxicology. Combined with a basic background in general biology, marine biology is essential for continued monitoring of marine organisms and environment for recreation, biodiversity, and food production. All marine biology courses are taken in the summer at the Gulf Coast Research Lab at Ocean Springs, Mississippi. The coursework credit is given by The University of Southern Mississippi and transferred to Central Methodist upon completion of each summer’s work. The student has the option of graduating with a Bachelor of Science Degree or a Bachelor of Arts Degree.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Biology knowledge base
Students should have the ability to demonstrate a fundamental level of academic competence in core biological content and issue knowledge.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Major Field Test
Marine Biology majors are required to take the Major Field Test (MFT) in biology before graduation, preferably during their senior year.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
The benchmark for success on the MFT is considered to be in the 30th percentile with the goal of the average moving to the 50th percentile.
1.1.2 **Assessment Measure**

**Science Seminar**

All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship or special problems experience in SC 425, Interdisciplinary Science Seminar. Biology faculty and faculty in the Science Division will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments on a grade sheet. The faculty members will evaluate the student's effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experience.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

1.1.2.1 **Benchmark**

It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluation for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%. Areas of particular interest include adequate preparation from existing course work, lab facilities to carry out this research, and use of appropriate technology in the research and the presentation.

**BENCHMARK**

**FINDINGS**

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**

---

1.2 **Student Learning Outcomes**

**Marine Biology Concepts**

Students will use the principles of biological classification to examine the diversity of life and identify the phylogenetic relationships of the major groups of organisms.
1.2.1 **Assessment Measure**

**Science Seminar**
All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship or special problems experience in SC 425, Interdisciplinary Science Seminar. Biology faculty and faculty in the Science Division will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments on a grade sheet. The faculty members will evaluate the student’s effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experience.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

1.2.1.1 **Benchmark**

It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluation for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%. Areas of particular interest include adequate preparation from existing course work, lab facilities to carry out this research, and use of appropriate technology in the research and the presentation.

**BENCHMARK**

**FINDINGS**

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**

1.2.2 **Assessment Measure**

**Lab Practices**

Periodically, all labs will be assessed for their effectiveness.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

1.2.2.1 **Benchmark**

Any lab for which the yearly average is < 60% will be re-evaluated for its effectiveness and how it can be improved to become a better teaching instrument.

**BENCHMARK**

**FINDINGS**
1.3 **Student Learning Outcomes**

Communication of Marine Bio. Knowledge and Ability

The well-trained Marine Biology major should be able to communicate effectively, both orally and in writing, about biology or marine biology concepts.

1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**

Science Seminar

All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship or special problems experience in SC 425, Interdisciplinary Science Seminar. Biology faculty and faculty in the Science Division will grade the seminar presentation by making written comments on a grade sheet. The faculty members will evaluate the student’s effectiveness in communicating key concepts and principles, correctly analyzing and interpreting data (when applicable) and making valid conclusions of their experience.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**

It is expected that all students will receive >75% on their formal evaluation for Science Seminar. Student work will be re-evaluated for any semester in which the average is <75%.
Program Mission

Conservatory Mission Statement
The faculty of the Swinney Conservatory are committed to facilitating student growth. Daily, we create opportunities for engaged students to develop musical maturity, intellectual curiosity, and commitment to the community. Our graduates demonstrate professional and musical excellence, creative and analytical thinking, articulate and thoughtful communication, and a commitment to service and leadership.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes

Administer a music program
Graduates will have the skills necessary to develop, coordinate, supervise, and evaluate a school music program with appropriate use of fiscal and human resources to best meet the needs of the enrolled children.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure

Master's Report - Administration
In the master’s report, students explain the current state of their program and their goals for maintaining or developing the program.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.1.1.1 Benchmark

Administration Met

BENCHMARK
Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

FINDINGS
All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.87/3.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
No Improvements Deemed Necessary
1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

Pedagogical skills

Graduates will have the skills necessary to assess the instructional needs of students and employ a variety of pedagogical techniques to help students develop musical skills.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure

Master’s Report - Pedagogy

In the master’s report, students will give evidence of mastery of a variety of pedagogical skills.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark

Pedagogy

BENCHMARK

Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

FINDINGS

All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.73/3.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes

Evaluate current issues in music education

Graduates will have the skills necessary to evaluate current issues in music education from an ethical, philosophical, technological, and historical framework while providing leadership for change.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure

Master’s Report - current issues

In the master’s report, students will give evidence that current ethical, philosophical,
technological, and historical issues are considered in the decision making process.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

### 1.3.1.1 Benchmark

**Current issues** Met

**BENCHMARK**
Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

**FINDINGS**
All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.67/3.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**
Academic

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**
No Improvements Deemed Necessary

### 1.4 Student Learning Outcomes

**Conducting**
Graduates will use conducting gesture to communicate musical information gathered through score study.

### 1.4.1 Assessment Measure

**Master’s report - conducting**
In the master’s report concert, students will conduct appropriately.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

### 1.4.1.1 Benchmark

**Conducting** Met

**BENCHMARK**
Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

**FINDINGS**
All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.67/3.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
1.5 **Student Learning Outcomes**
Use of technology
Graduates will assess the usefulness of a variety of technologies available to music educators and appraise the usefulness of the technologies in the classroom.

1.5.1 **Assessment Measure**
Master’s report - technology
In the master’s report, students will show evidence of understanding strategies for use technology effectively as a teaching/learning tool.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.5.1.1 **Benchmark**
Technology **Met**

**BENCHMARK**
Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

**FINDINGS**
All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.40/3.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**
Academic

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**
No Improvements Deemed Necessary

1.6 **Student Learning Outcomes**
Apply knowledge of music history and theory
Graduates will apply knowledge of music history and music theory to develop informed interpretations of music and communicate to students a deeper understanding of music they...
hear or perform.

1.6.1 Assessment Measure
Master’s report - history and theory
In the master’s report (analyses and prose), students will show evidence of understanding music theory and history. Analyses will reflect a deep understanding.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.6.1.1 Benchmark
History/Theory Met

BENCHMARK
Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

FINDINGS
All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.70/3.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
No Improvements Deemed Necessary

1.7 Student Learning Outcomes
Communication skills
Graduates will express themselves effectively, orally and in writing, amongst a community of scholars and practitioners.

1.7.1 Assessment Measure
Master’s report - communication
At the master’s report concert, students will communicate effectively with spoken word to the audience. In the master’s report, students will write effectively at a graduate level.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.7.1.1 Benchmark
Communication skills Met
BENCHMARK
Each student will earn a 2 (satisfactory) on the MR rubric as assessed by the faculty.

FINDINGS
All students met the goal. The cohort average was 2.60/3.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
No Improvements Deemed Necessary
Institutional Mission

Program Mission

Master of Education Mission
The M.Ed. program prepares graduate students for success in careers in teaching and education administration at the elementary, secondary, and higher education levels. The M.Ed. program requires 36 graduate hours of credit and can be completed during full or part-time study. The program is hybrid in design with many courses offered online, with live instruction available at CMU locations in Fayette, Columbia, Park Hills, Poplar Bluff, Sedalia, St. Louis, Trenton, and Union.

Student Learning Outcomes

Data Analysis Skills
Students will demonstrate capacity for the application of qualitative and quantitative data analysis

Assessment Measure

Final Project
Masters candidates in education complete a final project [thesis] paper as a part of the requirement for the course ED 596 - final project. To enroll in ED 596 students must first satisfactorily complete the ED 595 Research seminar in which they develop a research question, do preliminary research on their question, and prepare an annotated outline for the final project. The annotated outline is evaluated through six research conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. The Final Project paper is evaluated through a series of at least five writing conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. All final project papers are made available to all members of the graduate committee for review and comment through a dedicated graduate program space in the mycmu software

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

Benchmark

Final Project Rubric Met

BENCHMARK
Annual cohorts will average 80% or higher on the final project rubric, The paper asks a clear question and organizes and presents research that is relevant to answering
that question. Connected Documents:

**FINDINGS**
The 17 completers in the 2019-2020 cohort had an overall average of 97% on item #2 on the final project.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The cohort average for item #5 (overall score) for the final project is 90% and exceeds the benchmark.

**IMPROVEMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>Student Learning Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Student will demonstrate proficiency in library, archival and database research.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assessment Measure**

**Final Project**
Masters candidates in education complete a final project [thesis] paper as a part of the requirement for the course ED 596 - final project. To enroll in ED 596 students must first satisfactorily complete the ED 595 Research seminar in which they develop a research question, do preliminary research on their question, and prepare an annotated outline for the final project. The annotated outline is evaluated through six research conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. The Final Project paper is evaluated through a series of at least five writing conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. All final project papers are made available to all members of the graduate committee for review and comment through a dedicated graduate program space in the mycmu software.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

**Benchmark**

**Final Project Rubric** Met

**BENCHMARK**
Annual cohorts will average 80% or above on rubric item 3, Paper draws on sufficient high quality research within the appropriate discipline to be credible.
FINDINGS

The 17 program completers in the 2019-20 cohort had an average score of 93 on item #3 of the final project scoring rubric (research).

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The cohort’s average score on item #3 (research) exceeds the benchmark for this item.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes

Research Design

Student will demonstrate proficiency in research design, including the logical structure of the research question and the research evidence related to answering the question.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure

Final Project

Masters candidates in education complete a final project [thesis] paper as a part of the requirement for the course ED 596 - final project. To enroll in ED 596 students must first satisfactorily complete the ED 595 Research seminar in which they develop a research question, do preliminary research on their question, and prepare an annotated outline for the final project. The annotated outline is evaluated through six research conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. The Final Project paper is evaluated through a series of at least five writing conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. All final project papers are made available to all members of the graduate committee for review and comment through a dedicated graduate program space in the mycmu software

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 Benchmark

Final Project Rubric

Annual cohorts will average 80% or above on rubric item 2, Logical Structure.

FINDINGS

The 17 program completers included in the 2019-20 cohort averaged 97 on item #2 (Logical Structure) of the scoring rubric.
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

The cohort’s item #2 average exceeds the benchmark for this item.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.4 Student Learning Outcomes
Communication of Research Findings
The student will demonstrate a graduate level proficiency in the written analysis and explanation of research findings.

1.4.1 Assessment Measure
Final Project
Masters candidates in education complete a final project [thesis] paper as a part of the requirement for the course ED 596 - final project. To enroll in ED 596 students must first satisfactorily complete the ED 595 Research seminar in which they develop a research question, do preliminary research on their question, and prepare an annotated outline for the final project. The annotated outline is evaluated through six research conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. The Final Project paper is evaluated through a series of at least five writing conferences and the use of a standard grading rubric. All final project papers are made available to all members of the graduate committee for review and comment through a dedicated graduate program space in the mycmu software

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.4.1.1 Benchmark
Final Project Rubric Met

BENCHMARK
Annual cohort averages on the evaluator rubric will equal or exceed 80% on item 1 "Mechanics and editing and item 1 on the scoring rubric.

FINDINGS
The 2019-20 cohort averaged 90 on item 1 of the scoring rubric.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
The 2019-20 cohort’s item 1 average score exceeded the benchmark for this item.
## Project Attachments (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Final Project Rubric.docx</td>
<td>14KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Thesis Data for Weave 2019.xlsx</td>
<td>16KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.Ed. Thesis Data for Weave 2020.xlsx</td>
<td>16KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Mathematics Department Mission
The mathematics major is designed to prepare students to work in areas which require critical thinking skills and the ability to work with mathematical concepts. Students who complete a mathematics major at CMU are prepared to enter the job force in jobs requiring mathematical expertise and critical thinking skills, to attend graduate school in mathematics, statistics and/or engineering, and to teach mathematics in the middle and secondary grades.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Demonstrate Proficiency in Mathematics
Students who are proficient in undergraduate mathematics should be able to: a. think quantitatively b. problem solve c. communicate mathematically d. make connections among the various branches of mathematics and to areas outside of mathematics e. apply their knowledge to real world applications

Action Plan
Gather assessment data for MA105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 1</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create common assessment for MA105</td>
<td>11/27/2019</td>
<td>12/31/2019</td>
<td>Planned</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 2</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Major Field Test - Mathematics
Mathematical test of general knowledge majors who are not working towards certification take the MFT.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
1.1.1.1 Benchmark

The benchmark for success on the MFT is considered to be in the 30th percentile with the goal of the average moving to the 50th percentile. These levels were chosen because the test is designed for students who typically graduate with more hours in mathematics than students from CMU.

Not Reported this Period

Benchmark
The benchmark for success on the MFT is considered to be in the 30th percentile with the goal of the average moving to the 50th percentile.

FINDINGS
A few students took the MFT in math in S2019, but those results haven’t made it back to the math department. We’ll have to work on tracking these down, but in any case, our sample size will be too low to get a detailed and statistically valid analysis.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

1.1.2 Assessment Measure

Senior research project
In order to measure whether student can think quantitatively, problem solve, communicate mathematically, make connections among the various branches of mathematics and to areas outside of mathematics, the mathematics department requires each major to complete a three hour mathematics special problems course, MA 480 as a capstone experience. The major, working with a faculty advisor, will complete a research project in mathematics and/or mathematics education depending on the student’s interests. The student and advisor will come up with a “question” and the student will do the research and/or action research to answer the question and to make suggestions for furthering the research. Faculty members will work with each student throughout his/her project. Students will be required to turn in a written report describing their results prior to graduation. (These papers will be on file in the mathematics department.) In addition each student will be enrolled in SC 425 Science Seminar, Capstone. Each student will be required to present his/her research during the seminar.
1.1.2.1 Benchmark

All majors must successfully complete MA460 and SC425 with a grade of C or higher. Student work and curricular requirements will be re-evaluated for years in which student performance does not meet these expectations.

FINDINGS

All 3 students enrolled in MA480 received an A in S2019. The other math majors who presented on their primary major at SC425 received satisfactory scores (according to the SC425 data) as well.

1.1.3 Assessment Measure

Course Assessments

Course Assessment Summary Reports for MA103 and MA109.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.1.3.1 Benchmark

Gather course assessment data for two of our major service courses (MA109/I, MA103/I, MA105)

FINDINGS

Assessment summaries in Project Attachments

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Results were generally satisfactory, but areas for improvement in each course are noted in the assessment summaries.
IMPROVEMENT TYPE  Academic

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION  Action plan created

Data was gathered for MA109/I and MA103/I, which had not been done in the past. We need to work on standardizing measures for MA103 and gathering assessment data for MA105 for AY2019-2020.

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Communicate Mathematical Concepts
Students majoring in mathematics should be able to communicate, through writing and oral communication, their understanding of mathematical concepts and functions.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Senior Research Project
In order to measure whether student can think quantitatively, problem solve, communicate mathematically, make connections among the various branches of mathematics and to areas outside of mathematics, the mathematics department requires each major to complete a three hour mathematics special problems course, MA 460 as a capstone experience. The major, working with a faculty advisor, will complete a research project in mathematics and/or mathematics education depending on the student’s interests. The student and advisor will come up with a “question” and the student will do the research and/or action research to answer the question and to make suggestions for furthering the research. Faculty members will work with each student throughout his/her project. Students will be required to turn in a written report describing their results prior to graduation. (These papers will be on file in the mathematics department.) In addition each student will be enrolled in SC 425 Science Seminar, Capstone. Each student will be required to present his/her research during the seminar.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
All students complete SC425 with a C or better and submit a completed capstone research paper. Met

BENCHMARK  All students complete SC425 with a C or better and submit a completed capstone research paper.
FINDINGS
All 3 students successfully completed their presentation and capstone research papers.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
All received an A on these projects, and from the capstone papers, their writing abilities were very satisfactory. This was a particularly strong group of students, so these results aren’t surprising.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic Process Modifications

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
Assessment Revision Needed

IMPROVEMENT
Just collecting capstone papers and using a common rubric has been a good first step in this process. Going forward, we need to ensure consistent collection and storage of papers, as well as update the rubrics as needed for our department. Another issue is that most people who receive math majors do so as a second major. We’ll have to work with other departments to collect better data and track these students more effectively.

