

Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Report

Coppin State University

Executive Summary

For the purpose of continued institutional renewal, faculty, staff, and administrators at Coppin State University have committed to a culture of planning, research, assessment and accountability. In general, the University continues to engage its internal and external constituencies in study, planning, assessment, and development so that it will be well positioned to carry out its very visible urban mission. An on-going effort has been made to measure overall effectiveness towards the achievement of the University's mission and goals. With respect to assessment, Coppin relies on a broad range of means for measuring, evaluating, and assessing educational outcomes. In order to promote planning and assessment, Coppin relies on the Office of Planning and Accreditation and the Center for Institutional Assessment to facilitate its strategic planning, research, and assessment efforts. Consequently, Coppin State University is committed to maintaining a working relationship with every student, faculty, and staff member; thereby, assuring every voice is heard.

The goal of the University assessment process is to encourage institutional self-awareness, self-understanding, and genuine self-improvement. In general, CSU developed an aggressive campaign to assess student learning outcomes through the institutionalization of the Center for Institutional Assessment, Faculty Assessment Committee, and Assessment Steering Committee. Importantly, during the academic year 2006-07, faculty professional development included training sponsored by The Middle States, opening sessions sponsored by The Office of the Provost with assessment consultants, and assessment technical assistance. Uniquely to CSU, a Director of Assessment was hired. The Director works closely with faculty and has responsibilities for the oversight of the Center for Institutional Assessment. The Center is a centralized University resource designed to inform planning and policy decisions in a wide range of academic and administrative areas. During academic year 2005-2006, the Center focused its efforts on training and development, survey development, assessment, educational research around the use of technology in teaching, and strategic planning.

In conjunction with the Office of Planning and Accreditation, the Center for Institutional Assessment has responsibilities for coordinating assessment efforts at Coppin. The Office of Planning and Accreditation has unique responsibilities in establishing an institutional culture of assessment with the support of University constituencies. Additionally, the Dean of the School of Arts and Sciences champions efforts to improve student learning assessment for general education courses with application to non-general education courses. The School has developed a collective effort at addressing course level performance which included the development of direct and indirect measures.

The assessment campaign is mission driven and dynamic as the University continues to evolve into a model urban comprehensive liberal arts institution. New assessment activities have been initiated. The methods used for data collection, analysis and reporting continue to improve, capitalizing on the institution's information technology infrastructure. These activities have enabled the University to improve academic programs through timely and complete student learning outcomes assessment at the institutional, program and course-levels.

In general, the campaign has increased institutional effectiveness and efficiency by the following examples:

- An aggressive campaign to assess student learning outcomes has been launched to ensure that proper interventions are installed to improve general education requirements and course level performance. For example, English has been cited as having courses that need further redesign to address unprepared student needs. Specifically, actions are underway to assess ACCUPLACER and to address the need for a lower level English course for students who cannot successfully pass EN 101.
- During spring 2006, the University secured the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus. What follows are the results for the indicator 11F, Analyzing quantitative problems.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.92, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.86.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.26, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.02.

- The success rates for Arts & Humanities, Social & Behavioral, Natural Sciences, and Interdisciplinary & Emerging Issues, reported rates above 70 percent for the spring and fall terms during academic year 2003-2004 to academic year 2005-2006.
- During spring terms 2005 and 2006 for English 495, Senior Seminar, student pass rates for the following assessment instruments were: portfolio assessment, 86 percent; comprehensive exam, 82 percent; and the departmental assessment, 57 percent whereas the EN 101 course level assessment data weren't easily available except for one term which was incomplete.
- Using MNSC 150, Technology Fluency, three courses were assessed during fall 2006 and spring 2007. Each of the courses used the Skillset Assessment Manager (Skillset Assessment Manager (SAM)) and assessed competencies for Microsoft Office. The average competency score in Microsoft Excel was 74 percent, while the average score for PowerPoint was 85 percent. Importantly, the average score for proficiency in Microsoft Word was 94 percent using these three courses.

- The CSU assessment process is inclusive of the following data components: a comprehensive survey research, student perception of teaching quality, skill acquisition, learning outcomes, technical infrastructure, assessment, specialized studies, program level data, and institutional learning.
- Math faculty have crafted a course redesign for the DVMT with accommodations for more lab and better assessment measures. The department has also committed the summer to working on redesign initiatives and goals for a pilot to begin in fall 2007.
- While reviewing the general education requirements in Table 4, the oral and written communication competency illustrated that 88% of all general education courses contained this competency. Additionally, 42% of all general education courses contained scientific and quantitative reasoning with 36% of all courses reflecting technological competencies. Lastly, critical analysis and reasoning competencies were found in 96% of all courses with information literacy indicated in 68% of courses reviewed.

During the last three years, CSU has invested in technical infrastructure to develop analytical systems to provide indirect measures for the purpose of assessment. Due to the technological focus at CSU, infrastructure has been developed to warehouse institutional effectiveness indicators. The institution currently uses PeopleSoft and has developed specialized Assessment modules using I-Strategy for purposes of warehousing critical information. This data are then used in reporting to assess quality improvement by unit. Using the unit representatives, data are interpreted into useful information and then used in a continuous improvement effort. In preparation for the evaluation, and in an effort to address emerging new performance standards, departments designed performance assessment systems that permits the unit to review the performance of students, faculty, and programs in a systemic manner. This performance assessment system prescribes a data collection process that can be used to make informed decisions concerning the improvement of services and programs. The recently designed performance assessment system permits the department to review the performance of students, faculty, programs, and offices, in a more systematic manner. The system prescribes a data collection process that can be used to inform the decision-making process of the specific program and the division, to assure continuous quality improvement. Departments have identified categories of goals, which have been aligned with the conceptual frameworks and strategic plan. For example, some academic categories include: 1) the quality of instructional programs, 2) diversity of faculty and students, 3) adequacy of resources, 4) unit productivity, 5) collaborative initiatives and partnerships, and 6) student retention.

