MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY
STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ANNUAL REPORT
2013-2014

OVERVIEW/METHODOLOGY [1]

To demonstrate effectiveness in educational programs, every academic program at MVSU, including the General Education program, goes through an annual assessment process. Each program identifies student learning outcomes, assesses the extent to which it achieves those outcomes, and uses the results of assessment to make improvements. Additionally, special initiatives are undertaken to measure competencies in General Education.

The MVSU Mission Statement serves as the guiding document for developing broad categories of student learning. The Mission Statement sets the stage for student learning in that it articulates the University's intent to prepare students who are **1) critical thinkers, 2) exceptional communicators, 3) service-oriented, engaged and productive citizens 4) capable researchers and 5) accomplished in their disciplines**. Academic assessment reporting begins with an alignment to these broader goals.

Program Assessment

The five core categories were to summarize the achievements in assessment by the degree programs at Mississippi Valley State University. In reporting Program Assessment, outcomes are grouped by the five categories and then summarized by competency. For each student learning outcome, at least one assessment benchmark is given, which includes a measure of performance. The total benchmarks met are divided by the total benchmarks attempted to arrive at a percentage of student learning outcomes met.

In 2013-2014, a majority of student learning outcomes were met in each of the broad learning categories aligned with the MVSU mission statement. Summary statistics for each student learning category and related outcomes are provided in Table 1 below. Based on the analysis of the benchmarks, a number of improvements were made. Assessment measures wee refined and interventions were undertaken to improve student learning. These improvements are summarized in Table 1 and detailed by degree program in Table 2.

---

[1] This report is adapted from McNeese Sate University's compliance report for SACS standard 3.3.1.1. http://www.mcneese.edu/sacs/comprehensive_standard_3_3_1. McNeese has 3 student learning outcomes that are pursued university-wide as part of a master plan. MVSU uses its mission statement to identify its common student learning outcomes.

General Education Assessment

The University also measures student competencies fostered by the courses in its general core curriculum. The same categories are used as in Program Assessment so that all academic endeavors can be aligned with the University Mission. In 2013-14, competencies in General Education were measured through the University's Quality Enhancement Plan focusing on writing and a signature assignment from speech classes. The results from those assessments are summarized in tables 3-6. During Academic Year 2013-14, the University focused on assessing effective communication. Plans are underway to expand general education assessment.

Table 1. Program Benchmarks Summary

STUDENT LEARNING GOALS (2013-2014)	Benchmarks			Improvements		
	Total	Number Met or Exceeded	Percentage Met or Exceeded	Means of Assessment	Interventions	Gains in Student Learning
I. Students will be critical thinkers.						
General Critical Thinking	4	2	50%	0	0	
Critical Reading	8	4	50%	0	0	
Mathematics	12	6	50%	0	2	
Total	**24**	**12**	**50%**	**0**	**2**	
II. Students will be exceptional communicators.						
Writing Proficiency	27	20	74%	0	4	
Oral Proficiency	7	4	57%	0	0	
Computer Literacy	5	1	20%	0	0	
Total	**39**	**25**	**64%**	**0**	**4**	
III. Students will be service-oriented, engaged, and productive citizens.						
Total	**12**	**9**	**75%**	**0**	**0**	
IV. Students will Participate in Research						
Total	**28**	**28**	**100%**	**1**	**5**	
V. Students will Master the Disciplines						
Total	**134**	**99**	**74%**	**2**	**17**	

*The AY 2013-2014 reporting format did not encourage reporting student learning gains. This problem has been corrected in the AY 2016-2017 format.