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Application of Mathematical Knowledge
Students majoring in mathematics will be able to apply their knowledge practically, using critical thinking skills and methods.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
Graduate Survey
We presently keep track of our students on an informal basis.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
The majority of math majors will find employment in a mathematics related field.

BENCHMARK
The majority of math majors will find employment in a mathematics related field.

FINDINGS
No specific survey information has been received. From last spring, one major is working in the insurance industry, one in banking, one in an astronomy graduate program, and another is in the engineering program at Missouri S&T (as part of the 3-2 program).
ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic Process Modifications

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
Assessment Revision Needed

IMPROVEMENT
We need to have a better way to track math majors, especially since it is a second major for so many students. Currently, we’ve had to directly request data from Amber, but having the ability to access this data easily and on demand would be much more helpful.

Project Attachments (4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA 103 Assessment data Gordy S2019.xlsx</td>
<td>21KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA103 Assessment 2019-Spring.doc</td>
<td>70KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA109 assessment summary SP19.doc</td>
<td>66KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA109 Final exams.xlsx</td>
<td>9KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Music Program Mission Statement
The faculty of the Swinney Conservatory are committed to facilitating student growth. Daily, we create opportunities for engaged students to develop musical maturity, intellectual curiosity, and commitment to the community. Our graduates demonstrate professional and musical excellence, creative and analytical thinking, articulate and thoughtful communication, and a commitment to service and leadership. The Conservatory serves three constituencies: scholar-musicians preparing for a career in music, students participating in music as an additional dimension to their studies, and those who participate in music to increase their knowledge and aesthetic sensitivity.

Student Learning Outcomes
Theory and Aural Skills
Students will acquire a body of knowledge and technical skills necessary to pursue music as a profession and/or post graduate study. Discovering, analyzing, and creating music and the skills necessary to communicate effectively orally and in writing are key to developing mastery of this thread.

Assessment Measure
Student Survey - Theory Sequence
The Theory faculty will discuss and analyze the results of the Theory Sequence Survey completed by students during MU465 Form & Analysis. When evidence suggests that change is needed, action plans will be developed.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Student Exit Survey - Academic Indirect

Benchmark
Theory sequence exit survey Met

All students will perceive that they grew as theorists and thinkers as a result of the theory courses.
All students perceive growth as theorists and thinkers.

The results of the Theory Sequence Exit Survey were largely positive and specifically complimentary of the faculty.

A few specific things were discussed regarding comments and suggestions from students and observations of faculty:

- Multiple students have addressed the speed at which certain courses move (MU150 moves too slow, MU465 moves too fast). We conclude that the pace of each is adequate due to the level of the course and the amount of material needed to cover in each course.
- We will continue as planned with the current writing sequence as multiple students commented on the helpfulness of writing in each course, culminating in MU465.
- Dr. Simons will work closely with Dr. Perkins to more closely align MU465 with MU322 (Music History II). Students noticed some overlap, but would like to see more.
- Several students commented on having a semester off between Theory III and Form. While some students appreciated the “clean slate,” others felt that the time off made it difficult to review and get back into the swing of things. Since this was the first year since this change was implemented, we decided to wait for another round of surveys before making any change.

### Improvement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improvement Type</th>
<th>Improvement Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1.2</strong> Assessment Measure</td>
<td>Writing Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory faculty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BENCHMARK</td>
<td>All students’ writing skills will improve over the 5-course theory sequence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>The writing skills of a representative sample (30%) showed improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS</td>
<td>The theory faculty met July 29, 2019 to compare a random sample of student papers. Writings from MU150 and MU465 were selected from 30% (3/10) of completers of the theory sequence. (Pre-test/Post-test model)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We compared students’ writing skills in four categories:
- Introduction effectively sets stage for paper. Thesis sentence is original and well thought out.
- Paper has clear, easy to follow structure with sufficient development. Presentation of analysis is thorough and specific in proving thesis.
- Academic tone is consistent throughout. Paper is clear, concise, and compelling. No grammatical errors.
- Conclusion is thought provoking and speculative.

All students showed improvement in writing introductions. Specifically, 33% improved in organization of the introduction and narrowing to the thesis statement. 66% employed greater sophistication in the writing style (sentence structure, flow).

All students did well in the structure category on both the 150 and 465 papers. Though there was no improvement, students were able to transfer their skills to writing about more complex music.

One student’s use of academic tone was poorer in 465 (the student also earned a lower grade on the 465 paper*). We suspect she did not work as hard on the 465 paper. The other students’ skills in using of academic tone were more mature and used musical language more appropriately.

All students improved their skills in writing conclusions.

*Faculty use the same rubric in assessing student papers and discuss grading philosophies and approaches.
1.1.3 **Assessment Measure**
Aural Skills Proficiency Exam

Over the course of the three semester aural skills sequence, students will complete an Aural Skills Proficiency Exam.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Performance - Academic Direct

1.1.3.1 **Benchmark**
Aural Skills I Proficiency Exam **Met**

**BENCHMARK**
80% of students will earn a pass or provisional pass on the exam.

**FINDINGS**
100% of the students earned a pass of provisional pass (five with provisions to repeat one or two of the skills by midterm of Aural Skills II).

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The new Aural Skills I Proficiency Exam was given to 18 students on May 6, 2019. All students passed, five with provisions to repeat one or two of the skills by midterm of Aural Skills II. All Aural Skills faculty and the Dean of the Conservatory were present for all or a portion of the exams. Faculty discussed student performance between and following the exams. We were overall pleased with the choice of skills tested and student performance. We will meet in the fall to talk about increasing the difficulty of the exam and possibly shifting a few of the AS II learning outcomes to AS I, as well as discussing the AS II Proficiency Exam in more depth (including possible test question examples). The Aural Skill I Proficiency Exam will be used with other assessments to admit students into the honors section of Aural Skills II this fall. We agreed that meeting to discuss outcomes and having students take a skills oriented exam has been beneficial to us as faculty in our day to day teaching. The exam also seemed to add some importance to this portion of the music curriculum in the minds of students.
1.1.4 Assessment Measure
MoCA Theory
The Missouri Content Assessment (MoCA) is the certification exam for music educators in Missouri.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Licensure exam - Academic Direct

1.1.4.1 Benchmark
The MoCA assesses student’s skills and understanding in theory and aural analysis of music.

BENCHMARK
80% of students who matriculate and graduate with a BME will score at a 3 (meets expectation) or higher.

FINDINGS
80% (4/5) scored at the 3 or higher in the theory section of the MoCA. 80% (4/5) scored 3 or higher on the aural analysis section. The cohort average was 3.33.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
The theory and aural skills coursework appears to appropriately prepare students to pass the licensure exam. Presumably, this means they have the requisite theory and aural skills to teach.

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Music History and Literature
Students will acquire a body of knowledge and academic skills in Music History and Literature sufficient to pursue music as a profession and/or post graduate study. Discovering, analyzing, and creating music and the skills necessary to communicate effectively orally and in writing are key to achieving this thread.
1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Student Survey - History Sequence
The History faculty will discuss and analyze the results of the History Sequence Survey completed by students during MU423 American Music History. When evidence suggests that change is needed, action plans will be developed.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Student Exit Survey - Academic Indirect

1.2.1.1 Benchmark
History sequence exit survey Partially Met

BENCHMARK
80% of students will see value in the study of music history.