In specialized areas, the University has many successes. The School of Education was reaccredited by the National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education programs and the Maryland State Department of Education during spring 2006 while the School of Nursing and the Department of Social Work are scheduled for reviews in fall 2007 and spring 2008, respectively. Importantly, the institution is preparing for its Middle States Commission on Higher Education review for reaffirmation of accreditation in academic year 2007-2008. The University-wide Academic Program Review Committee (APRC) was re-activated in 2001 to facilitate internal academic program reviews. Its charge was to review all academic programs at

the institution during a seven-year cycle. The Committee comprised of faculty, chairpersons, and administrative representatives of the University at large, created a review process that includes the administration of a programmatic self-study. The instruments used to evaluate the self-study insure compliance with Middle States Commission on Higher Education, National Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education, National League for Nursing, Council on Social Work Education, and Council on Rehabilitation Education. In addition the APRC serves to provide ongoing assessment of all programs. This process is used for those programs where specialized accrediting agencies are applicable, as well as those where no such specialized accreditation is in effect to date, i.e. History, Geography, and Global Studies, Social Sciences, Criminal Justice. The APRC has set a seven-year schedule to review all academic programs internally as part of its process to achieve continuous quality improvement.

In summary, the University has adopted an institutional assessment model that incorporates assessing student learning outcomes at the institution, program, and course levels. Both the institutional and program levels are informed by the strategic plan which provides a useful blueprint for the future direction of Coppin State University. In addition, the University began its self-study process demonstrating the application of Middle States Commission on Higher Education *Characteristics of Excellence* using its Standards Seven, Institutional Effectiveness, and Standard Fourteen, Assessment of Student Learning as its guide. The Coppin assessment process answers two critical questions:

- How is institutional effectiveness assessed at CSU through the use of strategic goals and objectives?
- How are assessment data and results used to improve policy formation, budget and fiscal planning, curriculum and student development, and teaching and learning?

The ongoing assessment process at Coppin consists of data collected in nine categories. Finally, the assessment process at Coppin is anchored in the strategic goals of the institutional strategic plan, *Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential...Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan*.

Table 4.
General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix (GERSCM)

Competency	WOC			SQR			CAR			TC			IL		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	4	4	100.00%	0	4	0.00%	4	4	100.00%	3	4	75.00%	4	4	100.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	22	22	100.00%	8	22	36.36%	21	22	95.45%	7	22	31.82%	8	22	36.36%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	7	7	100.00%	1	7	14.29%	7	7	100.00%	0	7	0.00%	5	7	71.43%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	4	5	80.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	5	100.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	3	7	42.86%	3	7	42.86%	6	7	85.71%	0	7	0.00%	7	7	100.00%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	4	5	80.00%	4	5	80.00%	5	5	100.00%	3	5	60.00%	5	5	100.00%
Total	44	50	88.00%	21	50	42.00%	48	50	96.00%	18	50	36.00%	34	50	68.00%

Key:

WOC = Written and Oral Communication
 SQR = Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning
 CAR = Critical Analysis
 TC = Technological
 IL = Information Literacy

Program Level Assessment

When the General Education Committee began meeting in early 2006 to review performance in General Education (GE) courses, it had no means to assess aggregate data in order to determine success/no success results or grades earned for specified terms. In July, 2006 Coppin hired a functional PeopleSoft specialist to work with the Committee and evaluate its functional requirements for analytical data. Specifications for analytical reports were quickly developed and prototypes tested by a sub-group of the Committee by early August, 2006. The EagleLINKS Student Analytics tool, an iStrategy software application, that interfaces with the PeopleSoft Student Administration (SA) system was chosen as the tool of choice for generating the General Education analysis since most of the SA tables were targeted for existing reports. Only minor “tweaking” of existing reports and addition of a few tables was required to create General Education reports.

Assessment Measures

To support effective communication of assessment approaches, departments in the School of Arts and Sciences (SAS), developed a repository of syllabi on a shared department drive during the fall of 2005. This initiative was expanded during the fall of 2006, when SAS created a shared School folder to enhance interdepartmental access to School syllabi and to support accountability by relating outcomes/competencies to course objectives. In this way, assessment measures used throughout the School can be reviewed by any instructor to strengthen student learning outcomes. In addition to the shared folder development, all General Education instructors are required to post their syllabi on the faculty website to support public accountability. All SAS syllabi for each semester, effective fall 2006, are available to faculty to peruse on the J: drive. Notably, all syllabi for general education must reflect the General Education competencies.

Assessment Results

In order to develop a better assessment of General Education at CSU, indirect assessment measures were used: GE categorical assessment, Term Success Rates, and the spring 2006 National Study for Student Engagement (NSSE).

The following aggregate data in Table 1 has been compiled for the spring 2006 term. Data provide answers to the following questions in assisting the institution in better understanding the performance of GERs at Coppin State University. The questions of interest are:

1. What is the success rate for each GE category?
2. What is the number of students in GERs in this category?
3. What is the number of students who have academic withdrawals with the GE category?
4. What is the number of seniors enrolled in GERs within each category?
5. What is the number of GER classes over limit within each category?

Table 1.
Question by GE Category, Spring 2006

Q#	Question	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Category V	Category VI
		English Comp	Arts & Humanities	Social & Behavioral	Mathematics	Natural Sciences	Interdisc & Emerging Issues
1	Success rate?	46%	73%	71%	75%	80%	79%
2	# Students in GERs?	806	2474	791	408	534	872
3	# AW grades?	13	22	0	19	1	12
4	# Seniors in GERs?	19	300	49	51	116	114
5	GER classes over limit? (total over)	22 (53)	35 (118)	7 (19)	4 (8)	6 (14)	12 (34)

Using Tables 2 and 3, the trend results indicated that the success rates for Category I - English Composition courses varied between 43% and 46% during the spring terms 2004 to 2006 while fall results ranged from 50% to 55%. Students must pass these two composition courses with a C grade while they may pass all other GE courses with a D grade. Considering all the other categories during this period, Category IV – Math had the next lowest success rates for general education. Specifically, spring 2004 to spring 2006 reflected success rates of 68 percent to 75 percent while fall 2004 to fall 2006 illustrated success rates of 69 percent to 72 percent.

Importantly, the success rates for Arts & Humanities, Social & Behavioral, Natural Sciences, and Interdisciplinary & Emerging Issues, reported rates above 70 percent for the spring and fall terms during academic year 2003-2004 to academic year 2005-2006.