Table 2. Improvements by Degree Program

DEGREE PROGRAM	IMPROVEMENTS	TYPE	CATEGORY
Applied Technology, BS	Weekly progress checks implemented.	Means of Assessment	Research (4)
Applied Technology, BS	Adding a presentation component to core curriculum courses.	Intervention	Research (4)
Applied Technology, BS	A writing component was added to all department courses.	Intervention	Effective Communication (2)
Applied Technology, BS	Voted to eliminate one internship course from the graduation requirements	Means of Assessment	Discipline Mastery (5)
Accounting, BA	Reviewed syllabi and curricula	Means of Assessment	Discipline Mastery (5)
Accounting, BA	Examined course textbook selection and teaching methods	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Criminal Justice, BS	Aligned course objectives with Dept	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Criminal Justice, MS	Aligned course learning objectives Dept	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Early Childhood Ed	Re-emphasized teaching of theory	Intervention	Effective Communication (2)
Early Childhood Ed	Candidates were provided video lessons to strengthen preparation and understanding for writing integrated lesson plan for their unit	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Early Childhood Ed	Emphasized guided teaching and modeling	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Elementary Ed, BS	Time management issues were addressed during weekly Teacher Intern seminars	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Elementary Ed, BS	Targeted Student Accountability, Lesson Planning, Discipline Models and Using Data to Guide Instruction	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Elementary Ed, BS	Utilized Classroom Management Strategies and Assessment and Evaluation Topics that target Student Accountability	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Elementary Ed, MS	Assessed the progress of the students' learning using new tools	Intervention	Research (4)

Table 2. Continued…

DEGREE PROGRAM	IMPROVEMENTS	TYPE	CATEGORY
Elementary Ed, MS	Monitored test time more closely	Intervention	Research (4)
Elementary Ed, MS	Adopted current research on best practices	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
English	Required a 20-page research paper in an upper-level 3-credit course in junior year	Intervention	Research (4)
English	Students took turns answering the exercise questions, assisted with speaking aloud	Intervention	Effective Communication (2)
Music/Music Ed	Instructor implemented new levels of instruction and clearly defined the goals required	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Music/Music Ed	The faculty decided to survey students that took the exam to try and understand why there were large sections left blank.	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Music/Music Ed	The faculty decided to survey students that took the exam to try and understand why there were large sections left blank.	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Theater	Re-emphasized which improved the delivery of the dramatic presentation.	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Mathematics	Made changes in instructional component of math curriculum.	Intervention	Critical Thinking (1)
Rural Public Policy, MA	Students were encouraged to consult faculty one-on-one	Intervention	Discipline Mastery (5)
Rural Public Policy, MA	Students are required to write components of research proposals in their class assignments to familiarize them with the research process	Intervention	Research (4)

Table 3. General Education Benchmarks Summary. (2013-2014)

COMPETENCY	BENCHMARKS			EVIDENCE
	Total	Number Met or Exceeded	Percentage Met or Exceeded	
I. Writing Proficiency (QEP)				
English 101	7	0	**0%**	Table 4 (Appendix)
English 102	11	2	**18%**	Table 5 (Appendix)
II. Oral Proficiency				
Speech 201	40	23	**58%**	Tables 6-7 (Appendix)
III. Computer Literacy				
Computer Science 111	5	Computer Science 111	**100%**	Computer Science 111 Table 8 (Appendix)

*Data provided by the QEP Oversight Committee, the Department of Mass Communications, and the Department of Mathematics, Computer and Information Sciences.

Table 4. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Benchmarks. English 101.

Benchmarks (Rubric Components)	ENGLISH 101 (Fall 2013, n=84)		
	Number of Students Meeting Benchmark (2 or Higher)	Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark (2 or Higher)	Overall Benchmark Met- 90%?
Rhetorical Situation	74	88.10%	No
Organization	72	85.71%	No
Content Development	75	89.29%	No
Syntax & Mechanics	69	82.14%	No
Writing Process	64	76.19%	No
Conventions	70	83.33%	No
Reflection	67	79.76%	No

Table 5. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Benchmarks. English 102.

Benchmarks (Rubric Components)	ENGLISH 102 (Spring 2014, n=13)		
	Number of Students Meeting Benchmark (2 or Higher)	Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark (2 or Higher)	Overall Benchmark Met- 90%?
Rhetorical Situation	65	89.04%	No
Organization	65	89.04%	No
Content Development	68	93.15%	Yes
Syntax & Mechanics	70	95.89%	Yes
Writing Process	62	84.93%	No
Conventions	65	89.04%	No
Reflection	60	82.19%	No
Research Benchmarks*			
Valid Sources	59	80.82%	No
Internal Citation	50	68.49%	No
Integrated Sources	53	72.60%	No
Bibliography	40	54.79%	No

*Research rubric components were measured only in English 102 for AY 2013-2014.