FINDINGS
There is evidence that students see some value in music history and a connection to their musical lives.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
In reviewing the survey results, it appears the instrument is more akin to an SEI than a self-evaluation of student learning. The survey needs to be revised to collect data that is tied to the student outcome.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE
Academic Process Modifications

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION
Assessment Revision Needed

IMPROVEMENT
The survey instrument was revised and yielded more helpful information.

1.2.2 Assessment Measure
MoCA History/Culture
The Missouri Content Assessment (MoCA) is the certification exam for music educators in Missouri.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Licensure exam - Academic Direct

1.2.2.1 Benchmark
The MoCA assess student’s skills and understanding in music history/culture. Met

BENCHMARK
80% of students who matriculate and graduate with a BME will score at a 2 (just below state benchmark). Explanation: The lower threshold is acceptable because students have not finished the history sequence of courses when they take the
MoCA.

**FINDINGS**

100% of the students scored at the 2 level. 50% scored a 3 or higher. The cohort average was 2.67.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

The music history coursework appears to appropriately prepare students to pass the licensure exam. If history test scores begin to be a problem for passing exam, we will encourage students to wait to take the test until after complete the final course in the sequence.

**1.3 Student Learning Outcomes**

**Performance Skills**

Students will acquire a body of knowledge and performance skills in three areas: 1. Playing or singing skills sufficient for small and large ensemble participation. 2. Play or singing skills sufficient for performing a creditable public recital. 3. Playing reference instruments (piano and guitar) with a level of proficiency necessary for demonstration and teaching. The development of curiosity and the discipline to master skills is required for acquisition of performance skills at any level. Performing music is always an act of communication and often serves the community.

**1.3.1 Assessment Measure**

**Performance skills - ensemble**

Students perform sufficiently for satisfactory small and large ensemble participation. The Dean of the Conservatory attends nearly every concert performance (small and large ensemble). At these concerts she assesses the collective work of the students and professors and reports observations to the professors. Evaluation of large and small ensemble coaching is included in the Department Chair Response to Faculty Self-Evaluation. Some faculty also document goals and reflections of student/ensemble progress.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Performance - Academic Direct
1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**

**Ensemble skills** Met

**Benchmark**

Students will musically perform concerts with technical and stylistic accuracy.

**Findings**

Students in small and large ensembles are consistently performing with appropriate technical and stylistic skills.

**Analysis of Findings**

The Dean of the Conservatory attended nearly all concert performances (at least one for every ensemble) and found the performances to show evidence that students are performing musically with accuracy and appropriate style.

**Improvement Type**

Academic

**Improvement Description**

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

---

1.3.2 **Assessment Measure**

**Performance skills - solo**

Students perform with solo instrument/voice at a level sufficient for creditable public performance by one who professes music.

**Source of Evidence**

Performance - Academic Direct

---

1.3.2.1 **Benchmark** Met

**Benchmark**

80% of students will experience appropriate growth.

**Findings**

100% of students met the outcome.

**Analysis of Findings**

Studio faculty assessed their students’ growth from matriculation to graduation. Students are learning well in the studio setting. (see 1_2_3_1 student evaluations document)

**Improvement Type**

Academic

**Improvement Description**

No Improvements Deemed Necessary
1.3.3 **Assessment Measure**

Performance skills - reference instruments

Students are proficient with reference instruments at the level necessary for demonstration and teaching.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Performance - Academic Direct

---

1.3.3.1 **Benchmark**

**piano proficiency exam** *(Met)*

**BENCHMARK**

85% of students will earn a pass or provisional pass on the piano proficiency exam

**FINDINGS**

13/15 students met the standard - 87% earned a pass or provisional pass (7 provisional pass, 6 full pass)

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

Students are mastering piano skills at an appropriate level.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

Academic

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

---

1.3.3.2 **Benchmark**

**guitar playing and teaching assessment** *(Met)*

**BENCHMARK**

85% of students will earn an 80% on the assessment

**FINDINGS**

100% of students passed the assessment with an 80% or higher.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

Students are mastering basic guitar skills and are demonstrating teaching skills appropriate for a first year student. Earlier in the semester a similar exam was given and 3/19 did not pass at the 80% level. All three improved their scores on the second exam.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

Academic
### 1.4 Student Learning Outcomes

**Leading and Teaching Others**

Students will acquire proficient conducting skills, develop an understanding of psychology and pedagogy, and will demonstrate sufficient synthesis of the knowledge and skills of music making to begin a teaching career or enter post-graduate study. Leading and teaching require effective communication, curiosity about the subject matter and pedagogy, and service, respect, and leadership of the community.

---

#### Action Plan

Add materials pertaining to classroom management and effective communication to ED370 and ED376 in spring 2020. Monitor student abilities and scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 1</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional &quot;classroom management&quot; instruction</td>
<td>7/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action Item 2</th>
<th>Created</th>
<th>Due</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>additional &quot;effective communication&quot; instruction</td>
<td>7/24/2019</td>
<td></td>
<td>In Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Assessment Measure

**Student Teaching Assessments**

The music education faculty will meet annually to analyze data collected from the student teacher surveys and the cooperating teacher surveys. Action plans will be developed as necessary.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Clinical Evaluations, Reviews - Academic Direct

---

#### Benchmark

**MEES and cooperating teacher survey**

The cohort average will be at or above 3.0 in all categories on the MEES and the cooperating teacher survey.
The cohort average exceeded the 3.0 "skilled candidate" status.

**Student Teacher Surveys**

We had 6 student teachers this year from the Fayette campus, two in the fall term and four in the spring term, and 2 from the Three Rivers Campus, both in the spring. We separated the scores for the two groups because we don't have as much influence on the teacher preparation of the Three Rivers students as we do the students from the Fayette campus. Based on the Student Teacher Surveys, it appears that they felt the least prepared in the areas of Classroom Management (2.83/4) for the Fayette campus, and Behavior Management (2.5/4) for the Three Rivers campus. For Three Rivers, Assessment Strategies was a 2/ but only one of the students responded to that category. In the survey of 2017–2018 student teachers, the area they felt least prepared in was also Classroom Management (2.66/4) and we added more to ED370 in that area for the 2018-19 class.

Comparing the last two years shows some scores went up and some went down, although the ones that went down were very small changes. Ability to reflect on their own instruction and Ability to differentiate instruction went from 3.66 to 3.5. Professionalism went from 4 to 3.5 this year as well. So, it the students this year still lacked confidence in their preparation to handle a classroom and the situations that might occur.

**Cooperating Teacher Surveys**

The Cooperating Teacher Surveys seem to also indicate that the Student Teachers were weakest in Behavior Management (3.0/4) and Classroom Management (3.0/4) as well. We only have data for the Fayette campus for this part of the survey.

**Action:**

In order to better equip our students to be able to handle classroom management skills (organization, paper flow, grading, transitions, etc.), we plan to use classroom management videos as well as reading and discussing articles on classroom management. We will discuss strategies with the students on how to be organized in their student teaching experience and how to “stay ahead” of things. We also believe bringing in a second or third year teacher to talk about some of the techniques that they used that worked and didn’t work will help the students see a more practical
In looking at the results of the Summative Evaluation for the Cooperating Teachers, it appears that Effective Communication was the weakest area (3.33/4) for our Student Teachers on the Fayette campus, and there were 5 areas for the Three Rivers campus that averaged out at 3.5/4. We think that it is significant that ALL our averages for each of the 9 Quality Indicators were above the “3” level, which is ideally where we want the student teachers to be, and only 1 student teacher received less than 3 in any area. (a 2)

On the Summative Evaluation from the Supervising Teachers, 5 areas averaged out to a 3.5/4.0. Those areas were Student Learning, Growth, and Development; Curriculum Development; Critical Thinking; Positive Classroom Environment; and Effective Communication. We believe that these are not areas of concern as the scores are still half a point above where we want them to be. Also, none of our student teachers got lower than a 3 from their Supervising Teacher in any area. Our Thoughts:

We feel our student teachers are very well-prepared when they go out to student teach. Of course, there are areas they feel they are not as prepared as others as indicated on the Student Teacher Survey. We will continue to try to give them more information and experience on the areas they feel they are lacking.