Table 2.
Term Success Rates by GE Category, Fall Terms
2003 to 2005

Term	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Category V	Category VI
Success Rate	English Comp	Arts & Humanities	Social & Behavioral	Mathematics	Natural Sciences	Interdisc & Emerging Issues
2005	50%	74%	76%	72%	78%	79%
2004	55%	76%	72%	69%	77%	77%
2003	55%	78%	80%	72%	75%	82%

Table 3.
Term Success Rates by GE Category, Spring Terms
2003 to 2005

Term	Category I	Category II	Category III	Category IV	Category V	Category VI
Success Rate	English Comp	Arts & Humanities	Social & Behavioral	Mathematics	Natural Sciences	Interdisc & Emerging Issues
2006	46%	73%	71%	75%	80%	79%
2005	50%	76%	75%	71%	81%	79%
2004	43%	74%	72%	68%	80%	81%

Importantly, during spring 2006, the University secured the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus. What follows are the results for the indicator 11a, Acquiring a broad general education.

Indicator 11A: Acquiring a broad general education.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to not outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.96, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.18.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.37, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.31.

While reviewing the general education requirements in Table 4, the oral and written communication competency illustrated that 88% of all general education courses contained this competency. Additionally, 42% of all general education courses contained scientific and quantitative reasoning with 36% of all courses reflecting technological competencies. Lastly, critical analysis and reasoning competencies were found in 96% of all courses with information literacy indicated in 68% of courses reviewed.

Table 4.
General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix (GERSCM)

Competency	WOC			SQR			CAR			TC			IL		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	4	4	100.00%	0	4	0.00%	4	4	100.00%	3	4	75.00%	4	4	100.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	22	22	100.00%	8	22	36.36%	21	22	95.45%	7	22	31.82%	8	22	36.36%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	7	7	100.00%	1	7	14.29%	7	7	100.00%	0	7	0.00%	5	7	71.43%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	4	5	80.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	5	100.00%	5	5	100.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	3	7	42.86%	3	7	42.86%	6	7	85.71%	0	7	0.00%	7	7	100.00%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	4	5	80.00%	4	5	80.00%	5	5	100.00%	3	5	60.00%	5	5	100.00%
Total	44	50	88.00%	21	50	42.00%	48	50	96.00%	18	50	36.00%	34	50	68.00%

Key:

WOC = Written and Oral Communication

SQR = Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

CAR = Critical Analysis

TC = Technological

IL = Information Literacy

Continuous Improvement Efforts / Results of Assessment Activities

Instructors in several GE courses hold common exams. The examination results assist in norming the course level results with respect to teaching and learning outcomes. In the judgment of the Committee, more GE courses should include common exams to assure that instructors cover the syllabus course content and competencies. In order to address this matter, the Center for Institutional Assessment will be actively engaged with faculty to provide training and development on student learning outcomes assessment, development of learning syllabi, and development of pedagogy strategies. Additionally, the Faculty Assessment Committee will be utilized as a resource to garner support for faculty engagement in student learning. Certain areas will be targeted for interventions to improve course level performance by mandating syllabi competencies, assessment tools, assessment results, and continuous improvement efforts. Critically, a schedule of courses will be assessed for student learning outcomes assessment starting fall 2007 using feedback for faculty and non-faculty members of the Assessment Steering Committee.

Definition

Written and Oral Communication

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Write clear expository and persuasive prose;
- Express their ideas clearly and completely;
- Demonstrate in writing the ability to think analytically about personal experiences, observations, or readings;
- Apply MLA and APA citation styles appropriately;
- Write unified, coherent, and adequately developed paragraphs with clearly expressed ideas;
- Write sentences that conform to the convention of Standard English in usage, punctuation, and mechanics, including spelling; and take a variety of forms, employing such devices as coordination, parallelism, subordination and transition;
- Express ideas in language appropriate to the topic and audience; and
- Write and speak proficiently.

Assessment Measures, Course Level

For this competency, two courses were used to assess course level performance, EN 101, English Composition 1, and EN 495, Senior Seminar. To illustrate proficiency for this competency, EN 101 / EN 495 course level assessment employed the usage of the portfolio assessment which followed the Standards for a “C” Paper as the assessment rubric. These standards include papers demonstrating competency in content, organization, style/expression, and grammar mechanics. Also, EN 101 also used the SAT Rubric during its course level assessment. All courses either used a committee and / or instructor review for the assessment of the portfolio. Additionally, EN 495 utilized three assessment instruments: portfolio, comprehensive examination, and departmental assessment. Each assessment instrument contained its own assessment measures for written and oral competency.

Assessment Results

Direct Measures

During spring terms 2005 and 2006 for English 495, student pass rates for the following assessment instruments were: portfolio assessment, 86 percent; comprehensive exam, 82 percent; and the departmental assessment, 57 percent whereas the EN 101 course level assessment data weren't easily available except for one term which was incomplete.

Table 5.
EN 390, Course Assessment
Academic Years, 2005 and 2006

Spring Term	Portfolio	Comprehensive Exam	Departmental Assessment
2006	84.62	72.22	61.11
2005	88.24	92.59	53.33
Average	86.43	82.41	57.22

Using the General Education Requirements Syllabi Competency Matrix (GERSCM), all English courses (Category 1 with a sample of 4 courses), Arts and Humanities (Category 2 with a sample of 22 courses), courses) and Arts and Humanities (Category 2 with a sample of 22 courses), and Social and Behavioral (Category 3 with a sample of 7 courses) had competency for Writing and Oral Communication. While reviewing the general education requirements, 44 of 50 courses (88 percent) had Writing and Oral Competencies within the syllabus (Please refer to Table 6).

Table 6.
General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix, Written Oral and Communication

Competency	WOC		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	4	4	100.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	22	22	100.00%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	7	7	100.00%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	4	5	80.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	3	7	42.86%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	4	5	80.00%
Total	44	50	88.00%

Indirect Measures

Indirect measures for this competency included the use of grade distribution for spring 2006 (see Table 7) and the spring 2006 NSSE Results.

Table 7.
Grade Distribution, Spring 2006, Cat I - English Composition

Course	A	B	C	Subtotal
ENGL 101 (008070)	23	49	91	386
ENGL 102 (008071)	45	91	59	407
ENGL 104 (008073)	7	4		13
Grand Total	75	144	150	806

Using the National Study for Student Engagement Spring 2006 Administration, the following survey indicators were noted:

Indicator 11C: Writing clearly and effectively.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.13, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.02.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.36, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.15.

Indicator 11D: Speaking clearly and effectively.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.10, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.80.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.31, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.04.