Table 6. General Education Benchmarks: Speech 201. (Fall 2013)

Benchmarks (Rubric Components)	FALL 2013 (n=126)		
	Number of Students Meeting Benchmark (3, 4 or 5)	Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark (3, 4 or 5)	Mean Score
General			
A. The speaker seemed committed to the topic	114	90.48%	4.29
B. The speech fulfilled specifics of the assignment	116	92.06%	4.22
C. The speech promoted identification among topic. audience and speaker	117	92.86%	4.4
D. The thesis was clearly stated	118	93.65%	4.49
E. The topic was handled with imagination	118	93.65%	4.29
F. The time limit was adhered closely	114	90.48%	4.39
Substance and Structure			
A. The introduction aroused interest	118	93.65%	4.48
B. The speech was easy to follow	116	92.06%	4.43
C. The main points were easy to identify	118	93.65%	4.41
D. The main points were supported with evidence and documentation	112	88.89%	3.19
E. The conclusion helped to remember the speech	117	92.86%	4.37

| F. Transitions were used effectively | 117 | 92.86% | 3.99 |

Table 6. Continued…

Presentation			
A. Language was clear, simple, direct, and expressive with appropriate projection	118	93.65%	4.44
B. Grammar was correct	104	82.54%	3.87
C. Presentation was conversational with appropriate rate of speaking, use of Pauses, gestures, and body language	113	89.68%	3.87
D. The speech was presented extemporaneously	112	88.89%	4.13
E. Notes/note cards were not Used excessively	110	87.30%	4.03
F. Speaker maintained good eye contact	114	90.48%	4.2
Appearance			
A. Speaker was dressed appropriately, including shoes and accessories	116	92.06%	4.44
B. Speaker was well-groomed (hair, face, etc.)	118	93.65%	4.51

Table 7. General Education Benchmarks: Speech 201. (Spring 2014)

Benchmarks (Rubric Components)	SPRING 2014 (n=57)		
	Number of Students Meeting Benchmark (4 or 5)	Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark (4 or 5)	Mean Score
General			
A. The speaker seemed committed to the topic	35	61.40%	3.88
B. The speech fulfilled specifics of the assignment	35	61.40%	3.82
C. The speech promoted identification among topic. audience and speaker	41	71.93%	4.12
D. The thesis was clearly stated	39	68.42%	4.11
E. The topic was handled with imagination	34	59.65%	3.63
F. The time limit was adhered closely	35	61.40%	3.88
Substance and Structure			
A. The introduction aroused interest	38	66.67%	4.04
B. The speech was easy to follow	37	64.91%	4
C. The main points were easy to identify	36	63.16%	4.04
D. The main points were supported with evidence and documentation	18	31.58%	2.35
E. The conclusion helped to remember the speech	32	56.14%	3.82
F. Transitions were used effectively	34	59.65%	3.95

Table 7. Continued…

Presentation			
A. Language was clear, simple, direct, and expressive with appropriate projection	37	64.91%	3.91
B. Grammar was correct	18	31.58%	3.19
C. Presentation was conversational with appropriate rate of speaking, use of Pauses, gestures, and body language	38	66.67%	3.77
D. The speech was presented extemporaneously	35	61.40%	3.81
E. Notes/note cards were not Used excessively	32	56.14%	3.75
F. Speaker maintained good eye contact	36	63.16%	3.81
Appearance			
A. Speaker was dressed appropriately, including shoes and accessories	43	75.44%	4.25
B. Speaker was well-groomed (hair, face, etc.)	46	80.70%	4.37

Table 8. General Education Benchmarks: Computer Science 111.

Application	Percentage of Content Understood (n=72) (Benchmark=60% for each category)
Internet Explorer 9	85%
MS Access 2010	83%
MS Excel 2010	82%
MS PowerPoint 2010	79%
MS Word 2010	85%