Action: Since Effective Communication was the area the Cooperating Teachers felt needed the most work, we will spend more time working with the students on how to present themselves to a class. We will also give them more opportunities to talk in front of the class, using it as a “lab” for their upcoming placement.

Overall Conclusion:

Based on the data from the 2018 – 2019 school year using both the surveys and Summative Evaluations, more focus needs to be placed on these areas.

1. Classroom management and student behavior management strategies.
2. Effective communication in the classroom.

**Improvement Type**

**Improvement Description**

Academic Process Modifications

Action Plan implemented; will assess next cycle

### 1.4.2 Assessment Measure

**Music Ministry Leadership**

The professor of the MU401 Rehearsal Techniques course provided a summary of his observations of students in the class including reflection on each student’s growth throughout the program.

**Source of Evidence**

Observation of Students - Academic Direct

### 1.4.2.1 Benchmark

Student’s skills in teaching and leading others in worship ensemble rehearsals will become more effective.

**Benchmark**

90% of students will show appropriate growth.

**Findings**

100% (2/2) of students in MU401 showed improved teaching effectiveness in the class and throughout the program.

**Analysis of Findings**

We are pleased the the number of opportunities students have to lead and teach in the music ministry degree seems to be allowing appropriate growth as they prepare to be music ministers. Summaries are included in "1_4_2_1 MM lead and teach.pdf."

### 1.4.3 Assessment Measure

**MoCA music ed/tech**

The Missouri Content Assessment (MoCA) is the certification exam for music educators in
1.4.3.1 **Benchmark**
The MoCA assesses students' skills in music education pedagogy and technology.

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**
80% of students who matriculate and graduate with a BME will score at a 2 (just below state benchmark). Explanation: The lower threshold is acceptable because much of the coursework in this area happens after the exam is taken.

**FINDINGS**
100% scored at the 2 or higher in the music education/technology section of the MoCA. 4/6 scored a 3 or a 4. The cohort average was 3.0.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The music education and technology coursework appears to appropriately prepare students to pass the licensure exam. If test scores begin to be a problem for passing exam, we will encourage students to wait to take the test until after completing the final course in the sequence.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**

---

**Project Attachments (8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1_1_1_1 student survey theory.pdf</td>
<td>60KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1_2_1_1 HistorySurvey_Fa2018.pdf</td>
<td>96KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1_3_2_1 senior evaluations.pdf</td>
<td>99KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1_3_3_2 Guitar teaching 1 2018.pdf</td>
<td>73KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

1 Program Mission
Physics Department Mission
The physics major is designed to prepare students for graduate school in physics and allied areas of science and engineering. Students will also be qualified for scientific or technical employment with industry or government. It is also designed to prepare students to teach physics at the high school level. The student has the option of graduating with a Bachelor of Science degree or with a Bachelor of Arts degree.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Knowledge of Physics
Physics majors should have a thorough knowledge & comprehension of the fundamental concepts and scientific theories of physics. In addition, they should be competent problem-solvers of both theoretical and practical problems.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Major Field Test
Students take this nationally normed examination prior to graduation to assess their knowledge base in the field of Physics. Results from this testing will be used to evaluate course offerings and course content to determine if adjustments should be made to the curriculum. It may be necessary to compile data over a 4-5 year period due to the small number of physics majors to get meaningful data on any potential curricular adjustments.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Multiple Choice Exam - Academic Direct

1.1.1.1 Benchmark
Not Reported this Period

BENCHMARK
It is acceptable for the average score to be in the 30th percentile with the goal of the average in time moving to the 50th percentile.

FINDINGS
This year two physics majors took the Physics Major Field test. Due to the low
number of students that took the exam I do not have data on the results of the test.

I attempt to gather data from the major field test from the physics majors but the low number of students does not allow the viewing of this data. Possible an in house exam would be a better way measure this outcome. I did talk with the two physics majors after the exam to get a feeling of how the preformed. They commented that the test does cover all they learned in the physics course and also went a bit deeper in some areas but they did attest to the fact that the material they were tested on they had seen in their courses.

### Student Learning Outcomes
**Proficiency in Physics Laboratory Skills**
Physics majors should be competent, ethical, and safety-conscious in the lab. They should be able to design and set up an experiment, collect and analyze data, properly document experiment procedures and data, identify sources of error, interpret results and make relevant connections to other areas in physics and other science disciplines.

### Assessment Measure
**Lab Course scores**
Any laboratory exercise in any course in which the year average grade for the class was < 60% will be reevaluated for potential problems and how it can be improved to become a better teaching instrument.

### Benchmark
**60% or better**
Any laboratory exercise in any course in which the year average grade for the class was < 60% will be reevaluated for potential problems and how it can be improved to become a better teaching instrument.
FINDINGS

No class averages were below the 60% threshold.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Students are seeing the connection between lab and lecture more. This has been mentioned in the evaluations for the lab.

The use of the iPad for data collection has helped all students to see the data not just the person collecting the data, this has helped the students understanding of what the data represents and how they can analysis it.

The physics majors have been giving presentations of their data they take in some of the labs and this has further helped the proficiency in the labs and the student’s understanding of the material.

IMPROVEMENT

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Communication of Physics Knowledge and Ability

Physics majors should be able to effectively communicate orally and in writing chemical principles and theories, the procedures and results of experiments, and their analysis of problems. They should be able to defend conclusions reached in experimental results or solution to problems.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
Science Seminar

All majors must give an oral presentation on a research, internship, or special problems experience in SC 425, Science Seminar. Following the presentation, students are required to answer questions from any of the science disciplines. The faculty members present evaluate the student’s effectiveness in communicating key concepts and data, analyzing and interpreting of the information, and making valid conclusions of their experience. Written comments will be made concerning the presentation. In addition, a numeric score will be given to the presentation.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
75% or above  Exceeded
BENCHMARK

It is expected that all students will receive > 75% on their formal evaluations for Science Seminar. Student work will be reevaluated for any semester in which the average is < 75%.

FINDINGS

Both of the physics majors presented at science seminar and received an A in the course.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

Both of the physics majors this year did research that was more literature based not experiment based. Both presentations incorporated a heavy math component to the research.

The research topics were very in-depth and challenged both students to use knowledge they learned during their time at CMU and required a large amount of additional research.

I am very pleased with the outcome of both projects.

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Political Science Mission Statement
The Division of Social Sciences offers a bachelors degree program in political science which is designed to provide the student with a solid grounding in American political institutions, international relations, comparative political systems, public law, and political philosophy. Throughout the curriculum the student is encouraged to critically examine the nature of relationships between citizens and the state as well as between states. The major in political science prepares the student for entry into careers in business management, interest group advocacy, political consulting and public service at the national, state or local levels. The political science major is often used as the preliminary step toward professional training in the law or advanced study in political science or public administration. The political science program provides students with opportunities for independent studies, field experiences and internships. The Political Science Major has the option of graduating with a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree.

Student Learning Outcomes
Library, archival and database research
Students will display a capacity to effectively employ library, archival and electronic databases for research purposes.