Continuous Improvement Efforts / Results of Assessment Activities

The members of the Freshman Composition Committee, which is comprised of instructors teaching ENGL 101 and ENGL 102, attribute the low pass rates to entering unprepared students for these courses. In their judgment, one possible solution to this problem is the tracking of students in ENGL 101 sections to provide additional assistance to students scoring low on the ACCUPLACER so that they have the requisite skills to pass GER courses. An aggressive campaign to assess student learning outcomes has been launched to ensure that proper interventions are installed to improve general education requirements and course level performance. For example, English has been cited as having courses that need further redesign to

address unprepared student needs. Specifically, actions are underway to assess ACCUPLACER and to address the need for a lower level English course for students who cannot successfully pass EN 101. Additionally, during academic year 2006-07, new course coordinators were selected to improve course level assessment for EN 101 and EN 495.

Definition

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Collect, analyze, and interpret data relevant to testing a hypothesis;
- Develop an understanding and an appreciation of the fundamental laws of nature;
- Heighten sensitivity for all living things through a conceptual understanding of the phenomena of life, the processes that govern life, and the role of living things in the universe; and
- Understand the fundamental theories, principles and techniques of the biological sciences and related areas such as chemistry, physics, and math as indicated by current and predicted trends in the discipline.

Assessment Measures, Course Level

Using the GERSCM, all mathematics courses (Category 4 with sample of 5 courses) had competency for scientific and quantitative reasoning. While reviewing the general education requirements, 21 of 50 courses (42%) had scientific and quantitative reasoning competencies within the syllabus (Please refer to Table 8).

Table 8.

General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix, Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

Competency	SQR		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	0	4	0.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	8	22	36.36%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	1	7	14.29%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	5	5	100.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	3	7	42.86%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	4	5	80.00%
Total	21	50	42.00%

Assessment Results

The population at Coppin State is comprised of over 4,000 students who are enrolled in day, evening, and weekend undergraduate/graduate courses. Many are Baltimore residents from very diverse ethnic, religious, and socio-economic backgrounds. Students who do not pass the placement test in mathematics must take the developmental math course DVMT 108 Elementary Algebra and/or DVMT 109 Intermediate Algebra. Of the 3,200 students who are undergraduates, about 90% have to take developmental math with a 75% failure rate. (See Table 9 and Table 10 below.)

In addition, students have to take these courses two or three times before they pass the course can take the appropriate college level general education math course. In effect, the high failure rates and repeat failure rates in both courses detract from the student's academic progress to graduation and impacts heavily on the institutional graduation rate.

Table 9.
Number of Students Passing DVMT 108
Fall Terms, 2004 to 2006

Status	2004	2005	2006
Enrolled	629	587	496
Passing	230	203	N/A
Continued Studies(CS)	186	164	N/A
Failed(F)	66	43	N/A
Withdraw	52	87	N/A
Auto Withdraw	87	82	N/A
Other	8	8	N/A
Percent Passing	36.6%	34.6%	N/A
Total Undergraduate Enrollment	3211	3411	3301

Table 10.
Number of Students Passing DVMT 109
Fall Terms, 2004 to 2006

Grade	2004	2005	2006
Enrolled	254	220	185
Passing	67	40	N/A
Continued Studies(CS)	105	105	N/A
Failed(F)	19	39	N/A
Withdraw	21	25	N/A
Auto Withdraw	41	11	N/A
Other	1	0	N/A
Percent Passing	26.4%	18.2%	N/A
Total Undergraduate Enrollment	3211	3411	3301

Table 11.
Cat VII - Developmental Courses, Success Rates, Spring 2006

Course	Successful	Grand Total
DVMT 108 (007798)	74 (26%)	290 (100%)
DVMT 109 (007799)	62 (25%)	247 (100%)

Table 12.
Cat IV – Mathematics, Success Rates, Spring 2006

Course	Successful	Grand Total
MATH 103 (008488)	13 (87%)	15 (100%)
MATH 110 (008492)	84 (64%)	132 (100%)
MATH 125 (008499)	61 (74%)	82 (100%)
MATH 131 (008500)	53 (79%)	67 (100%)
MATH 203 (008509)	94 (84%)	112 (100%)

Table 13.
Cat V - Natural Sciences, Success Rates, Spring 2006 – Senior Students Only

Course	Successful	Grand Total
BIOL 101 (007414)	36 (95%)	38 (100%)
BIOL 104 (007417)	6 (100%)	6 (100%)
BIOL 107 (007420)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
CHEM 101 (007486)	1 (100%)	1 (100%)
PHSC 101 (009031)	16 (94%)	17 (100%)
PHSC 103 (009033)	47 (89%)	53 (100%)

Using the National Study for Student Engagement Spring 2006 Administration, the following survey indicators were noted:

Indicator 11F: Analyzing quantitative problems.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.92, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.86.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.26, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.02.

Continuous Improvement Efforts / Results of Assessment Activities

Coppin uses the ACCUPLACER to test incoming freshmen in mathematics and reading. Students are assigned to the developmental mathematics course DVMT 108 with an ACCUPLACER mathematics score in the 0 – 81 range; to DVMT 109, with a score in the 82 – 108 range; to the MATH course appropriate to their major, with a score above 108. Test results are recorded in Test Scores for students in the PeopleSoft Student Administration (SA) system as pre-test results using the code ACCU. Post-test scores are also recorded in Test Scores for students in SA to support ongoing analysis of the relationship of the scores to performance in mathematics General Education courses. The post-test score is a combination of work completed in the MATH course as well as the grade earned in the final exam.

The mathematics instructors for GER math courses [MATH 110, MATH 125, and MATH 131] will develop a rubric to evaluate the competencies appropriate to the multiple-choice examination. Forms will be developed in EXCEL to capture performance in the specified rubrics. It is anticipated that manual analysis will be supported by the target date and plans are

underway to record rubric scores in EagleLINKS using GradeBook by 2008 or 2009 following implementation of the next Student Administration system upgrade. Additionally, math faculty have crafted a course redesign for the DVMT with accommodations for more lab and instruction time. The department has also committed the summer to working on redesign initiatives and goals which will be piloted in fall 2007. Four critical components of a redesign plan for developmental Mathematics include:

- A consistent course across the curriculum. Currently, there are only two components of the developmental curriculum that are consistent and these are the departmental final exam and the syllabus. Math faculty want to develop a course that is consistent in the following areas:
 - a. Delivery of course content
 - b. Quizzes
 - c. Course Management System
 - d. Grading Procedures
 - e. Homework assignments
 - f. Tutorials
- Structure of students study habits through mandatory lab hours.
- Decrease lecture time and increase lab hours. The department has agreed that every faculty member will convert 1 hour of regular office hours to 1 hour of lab hours.
- Focus on assessment on an individual, class and institutional level. The math faculty are interested in implementing an online system that automatically assesses student assignments and provides feedback.

