

Institutional Effectiveness Committee

Assessment of Institutional Reports

The Director of Institutional Research summarized the common methods that were being used in program Institutional Effectiveness Reports for the 2002-2003. The following strategies were found to be in use:

Assessment Method	Used		Percent Using
	Yes	No	
Senior Exit Survey	8	7	53.33%
Informal Student Input	14	4	93.33%
Informal Faculty Input	9	6	60.00%
Alumni Survey	8	7	53.33%
Employment Survey	1	14	6.67%
Writing Assessment	5	10	33.33%
Student Skills Inventories	5	10	33.33%
Information Seeking Skill Test	4	11	26.67%
Specific Short-term Projects	7	8	46.67%
External Assessment of Learning Outcomes	6	9	40.00%
Internal Assessment of Learning Outcomes	9	6	60.00%

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness began in 2003-2004 upon suggestion by the Director of Institutional Research. Each department's IE report is evaluated by at least two members of the IE Committee and these data are given to the program's Chair and Coordinator for IE.

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Reports for 2003-2004

	Assessment Methods	Mission/Goals	Results	Planned Changes	Changes In Place	Overall Rating	Meets SACS Standards
Art Education	Weak	Very Strong	Neutral	Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Strong
Art	Neutral	Strong	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral

Biology	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Business	Neutral	Very Strong	Neutral	Strong	Very Strong	Neutral	Strong
Chemistry	Strong	Neutral	Neutral	Weak	Neutral	Neutral	Strong
<i>Early Childhood</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>
<i>Education MAT-LD</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>
Elementary Education	Neutral	Very Strong	Weak	Neutral	Weak	Neutral	Strong
English Composition	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
History	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Neutral	Strong	Strong	Very Strong
<i>Instructional Accommodation</i>	<i>Very Strong</i>	<i>Very Strong</i>	<i>Very Strong</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Neutral</i>
Library	Strong	Neutral	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Mass Communication	Strong	Strong	Neutral	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong

n							
MASP	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Math	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
MEd LD	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>
Physics	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Psychology	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Sociology	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Very Strong</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	3.50	<i>Neutral</i>
Speech	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Weak</i>
Student Affairs	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Strong</i>	<i>Neutral</i>	<i>Weak</i>	<i>Neutral</i>
Teaching Materials Center	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Theatre	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong

Writing Center	Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Strong
----------------	--------	-------------	--------	--------	-------------	--------	--------

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Reports for 2004-2005

	Assessment Methods	Mission/ Goals	Results	Planned Changes	Changes In Place	Overall Rating	Meets SACS Standards
Biology	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Business	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Chemistry	Strong	Neutral	Neutral	Weak	Neutral	Neutral	Strong
<i>Early Childhood</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>	<i>Very Weak</i>
English Composition	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Professional Writing	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Library	Strong	Neutral	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
MASP	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Math	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Physics	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong

Psychology	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Sociology	Neutral	Very Strong	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral	Neutral
Speech	Weak	Strong	Weak	Weak	Very Weak	Neutral	Weak
Teaching Materials Center	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong	Strong
Theatre	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong
Writing Center	Strong	Very Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Very Strong	Strong	Strong

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Reports for 2005-2006

Evaluation of Institutional Effectiveness Reports for 2006-2007

Content of Strong IE Reports

In examining the IE reports submitted by departments/programs in 2005, the following items were typically addressed in the reports rated "Good" (4) or "Excellent" (5).

1. total number of presentations by faculty; percentage of faculty presenting
2. total number of publications by faculty; percentage of faculty publishing; where and what published
3. total number of faculty seeking further education, via workshops or courses
4. total amount of committee and service activities by faculty
5. total amount of community service by faculty
6. curricular improvements made and new courses created
7. technology purchased and how used
8. student presenting papers at conferences or receiving awards
9. grants and awards won by faculty

Last update: 2005

10. performance of students on exit exams and other criteria (distribution of grades/performance on assignments); what is the goal for their performance and if it was met
11. ratio of faculty to students
12. number of majors and minors; are these increasing and by how much
13. fostering interdepartmental relationships and how
14. student clubs and honor societies and their activities
15. overall teaching evaluations/average rating for faculty
16. rigor of course content
17. course overloads
18. use of facilities
19. general availability of faculty for students
20. student perceptions/views of program
21. enrollments in courses
22. how these aforementioned items match up with the department/program's mission statement and objectives
23. (in some reports) goals/standards set for each of the preceding 1-21 items
24. (in some reports) how many graduates entering graduate school