Assessment Measure
Senior Thesis
Senior students complete a senior thesis as part of the requirement for the senior thesis seminar (480). The thesis is written under the direct supervision of the 480 instructor. The project is designed to require the student to demonstrate both content knowledge in the discipline of their major as well as key research and writing skills. Students must defend their thesis in an oral presentation to a panel of three faculty members. Each defense panel member must certify that the thesis and oral defense meets their standard for quality undergraduate research as to content, writing, logical analysis and oral presentation. Faculty panels evaluate each thesis using a standard rubric which rates the student’s performance in
the oral defense, the quality of the research, the quality of the writing, and the logical structure of the argument presented.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Rubric Graded Exam - Academic Direct

1.1.1 Benchmark

**BENCHMARK**
Each class cohort average the thesis rubric item for "Research" should meet or surpass the 32/40.

**FINDINGS**
For the 2018-2019 cohort the average for the "Research" item on the faculty rubric was 35.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The benchmark was exceeded.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Research design and data collection proficiency
Students will be able to design a clear research question, collect relevant data and construct a narrative analyzing their findings.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Senior Thesis
Senior students complete a senior thesis as part of the requirement for the senior thesis seminar (480). The thesis is written under the direct supervision of the 480 instructor. The project is designed to require the student to demonstrate both content knowledge and writing skills. Each student must defend their thesis in an oral presentation to a panel of three faculty members. Faculty panels evaluate each thesis using a standard rubric which rates the student’s performance in the oral defense, the quality of the research, the quality of the writing, and the logical structure of the argument presented.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
1.2.1.1 **Benchmark**

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**
Each cohort should meet or exceed the 75% score threshold on the overall senior thesis rubric.

**FINDINGS**
The 2018-2019 PLSC cohort had an overall average of 90 on the senior thesis.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The 2018-2019 cohort average exceeded the benchmark.

1.2.2 **Assessment Measure**
Average score for the Research Design item for the senior thesis rubric. The cohort average on the research design item (3) of the thesis rubric will meet the 75% threshold (23). The 2018-2019 cohort average was 27.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Rubric Scored Assignments - Academic Direct

1.2.2.1 **Benchmark**

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**
The cohort average on the research design item (3) of the thesis rubric will meet the 75% threshold (23)

**FINDINGS**
The 2018-19 cohort average on the research design item was 27.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The threshold was exceeded.
1.2.3 Assessment Measure
Profiles in Success - Political Science

Political Science Profiles in Success contains profiles of the immediate post-graduate undertakings of political science majors (those for whom data can be collected). These profiles are posted on the program’s website and used for recruiting purposes.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Observation of Students - Academic Direct

1.2.3.1 Benchmark
Quality Measure Met

BENCHMARK
Include profiles of recent graduates

FINDINGS
The profiles in success provides the interested reading with a sense of the quality of the program’s preparation of its students and the range of career paths open to those students after graduation.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
Political Science Profiles in Success presents concrete evidence of the program’s real-life outcomes in preparing a small number of highly motivated liberal arts students for career success beyond the academy.

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Political science knowledge

Students will display familiarity with the major authors, works, and theories of the canon of political science in each of the following sub-disciplines: a. American Political Institutions and Processes including public law b. International Relations c. Comparative Political Systems (Area Studies)
Assessment Measure
Major Field Test
Political Science majors must complete the Major Field Test in political science during their senior thesis seminar. The test results allow us to compare our seniors to a national population of political science majors. The test provides results in three sub-fields (American institutions and processes; International Relations; and area studies) as well as a composite score.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Standardized test - Academic Direct

Benchmark

Each three-year rolling cohort of CMU political science seniors will have average composite MFT scores within two standard deviations of the national average for the same period.

The CMU three-year rolling average is 144.5 and the national average composite for the same period is 156 with a standard deviation of 14.

The benchmark was far exceeded.

Student Learning Outcomes
Research communication proficiency
Students will be able to present, discuss and defend their own research at a high level of professional discourse.

Assessment Measure
Senior Thesis
Item 5 on the faculty scoring rubric for senior theses - "The oral presentation is articulate and the defense clearly addresses the questions from the committee members."

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
1.4.1.1 Benchmark

**BENCHMARK**

Average Faculty scores on rubric item #5 will be 7.5/10 or above.

**FINDINGS**

The average item #5 score for the 2018-2019 faculty rubrics was 9.5.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

The benchmark was fulfilled.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

---

**Project Attachments (5)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Catalog Rev PS.doc]</td>
<td>30KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PS Profiles in Success. Summer 2019.docx]</td>
<td>22KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PS Senior Thesis Data for Weave 2019.xlsx]</td>
<td>10KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[PS_MFAT_Scores for WEAVE 2019.docx]</td>
<td>14KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Senior Thesis Rubric.docx]</td>
<td>12KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Psychology Department Mission
The Division of Social Sciences offers bachelor degree programs in psychology which are designed to assist students in gaining an understanding of the science of human behavior and mental processes. Students will become familiar with the most important contemporary research findings in the fields of learning, personality, counseling, psychophysiology, social processes, abnormal psychology, and human development. The psychology major is often used as a foundation for professional training in counseling, law, the ministry, or graduate study in psychology. The psychology major has the option of graduating with a Bachelor of Arts or a Bachelor of Science degree. The requirements of the Bachelor of Arts in psychology provide a broad liberal arts exposure to the discipline and thereby prepare students for a broad range of careers in business management and public service. The requirements of the Bachelor of Science in psychology include a stronger emphasis on the development of analytic skills and thus may be of special interest to students planning to pursue advanced degrees in the field. As a requirement for graduation, all psychology majors must pass a written and oral assessment examination in the final semester of their course work.

Student Learning Outcomes
The demonstration of knowledge
A specific student-outcome goal for the CMU psychology program includes the demonstration of knowledge regarding the general principles of psychology, the major theoretical frameworks, and the process of designing and conducting empirical research.

Assessment Measure
Major Field Test
This goal will be assessed by examining graduating seniors’ performance on the Major Field Test in Psychology. Students graduating with a major in psychology will be expected to complete the Major Field Test in Psychology.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Standardized test - Academic Direct
1.1.1 Benchmark Met

**BENCHMARK**
The mean score for students taking the MFT in the given report period will be within one standard deviation of the national mean on total score and subscore areas.

**FINDINGS**
CMU students continue to perform within the desired student learning outcomes established by the Psychology Department.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
The overall performance of CMU students for AY2018-2019 showed an increase on Subscore1: Learning, Cognition, Memory; and Subscore2: Perception, Sensation, Physiology and a decrease on total score, Subscore3: Clinical, Abnormal, Personality; and Subscore 4: Development and Social than the previous report year. While scores on Subscore4 reflected a noticeable decline, the decrease on total score and Subscore3 was very small (only 1 point). As the psychology department completes its program review in the Spring 2020 semester, revisions such as course offerings, content, and staffing will be given consideration.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**
Academic Process Modifications

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**
Improved Scores

**IMPROVEMENT**
The overall performance of CMU students for AY2018-2019 showed an increase on Subscore1: Learning, Cognition, Memory; and Subscore2: Perception, Sensation, Physiology.

---

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

**The application of competencies**
The application of these competencies to the continuous development of critical thinking and problem-solving skills.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure

**Senior Thesis**
The thesis and its defense are the central components of a senior capstone course entitled Senior Thesis (PY480). The multifaceted evaluation of performance in this course consists of the following: i. The development of a thesis statement in conference with the PY 480 instructor. ii. An extensive, scholarly literature review pertaining to the selected thesis statement. iii. Completion of at least two sequentially revised drafts of the thesis (each of
which is to be the subject of instructor editing and an editorial conference.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Thesis/project - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark

**BENCHMARK**
A minimum of 80% of these students will earn a minimum average of 80% on the scoring rubric used in the Division of Social Sciences from their faculty committee.