The course learning outcomes have been discussed and revised from the old syllabus. Assessment will be done through quizzes, test and homework. Analysis of assessment will be completed on an individual, class and institutional level. At the institutional level, data will be collected by the Student Analytics System through PeopleSoft. On the class level, data will be collected through s course management system. Both EDUCO and *MyMathlab* are very effective in providing various student assessment activities and analysis of student assessment.

The coordinator of freshman mathematics will be responsible for collecting and analyzing data on the class level and the class instructor will be responsible for collecting data on the individual level. The main purpose for collecting this data will be to identify areas that students, instructors, and administrators can make improvements.

Definition

Critical Analysis and Reasoning

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Think critically and analytically using purposeful, self-regulatory judgment;
- Distinguish critical from non-critical information;
- Verify or refute expert opinions;
- Ask questions for clarification after receiving an assignment; and
- Use high-quality content and reflect evaluative thinking in the context of the students' academic level and discipline, as evidenced during classroom discussions, when writing papers, creating displays, or when speaking or performing publicly.

Assessment Measures, Course Level

Using one section for SOC 101, Introduction to Sociology, course data for spring 2007 were assessed on the following criteria: information knowledge, example application, explanation analytical, choices comparison analysis, application, and synthesis. Overall, students demonstrated competency for information knowledge, example application, choices comparison analysis, and application while needing improvement in the areas of explanation analytics and synthesis. In general, the average score for the course assessment instrument was 76 percent.

Assessment Results

Using the GERSCM in Table 14, all English courses (Category 1 with a sample of 4 courses), Mathematics courses (Category 4 and sample of five courses), Social and Behavioral (Category 3 and a sample of 7 courses) and Interdisciplinary & Emerging Issues (Category 6 and a sample of 5 courses) had competency for critical analysis & reasoning. While reviewing the general education requirements, 48 of 50 courses (96%) had Critical Analysis & Reasoning competencies within the syllabus.

Table 14.
General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix, Critical Analysis and Reasoning

Competency	CAR		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	4	4	100.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	21	22	95.45%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	7	7	100.00%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	5	5	100.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	6	7	85.71%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	5	5	100.00%
Total	48	50	96.00%

Key:

CAR = Critical Analysis and Reasoning

Importantly, during spring 2006, the University secured the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus. What follows are the results of specific indicators:

Indicator 2B: Analyzing the basic elements of an idea, experience, or theory, such as examining a particular case or situation in depth and considering its components.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to not outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.02, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.11.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.36, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.26.

Indicator 2C: Synthesizing and organizing ideas, information, or experiences into new, more complex interpretations and relationships.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.95, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.89.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.11, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.07.

Indicator 2E: Applying theories or concepts to practical problems or in new situations.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.06, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.02.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.32, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.21.

Indicator 11E: Thinking critically and analytically.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to not outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.19, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.22.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.49, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.39.

Indicator 11J: Learning effectively on your own.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.95, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.87.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.29, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.06.

Continuous Improvement Efforts / Results of Assessment Activities

The School of Arts and Sciences along with the Dean's leadership has been on active campaign to garner assessment activity and support for General Education. Additionally, the General Education Committee, comprised of primarily faculty, has been very engaged in contributing efforts towards improving General Education through attendance at meetings, writing draft assessments reports, and gathering assessment data. Specifically, the Director of Assessment works with the committee and provides guidance regarding data and technical assessment assistance.

Technological Competency

Definition

Technological Competency

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Master the current technologies, including the expanse of the World Wide Web;
- Access required information quickly and effectively; and
- Use technology effectively to communicate and analyze information.

Students will understand:

- The components of microcomputers and operating systems;
- How to use word processing, spread-sheets, database management systems, presentation software, graphics, and charts, the Internet, the electronic mail, and web publishing;
- The conceptual foundation underlying information technology; and
- How to construct a mental model of how a specific application is working, a model that enables them to think about what might be done to fix a problem, or how new applications might work.

Assessment Measures, Course Level

Using MNSC 150, Technology Fluency, three courses were assessed during fall 2006 and spring 2007. Each of the courses used the Skillset Assessment Manager (SAM) and assessed competencies for Microsoft Office. The average competency score in Microsoft Excel was 74 percent, while the average score for PowerPoint was 85 percent. Importantly, the average score for proficiency in Microsoft Word was 94 percent using these three courses.

Assessment Results

Coppin State University found that students, who utilized computer software, Tegrity, improved the overall performance by 19%, compared to those who did not use this software during spring terms 2006 and 2007.

Using the GERSCM in Table 15, all Mathematics courses (Category 4 with a sample of 5 courses) had competency for technological competency. While reviewing the general education requirements, 18 of 50 courses (36%) had technological competencies within the syllabus (Please refer to Table 13).

Table 15.
General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix, Technological Competency

Competency	TC		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	3	4	75.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	7	22	31.82%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	0	7	0.00%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	5	5	100.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	0	7	0.00%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	3	5	60.00%
Total	18	50	36.00%

Key:

TC = Technological Competency

Importantly, during spring 2006, the University secured the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus. What follows are the results of specific indicators:

Indicator 11G: Using computing and information technology.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.19, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.97.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.42, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.18.

Continuous Improvement Efforts / Results of Assessment Activities

On-going assessment of MNSC 150 will be maintained on a semester basis yearly to better understand course level performance using the software assessment module. Additionally, more documented course level data are needed regarding technological competency. Due to the institutional technical focus, CSU is using innovative technical resources for classroom usage such as Blackboard and Tegrity. While there needs to be more on-going documentation of

student learning outcomes, technology has transformed our learning environment. In the near future, course syllabi need to more adequately reflect this competency. Therefore, in academic year 2007-2008, more documentation will be required at the course level to document this competency along with the relevant assessment instruments and analyses. From this initial review, courses can be identified for student learning outcomes assessment.