**FINDINGS**
CMU students performed within the desired student learning outcomes on the scoring rubric used in the Division of Social Sciences.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
Because the psychology department revised the scoring rubric used for assessing the senior thesis, direct comparison to previous years is not possible. However, CMU graduates from the current report year demonstrated noticeable improvement in writing mechanics, analysis of research, and oral presentation skills. The psychology department has made a conscious effort to raise the quality of its graduates' writing skills. Starting in the Fall 2016 semester, students enrolled in many of the upper-level psychology courses are asked to submit rough drafts of required research papers to CMU’s Writing Center for feedback prior to turning in the final draft. Upon completion of the psychology department’s program review in the SP2020 semester, additional steps may be taken in hopes of better preparing them for the challenge of thesis writing.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**
Academic Program Improvement

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**
Improved Student Learning Assessments

**IMPROVEMENT**
CMU graduates from the current report year demonstrated noticeable improvement in writing mechanics, analysis of research, and oral presentation skills.

1.3 Student Learning Outcomes

The effective communication of understanding.

The effective communication of understanding through written and oral expression.
1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**

Senior Thesis

The thesis and its defense are the central components of a senior capstone course entitled Senior Thesis (PY480). The multifaceted evaluation of performance in this course consists of the following: i. The development of a thesis statement in conference with the PY 480 instructor. ii. An extensive, scholarly literature review pertaining to the selected thesis statement. iii. Completion of at least two sequentially revised drafts of the thesis (each of which is to be the subject of instructor editing and an editorial conference).

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Presentation - Academic Direct

---

1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**

**Met**

**BENCHMARK**

A minimum of 80% of these students will earn a minimum average of 80% on the scoring rubric used in the Division of Social Sciences from their faculty committee.

**FINDINGS**

CMU students performed within the desired student learning outcomes on the scoring rubric used in the Division of Social Sciences.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

Because the psychology department revised the scoring rubric used for assessing the senior thesis, direct comparison to previous years is not possible. However, CMU graduates from the current report year demonstrated noticeable improvement in writing mechanics, analysis of research, and oral presentation skills. The psychology department has made a conscious effort to raise the quality of its graduates' writing skills. Starting in the Fall 2016 semester, students enrolled in many of the upper-level psychology courses are asked to submit rough drafts of required research papers to CMU’s Writing Center for feedback prior to turning in the final draft. Upon completion of the psychology department’s program review in the SP2020 semester, additional steps may be taken in hopes of better preparing them for the challenge of thesis writing.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

Academic Program Improvement

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

CMU graduates from the current report year demonstrated noticeable improvement in writing mechanics, analysis of research, and oral presentation skills.
## Project Attachments (1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WEAVE tables AY1819-final.docx</td>
<td>22KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
The Religion and Church Leadership major is an interdisciplinary degree designed to help students develop the skills and knowledge necessary for successful ministry, lay or professional, in the Christian church.

Student Learning Outcomes
Students will be Biblically literate.

Assessment Measure
Biblical Knowledge Examinations
A summary of the student's performance on exams in courses related to Objective 1 will be collected and analyzed.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Test/Exam/Quiz - Academic Direct

Benchmark
Average scores Met

BENCHMARK
Students will meet 80% threshold on scores, students will perform at higher levels than non-majors.

FINDINGS
Fall 2018 Lower Level Course Average: 86.85 (4 students) Spring 2019 Lower Level Course Average: 81.4 (1 student) Fall 2018 Upper Level Course Average: 91.1 (2 students) Spring 2019 Upper Level Course Average: 82.0 (3 students)

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
RCL majors, in general, performed well on in their biblical studies coursework.
1. Majors demonstrated adequate knowledge of biblical content, concepts, and historical-critical methodology in the introductory level classes.
   RL201 Majors avg. = 86.95 (4 students)

   Others avg. = 78.29 (11 students)
RL202 Majors avg. = 81.4 (1 student)

Others avg. = 81.71 (27 students)

And in the upper level courses.

RL301 Majors. avg. = 91.1 (2 students)

Others avg. = 83.22 (10 students)

RL303 Majors avg. = 82.0 (3 students)

Others avg. = 68.1 (7 students)

2. RCL majors demonstrated the ability to apply historical-critical methodology to biblical texts.

• In RL201, they passed examinations including the history and composition of the Old Testament.

• In RL202, they worked with the synoptic problem and its relationship to the canonical Gospel tradition. The students also considered the non-Gospel works in their religious and historical context. They passed examinations in this subject matter.

• In RL301, Jesus’s ministry was placed in its historical context. Testing demonstrated a mastery of this material.

• In RL303, students studied the biblical prophetic tradition in its cultural, historical, and literary contexts. Students demonstrated adequate mastery through graded
exams, reports, and a project. The project (composing a prophetic oracle of their own) involved genre recognition and literary criticism.

Student success in biblical literacy has been consistent. I will continue to monitor student progress.

### 1.2 Student Learning Outcomes

#### Fundamental Skills
Students will have fundamental vocational skills necessary to succeed in leading ministry programs.

#### Assessment Measure

**Internship Reflections and Evaluations**
Students will reflect on experiences encountered within a required internship.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

#### Survey of Graduates

The vocational or professional careers of graduates should reinforce the successful completion of the program.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

### 1.3 Student Learning Outcomes

#### Theological Analysis and Reflection
Students will be able to analyze concrete ministry situations and reflect theologically on those situations.

#### Assessment Measure

**Senior Capstone**
Students will complete either a thesis or directed internship. Due to the interdisciplinary nature of the Religion and Church leadership curriculum, the capstone experience will be tailored to the individual vocational plans of the student.
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Sociology Mission Statement
Students majoring in sociology acquire a broad understanding of the discipline with special emphasis on the sociological perspective, social theory, social research methods and data analysis. Students develop abilities to explain the important influence of culture, social structure, and social processes on human behavior; to recognize continuing sources of social inequality; and to develop an awareness and appreciation of cultural diversity. Within the curriculum, students develop skills in writing, oral presentation, critical thinking, and use of the computer in the acquisition and analysis of information and data. Students are encouraged to engage in active learning in the classroom and in the community.

Student Learning Outcomes
Sociological Reasoning
Demonstrate sociological reasoning by describing how individual biographies are shaped by social structures and/or social interactions.

Assessment Measure
See the uploaded document.
In their senior year, students sign up for one of three capstone courses (Senior Thesis, Internship, or Sociology Senior Seminar). As part of the requirements for their capstone, they construct a digital portfolio of their work in the major. Students select their best papers illustrating how they achieved the six student learning outcomes. Students include responses to the following questions in the portfolio, as well as their resume. 1. What sociology courses did you take at CMU and other institutions? 2. Discuss how well you fulfilled the sociology major learning outcomes. Please discuss each learning outcome. 3. Which of the six learning outcomes do you feel your major prepared you the best? Use examples from your time at CMU or other institutions to support your statement. 4. Which of the six learning outcomes do you feel your major prepared you the least? Use examples from your time at CMU or other institutions to support your statement. 5. Are there are sociology courses you wished you
could have taken but were not offered? 6. After graduation, how will you market your skills learned in sociology to potential employers? 7. What kind of jobs do you feel prepared to pursue?

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Portfolio - Academic Direct

1.1.1 Benchmark

BENCHMARK
It’s expected that all students meet the expectations of the program.

FINDINGS
All is well.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
See the uploaded document.

1.2 Student Learning Outcomes
Research Methods
Demonstrate understanding of qualitative and/or quantitative research methods.

1.2.1 Assessment Measure
Portfolio
Portfolio assessment

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Performance - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 Benchmark

BENCHMARK
Students should meet expectations.

FINDINGS
All is well.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
See the uploaded document.
1.3 Student Learning Outcomes
Theory
Demonstrate understanding of classical and/or contemporary sociological theorists.

1.3.1 Assessment Measure
Portfolio
Portfolio assessment
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Portfolio Artifact - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 Benchmark
Students should meet expectations.

FINDINGS
All is well.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
See the uploaded document.