Information Literacy

Definition

Information Literacy

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Locate and evaluate meaningful information;
- Understand the usage of multiple information sources such as online databases, videotapes, government documents, and journals in conducting research and/or in problem solving;
- Identify information needed to address a given problem or issue;
- Find needed information and evaluate the information;
- Organize and use information effectively to address the problem or issue at hand;
- Identify the types of information and electronic resources found in the Coppin State University library;
- Conduct a search;
- Frame the research question so that it is appropriate for the breadth and depth required for the research project, in the context of available resources and time for research;
- Research information, use a broad range of information sources (e.g., electronic and print periodicals, chapters in books, government documents, archival material, and microfilm), and distinguish among the various types of resources (e.g., scholarly work, informed opinions of practitioners, and trade literature); and
- Seek help from faculty members, reference librarians, and others outside the institution.

Assessment Measures, Course Level

At this time, course level data were not available. However, as demonstrated by the GERSCM, there is competency being demonstrated at the course level. Future efforts will be geared to gathering course level data and results. The Faculty Assessment Committee and Assessment Steering Committee will add this competency to the list for immediate review for fall 2007 course level assessment projects.

Assessment Results

Using the GERSCM, all English courses (Category 1 with a sample of 4 courses), Mathematics courses (Category 4 with a sample of five courses), Natural Science (Category 5 with a sample of 7 courses) and Interdisciplinary & Emerging Issues (Category 6 with a sample of 5 courses) had competency for information literacy. While reviewing the general education requirements, 34 of 50 courses (68%) had information literacy competencies within the syllabus (Please refer to Table 16).

Table 16.
General Education Requirement Syllabi Competency Matrix, Information Literacy

Competency	IL		
	Total	No. of Crs.	Percent
Cat. 1 - English Composition	4	4	100.00%
Cat. 2 - Arts & Humanities	8	22	36.36%
Cat. 3 - Social & Behavioral	5	7	71.43%
Cat. 4 - Mathematics	5	5	100.00%
Cat. 5 - Natural Sciences	7	7	100.00%
Cat. 6 - Interdisc & Emerging Issues	5	5	100.00%
Total	34	50	68.00%

Key:

IL = Information Literacy

During the academic years of 2005 and 2006, over 50 instructors used the Coppin State University Library and required library instruction in one or more class meetings. To date, 1,088 students have been served by campus librarians.

Table 17.
Library Instruction Offered
Academic Years, 2005 to 2006

Library Instruction	04-05	05-06	Total
No. of Students Served	954	1088	4038
No. of Course Usages	49	54	216

Of the respondents for the Faculty and Course Evaluation in Table 18, 78 percent have used the Coppin State University Library during fall term. Majority of respondents indicated that minimum usage (once or twice a month) accounted for 26 percent while all other users responded that usage ranged from every weekend (8 percent) to several times a week (27 percent) to everyday (10 percent).

Table 18.
Faculty and Course Evaluation Results for Question Three: How often do you use the college library?

Fall Term	No. of Response		Valid Responses		Never		Before each exam	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2006	712	10.70	5,971		1,348	22.60	310	5.20
2005	78	1.70	4,456		979	22.00	243	5.50
2004	89	1.30	6,642		1,677	25.20	376	5.60

Fall Term	Once or twice a month		Every weekend		Several times a week		Everyday	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
2006	1,576	26.40	454	7.60	1,666	27.90	617	10.30
2005	1,175	26.40	353	7.90	1,283	28.80	423	9.50
2004	1,898	28.50	494	7.40	1,725	25.90	472	7.10

Importantly, during spring 2006, the University secured the National Study for Student Engagement to assess the level of student engagement on campus. What follows are the results of specific indicators:

Indicator 1D: Worked on a paper or project that required integrating ideas or information from various sources.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.14, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.08.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.43, while the NSSE cohort average was 3.37.

Indicator 1L: Used an electronic medium (list servers, chat group, Internet, IM, etc) to discuss or complete an assignment.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to not outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 2.61, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.64.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.10, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.83.

Indicator 2D: Making judgments about the value of information, arguments, or methods, such as examining how others gathered and interpreted data and assessing the soundness of their conclusions.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, first-year students tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.12, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.86.

Based on NSSE 2006 Administration, seniors tended to outperform their peers on this indicator with an overall score of 3.07, while the NSSE cohort average was 2.99.

Continuous Improvement Efforts / Results of Assessment Activities

More documented course level data are needed regarding information literacy. Due to the institutional technical focus, CSU is using innovative technical resources for classroom usage such as Blackboard and Tegrity. While there needs to be more on-going documentation of student learning outcomes, technology has transformed our learning environment. In the near future, more course syllabi need to include documentation and evidence of this competency. During the academic year 07-08, courses will be identified for selection in assessing this competency. Additionally, the selected courses will focus on assessment instruments, data collection, and analysis. The results will then be utilized in assessing information literacy practices at CSU with an ongoing plan to assess this competency.

Institutional Level Assessment

Systematic review of curriculum structure, content, and outcomes is managed by the Academic Program Review Committee (APRC), Curriculum Committee (CC), Faculty Assessment Committee (FAC), and General Education Committee (GEC). These committees are responsible for content and assessment affecting the educational programs in the University, and ultimately, all actions by the APRC, CC, FAC, and GEC must be approved by the faculty. The APRC, CC, FAC, and GEC are also responsible for reviewing course and programmatic assessment data to insure that expected abilities and competencies are being met in each year of the specified program.

In 2006, the FAC was formed to develop and implement an institutional assessment plan. This committee has responsibility for matters related to an instructional assessment techniques and assessment of educational outcomes of the offered programs. Currently, the FAC is reviewing assessment instruments and procedures for program and course level assessment as well as developing the institutional and programmatic assessment procedures. The FAC is comprised of the Director of Assessment along with appointed faculty members including the Associate Vice President, Planning and Accreditation. To support the FAC and all assessment activities, the Assessment Steering Committee (ASC) was created with membership that includes: Provost / Vice President of Academic Affairs, Associate Vice President of Planning and Accreditation, Director of Academic Resource Center, Faculty Chairperson, and the Director of Assessment. The goal of the ASC is to facilitate ongoing assessment at the institution. This committee's charge is to ensure that assessment is happening at all levels within the institution along with appropriate assessment measures and continuous improvement efforts.