1.4 Student Learning Outcomes
Social Inequalities
Demonstrate knowledge of social inequalities based on race, class, gender or sexuality.
1.4.1 Assessment Measure
Portfolio
Portfolio
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Portfolio - Academic Direct

1.4.1.1 Benchmark
Met

BENCHMARK
Meet expectations

FINDINGS
All is well.

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS
See the uploaded document.

1.5 Student Learning Outcomes
Field of Study
Demonstrate knowledge in a substantive field, for example: deviance, criminology, social psychology, family, or popular culture.

1.5.1 Assessment Measure
Portfolio
Portfolio
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Portfolio - Academic Direct

1.5.1.1 Benchmark
Met

BENCHMARK
Meet expectations

FINDINGS
All is well.
1.6 **Student Learning Outcomes**

Professional Employment
Secure professional employment.

1.6.1 **Assessment Measure**

Employment
Students should be able to find employment or go to graduate school after graduation.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Alumni efforts - Alumni

1.6.1.1 **Benchmark**

*Met*

**BENCHMARK**
Finding employment

**FINDINGS**
All is well

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**
See the uploaded document.
Institutional Mission
Central Methodist University prepares students to make a difference in the world by emphasizing academic and professional excellence, ethical leadership, and social responsibility.

Program Mission
Theatre Program Mission Statement
The faculty of the CMU Theatre Arts department provide education, training, and experience in the demanding collaborative art of theatre that fully complements and emphasizes the importance of a well-rounded engagement with life, one that is intellectual, psychological, artistic, curious, and collaborative. The faculty is dedicated to preparing students for any and all work involving public presentation; to supporting and expanding the understanding of human culture and history through theatre, its influence on the development of societal institutions, and the role theatre has played in the expression of human emotion; to educating students in the exploration and expression of the complexity and diversity of human existence, whether in the classroom or on stage; and to developing graduates with a holistic approach to their studies, and a panoramic perspective to human relationships. Theatre is above all a collaborative art that sets an example for how life should be lived. Artistic works of all kinds, especially in the influential world of the theatre strive to make the world a better place for all to live, requiring dedication to the community, while also challenging the society to expand its horizons and its understanding of life.

1.1 Student Learning Outcomes
Academic Preparation
Theory, history, and literature understanding sufficient to pursue theatre as a profession or for further academic study.

Action Plan
Portfolio Review headshots to be improved by working with a new or more permanent photographer.

1.1.1 Assessment Measure
Portfolio Review
Students prepare two monologues (or a monologue and a song) and perform for a panel of leading experts from the area. They also prepare a resume and head shot for evaluation by
the panel.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Performance - Academic Direct

### 1.1.1 Benchmark
**Portfolio Review preparation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>80% of students will have their monologues/songs memorized and headshot and resume prepared</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>All 14 students received positive reviews from our panel of theatre professionals. Most of the panelists return so they have multiple opportunities to observe our students and note the positive growth areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS</td>
<td>5 of the 14 students received glowing assessments from the panel with specific notes on growth areas (Araiza, Asi, Bryan, Jones, Kixmiller). 5 received very positive assessment with specific notes on growth areas (Casey, Guerkink, King, Preston, Sage). 4 received statements supporting their potential for growth or noting their improvement from previous years (Barnett, Braden, Wiggans, Wright).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1.1.2 Assessment Measure
**MoCA pass rates**

Missouri Content Assessments (MoCA) are standardized tests required to be passed by all candidates for a teaching or student services certificate.

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE
Standardized test - Academic Direct

### 1.1.2.1 Benchmark
**MoCA pass rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BENCHMARK</th>
<th>All theatre education students will pass the Missouri Content Assessment (theatre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FINDINGS</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS</td>
<td>Met</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central Methodist University
before student teaching.

**FINDINGS**

One student took, and passed the MoCA, during the 2018-2019 academic year.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

The benchmark was met.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

Academic

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

No Improvements Deemed Necessary

---

1.1.3 **Assessment Measure**

**Directing Projects**

Students prepare a one act play from selecting and analyzing the script to striking the set. This includes: recruiting and auditioning cast, setting rehearsal schedules, directing rehearsals, and organizing the box office.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Presentation - Academic Direct

---

1.2 **Student Learning Outcomes**

**Performance Skills**

Performance Skills sufficient for demonstration and creditable public performance at professional level.

1.2.1 **Assessment Measure**

**ACTF Reviewers and Post-Mortems**

ACTF Respondents give Production Team feedback on all areas of production. Post-Mortem is a report generated after each show closes, involving all production team members.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Clinical Evaluations, Reviews - Academic Direct

1.2.1.1 **Benchmark**

Met

**BENCHMARK**

Attention to detail provided from external evaluators and applying constructive criticism from production team.
Both Cabaret and The Odyssey were ambitious projects which led to retrospection and ideas for future productions.

Cabaret Respondent: Very much enjoyed show, but would have liked more precision in some of the choreography, a more direct correlation in set design and costumes to concentration camp motif, at times wanted to see more snappiness and edge to the characterizations.

Post-mortem: Cast felt we needed more musical rehearsals before choreography began and a more set rehearsal schedule.

The Odyssey Respondent: Loved being at a show with all the kids. Costumes and Set Design very appealing; scooters were a cute idea. Actors need to commit to all aspects of performance.

Post-mortem: Actors need to improve in their respect and interactions toward production team (AD/SM, etc.). Allergy notes need to be taken for costumes.

### 1.2.2 Assessment Measure
**Portfolio Review**
Students prepare two monologues (or a monologue and a song) and perform for a panel of leading experts from the area. They also prepare a resume and head shot for evaluation by the panel.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Performance - Academic Direct

### 1.2.3 Assessment Measure
**MoCA pass rates**
Missouri Content Assessments (MoCA) are standardized tests required to be passed by all candidates for a teaching or student services certificate.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**
Standardized test - Academic Direct
1.3 **Student Learning Outcomes**

Technical and Design Skills

Technical and artistic skills necessary to pursue theatre as a profession.

1.3.1 **Assessment Measure**

**TA253 Pre-/Post-tests**

Faculty will give a pre-test to students at the beginning of the course and the same test to students at the end.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Pre/post test - Academic Direct

1.3.1.1 **Benchmark**

**BENCHMARK**

All students will increase their scores.

**FINDINGS**

All students increased their scores to passing grades.

**ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS**

The class averaged an increase of 67 percentage points between the pre- and post-tests, with a range between 49 and 86. Students learned a significant amount in the class.

**IMPROVEMENT TYPE**

**IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION**

**IMPROVEMENT**

1.3.2 **Assessment Measure**

**ACTF Reviewers and Post-Mortems**

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

1.3.3 **Assessment Measure**

**MoCA pass rates**

Missouri Content Assessments (MoCA) are standardized tests required to be passed by all candidates for a teaching or student services certificate.

**SOURCE OF EVIDENCE**

Standardized test - Academic Direct
1.3.3.1 Benchmark

BENCHMARK

All theatre education students will pass the Missouri Content Assessment (theatre) before student teaching.

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT

1.4 Student Learning Outcomes

Leading Others

Synthesis of pedagogy, academic preparation, and performance skills sufficient to lead others in making theatre.

1.4.1 Assessment Measure

Directing Projects

SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.4.1.1 Benchmark

BENCHMARK

FINDINGS

ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

IMPROVEMENT TYPE

IMPROVEMENT DESCRIPTION

IMPROVEMENT
1.4.2 **Assessment Measure**
ACTF Reviewers and Post-Mortems
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

1.4.3 **Assessment Measure**
MoCA pass rates
SOURCE OF EVIDENCE

Project Attachments (3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attachments</th>
<th>File Size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O2 O3 O4 Post Mortem Cabaret blind.pdf</td>
<td>39KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O2 O3 O4 Respondent Cabaret.pdf</td>
<td>61KB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O3 TA 253 pre_post blind.pdf</td>
<td>60KB</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>