While the General Education Committee (GEC) has been charged with assessing the course and program level performance of General Education at CSU, it has been very active in providing administrative oversight and documenting and evaluating assessment outcomes. For example, the GEC has performed a course syllabus audit whereby GEC competencies were assessed through a mapping process to ensure documentation of course level assessment. The GE courses were assessed based on the approved General Education competencies reported to the State of Maryland 2004 into the Coppin State University SLOAR. Through curriculum mapping procedures, GEC identified the specific competency illustrated by respective syllabi.

To assist in the ongoing assessment efforts at CSU, two major indirect measures have been employed: Faculty and Course Evaluations and the National Study for Student Engagement. At CSU, faculty and course evaluations are assessed by institutional, program, course and instructor ratings. Yearly, these evaluations are included in the faculty member's annual performance review. During these reviews, faculty members are evaluated and given the appropriate points for overall performance with departmental feedback. At the department / program level, the evaluation information is used to improve teaching quality by the Provost, Deans, and Department Chairs (See Table 19). Additionally, The National Study for Student Engagement was first administered in spring 2006 as a way to gather more timely information about student engagement. The results have been disseminated to the Building Engagement and Attainment for Minority Students (BEAMS) Project Team and Planning Council and have been used to inform

the strategic planning and self-studies process as evidence of our work in student learning. Both of these initiatives have been spearheaded by the Center for Institutional Assessment. The role of the Center, in conjunction with the Office of Planning and Accreditation, is to coordinate assessment efforts at CSU. CSU assessment process answers two critical questions:

- How is institutional effectiveness assessed at CSU through the use of strategic goals and objectives?
- How are assessment data and results used to improve policy formation, budget and fiscal planning, curriculum and student development, and teaching and learning?

It is a centralized University resource designed to inform planning and policy decisions in a wide range of academic and administrative areas. During academic year 2005-2006, the Center has focused its efforts on training and development, survey development, assessment, educational research, and strategic planning. It provides critically important reporting, assessment, benchmarking, planning, and services to support institutional effectiveness while responding to the needs of the University community. An ongoing assessment process consists of data collected in nine broad categories.

The University has adopted an institutional assessment model that incorporates assessing student learning outcomes at the institution, program, and course levels. Both the institutional and program levels are informed by the strategic plan which provides a useful blueprint for the future direction of CSU. In addition, the University began its self-study process demonstrating the application of MSCHE Characteristics of Excellence using Standard Seven and Fourteen as its guide. Assessment is anchored in the strategic goals of the *Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential ...Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan*.

To better understand the magnitude of assessment at CSU in 2001, an audit is annually conducted to highlight the strengths and areas of improvement in the assessment methodology utilized at all levels. This assessment audit is delivered to each unit with detail instruction for completion. It includes the following dimensions:

- Assessment of goal performance
- Assessment of strategy performance
- Continuous improvement methods
- Assessment instruments (qualitative and quantitative)
- Fiscal resources required

Based on previous assessment audits, CSU was able to pinpoint areas where assessment could be strengthened and enhanced. This assessment model calls for a culture of evidence whereby assessment is documented and evaluated on a yearly basis and then utilized in efforts to improve the feedback process. It is our belief that assessment results should be used for celebration, improvement, and enhancement in the areas needing attention. CSU encourages a positive culture of assessment that is institutionally supported.

Assessment Components

The CSU assessment process is inclusive of the following data components:

- A **comprehensive survey research component**, which makes use of extensive standardized instruments to collect data on the attitudes and perceptions of several reference groups: entering freshmen, continuing students, graduating seniors, alumni, non-returning students, employers and students who applied, were accepted, and did not enroll (i.e., CIRP, NSSE, and Alumni Survey).
- A **student perception of teaching quality component** which utilizes the Course and Faculty Evaluation forms to evaluate courses and teaching and various standardized tools to measure the effectiveness of the General Education Program (i.e., Student Satisfaction Surveys).
- A **skill acquisition component** that includes a pre-test and post-test design model to measure student learning in the general education courses, and a departmental comprehensive and/or exit exam for majors completing program requirements including licensure exams (i.e., NCLEX, Placement Tests, Pre-College Summer Program Assessment, PRAXIS).
- A **learning outcomes component** with a focus on teaching and learning (i.e., SLOAR, Course Level Assessment Reports, Academic Program Review Matrix).
- A **technical component** which encourages the use of technology use in the learning environment (i.e., ANALYTICS, CEDAR, TERP).
- An **assessment component** based on the strategic indicators that are outlined in the strategic and assessment plan (i.e., MFR, *Coppin State University in 2010: Nurturing Potential ...Transforming Lives, A Strategic Plan, Peer Performance Report, Toll Report*).
- A **specialized studies component** for the purpose of developing a culture of evidence using educational research (i.e., NSSE, Center for Institutional Assessment Specialized Research Reports, cohort tracking).
- A **program level data component** based on ten indicators such as the relevance of each program to the overall mission of the University, the changing demand for program graduates, problems requiring corrective action, program quality (faculty, productivity (students and faculty), pattern of course offerings, outcomes, adequacy of resources, and fiscal/cost efficiency of programs (i.e., Academic Program Review Matrix, Annual Reports, Faculty Workload Report).
- An **institutional learning based** on providing technical training and resources through the support of the Center for Institutional Assessment and the Office of Planning and Accreditation under the division of the Office of the Provost (i.e., Opening Ceremonies, Special Speakers Series, Faculty Development Workshops, Faculty Grants, Title III Funds, and Yearly Technology and Learning Conferences).

For additional information on the assessment of student learning at Coppin State University, please contact Dr. Pamela Arrington, Associate Vice President for Planning and Accreditation at parrington@coppin.edu or 410-951-3828 and / or Dr. Kriesta L. Watson, Director, Center for Institutional Assessment at kwatson@coppin.edu or 410-951-3493.

May 18, 2007

Table 19.
Faculty and Course Evaluation
Fall Terms, 2004 to 2006

Section II: Course Evaluation	2004		2005		2006	
	AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
13. The course is well organized.	4.23	0.99	4.19	1.05	4.32	0.94
14. Course requirement, as stated in the course syllabus, are being implemented.	4.33	0.90	4.32	0.93	4.42	0.83
15. The course objectives are stated clearly.	4.30	0.92	4.31	0.94	4.41	0.84
16. The course materials are presented in a systematic manner.	4.24	0.96	4.23	0.98	4.34	0.89
17. The course in increasing my knowledge and understanding of the subject.	4.27	0.99	4.27	1.01	4.37	0.91
18. The course objectives are content in agreement.	4.22	1.02	4.28	0.92	4.37	0.84
19. The course content, technology, and materials used are appropriate to the subject matter.	4.27	0.92	4.27	0.94	4.35	0.86
20. The textbook contributes to my understanding of the subject.	4.22	1.02	4.21	1.03	4.28	0.99
21. The course gives me new ideas, skills and/or broadens my interests in the content area.	4.19	1.02	4.19	1.04	4.29	0.95
22. The testing and grading practices are fair and reflect important aspects of the course.	4.24	0.98	4.19	1.05	4.34	0.91
23. Overall, the quality of the course is excellent.	4.23	1.00	4.19	1.06	4.32	0.93

Section IV: Instructor Evaluation	2004		2005		2006	
	AVG	SD	AVG	SD	AVG	SD
34. Seems well prepared for class sessions.	4.42	0.89	4.43	0.93	4.51	0.82
35. Treats all students courteously and with respect.	4.43	0.93	4.43	0.94	4.55	0.08
36. Has a thorough knowledge of the matter.	4.57	0.78	4.58	0.81	4.61	0.73
37. Is readily available for consultation with students outside of class time.	4.31	0.96	4.30	1.00	4.40	0.89
38. Emphasizes major points in lectures and discussions.	4.41	0.96	4.43	0.93	4.49	0.84
39. Gives clear and specific instructions.	4.29	1.01	4.31	1.03	4.41	0.91
40. Provides useful feedback on student progress, examinations, and projects.	4.26	1.03	4.25	1.06	4.36	0.95
41. Asks relevant/stimulating questions and encourages discussions in class.	4.36	0.95	4.33	0.99	4.43	0.89
42. Answers questions clearly and completely.	4.30	1.00	4.30	1.04	4.41	0.92
43. Meets classes as schedule.	4.51	0.82	4.54	0.81	4.57	0.76
44. Overall, the instructor is an effective teacher.	4.40	0.93	4.40	0.98	4.50	0.85

APPENDIX

The following information is included to provide guidance on the criteria identified for each of the competencies listed.

Written and Oral Communication

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Write clear expository and persuasive prose;
- Express their ideas clearly and completely;
- Demonstrate in writing the ability to think analytically about personal experiences, observations, or readings;
- Apply MLA and APA citation styles appropriately;
- Write unified, coherent, and adequately developed paragraphs with clearly expressed ideas;
- Write sentences that conform to the convention of Standard English in usage, punctuation, and mechanics, including spelling; and take a variety of forms, employing such devices as coordination, parallelism, subordination and transition;
- Express ideas in language appropriate to the topic and audience; and
- Write and speak proficiently.

Scientific and Quantitative Reasoning

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Collect, analyze, and interpret data relevant to testing a hypothesis;
- Develop an understanding and an appreciation of the fundamental laws of nature;
- Heighten sensitivity for all living things through a conceptual understanding of the phenomena of life, the processes that govern life, and the role of living things in the universe; and
- Understand the fundamental theories, principles and techniques of the biological sciences and related areas such as chemistry, physics, and math as indicated by current and predicted trends in the discipline.

Critical Analysis and Reasoning

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Think critically and analytically using purposeful, self-regulatory judgment;
- Distinguish critical from non-critical information;
- Verify or refute expert opinions;
- Ask questions for clarification after receiving an assignment; and
- Use high-quality content and reflect evaluative thinking in the context of the students' academic level and discipline, as evidenced during classroom discussions, when writing papers, creating displays, or when speaking or performing publicly.

Technological Competency

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Master the current technologies, including the expanse of the World Wide Web;
- Access required information quickly and effectively; and
- Use technology effectively to communicate and analyze information.

Students will understand:

- The components of microcomputers and operating systems;
- How to use word processing, spread-sheets, database management systems, presentation software, graphics, and charts, the Internet, the electronic mail, and web publishing;
- The conceptual foundation underlying information technology; and
- How to construct a mental model of how a specific application is working, a model that enables them to think about what might be done to fix a problem, or how new applications might work.

Information Literacy

The definition used for this competency is that students will be able to:

- Locate and evaluate meaningful information;
- Understand the usage of multiple information sources such as online databases, videotapes, government documents, and journals in conducting research and/or in problem solving;
- Identify information needed to address a given problem or issue;
- Find needed information and evaluate the information;
- Organize and use information effectively to address the problem or issue at hand;
- Identify the types of information and electronic resources found in the Coppin State University library;
- Conduct a search;
- Frame the research question so that it is appropriate for the breadth and depth required for the research project, in the context of available resources and time for research;
- Research information, use a broad range of information sources (e.g., electronic and print periodicals, chapters in books, government documents, archival material, and microfilm), and distinguish among the various types of resources (e.g., scholarly work, informed opinions of practitioners, and trade literature); and
- Seek help from faculty members, reference librarians, and others outside the institution.

Yearly Course Level Assessment Timeline

Aug-07	Faculty Assessment Committee Training Begin
	Assessment Steering Committee Meeting
	MSCHE Standards Seven and Fourteen Completed
Sep-07	Course Level Assessment Training
	Course Level Selection for Assessment, GE Competencies
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
	Phase I Development of Assessment Database
	NSSE Set-Up Administration, Spring 2008
Oct-07	Course Level Assessment Training Continued
	Course Level Assessment - Mid-Term Data Collection Begin
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
	MSCHE Chair Site Visit
Nov-07	Course Level Assessment - Data Analysis
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
Dec-07	Course Level Assessment - Final Exam Data Collection
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
Jan-08	Data Collection Continues
	Faculty Assessment Committee Training Begins
	Course Level Assessment - Data Collection Ends
	Phase II Assessment Database Development
Feb-08	Faculty Assessment Committee
	Course Level Assessment Training
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings

	NSSE Administration
	Course Level Assessment Data Analysis
Mar-08	Course Level Assessment - Feedback Fall 2007 Courses
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
	Course Level Assessment - Mid-Term Data Collection Begin
Apr-08	Administration
	Faculty Course and Evaluation and Personal Computer Survey Administration
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
	MSCHE Site Visit
May-08	Faculty Course and Evaluation and Personal Computer Survey Administration
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
	Course Level Assessment - Final Exam Data Collection
Jun-08	Course Level Assessment Report, Fall Term
	Faculty Assessment Committee Meetings
	Assessment Steering Committee Meeting
	Phase III Assessment Database Development