

# MISSISSIPPI VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

## STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ANNUAL REPORT

### 2016-2017

#### OVERVIEW/METHODOLOGY <sup>1</sup>

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**

In this report, outcomes are grouped by the five categories and then summarized by competency. For each student learning outcome, at least one assessment marker is given, which includes a measure of performance. The total benchmarks met are divided by the total markers to arrive at a percentage of student learning outcomes met.

In 2016-2017, a majority of student learning outcomes were met in each of the broad learning categories aligned with the MVSU mission statement. More specifically, seventy-three percent (73%) of student learning outcomes related to critical thinking were met or exceeded. Fifty-four percent (54%) of student learning outcomes related to exceptional communication competencies were met or exceeded. Eighty-seven percent (87%) of student learning outcomes related to students' abilities to be service-oriented, engaged and productive citizens were met or exceeded. Ninety-two percent (92%) of student learning outcomes related to student research, as well as seventy-nine percent (79%) of outcomes related to subject mastery were met or exceeded. Summary statistics for each student learning outcome and related competencies are provided in Table 1 below. In addition, programs reported a total of 36 improvements, including 15 improvements in means of assessment, 9 improvements in

---

<sup>1</sup> This report is adapted from McNeese State University's compliance report for SACS standard 3.3.1.1. [http://www.mcneese.edu/sacs/comprehensive\\_standard\\_3\\_3\\_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 goals.

teaching interventions, and 12 gains in student learning. These improvements are summarized in Table 2 and detailed by degree program in Table 4.

### **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 2016-17, competencies in General Education were measured through the University's Quality Enhancement Plan focusing on writing and signature assignments from speech classes. The results from those assessments are summarized in tables 4-8.

**Table 1. Program Benchmarks Summary**

| <b>STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES<br/>(2016-2017)</b>                                 | <b>Benchmarks</b> |                                   |                                       |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
|  | <b>Total</b>      | <b>Number Met<br/>or Exceeded</b> | <b>Percentage Met<br/>or Exceeded</b> |
| <b>I. Students will be critical thinkers.</b>                                    |                   |                                   |                                       |
| General Critical Thinking  | 27                | 18                                | 67%                                   |
| Critical Reading   | 31                | 24                                | 0%                                    |
| Mathematics  | 6                 | 5                                 | 0%                                    |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>64</b>         | <b>47</b>                         | <b>73%</b>                            |
| <b>II. Students will be exceptional communicators.</b>                           |                   |                                   |                                       |
| Writing Proficiency  | 34                | 20                                | 59%                                   |
| Oral Proficiency   | 8                 | 3                                 | 38%                                   |
| Computer Literacy  | 4                 | 2                                 | 50%                                   |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>46</b>         | <b>25</b>                         | <b>54%</b>                            |
| <b>III. Students will be service-oriented, engaged, and productive citizens.</b> |                   |                                   |                                       |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>61</b>         | <b>53</b>                         | <b>87%</b>                            |
| <b>IV. Students will Participate in Research</b>                                 |                   |                                   |                                       |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>104</b>        | <b>96</b>                         | <b>92%</b>                            |
| <b>V. Students will Master the Disciplines</b>                                   |                   |                                   |                                       |
| <b>Total</b>   | <b>287</b>        | <b>227</b>                        | <b>79%</b>                            |

**Table 2. Reported Improvements (2016-2017)**

|                           |           |
|---------------------------|-----------|
| Means of Assessment       | 15        |
| Interventions             | 9         |
| Gains in Student Learning | 12        |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>36</b> |

**Table 3. General Education Benchmarks Summary. (2016-2017)**

| COMPETENCY                    | BENCHMARKS |                        |                            | EVIDENCE           |
|-------------------------------|------------|------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|
|                               | Total      | Number Met or Exceeded | Percentage Met or Exceeded |                    |
| <b>I. Writing Proficiency</b> |            |                        |                            |                    |
| English 101                   | 7          | 7                      | <b>100%</b>                | Table 5 (Appendix) |
| English 102                   | 11         | 6                      | <b>55%</b>                 | Table 6 (Appendix) |
| <b>II. Oral Proficiency</b>   |            |                        |                            |                    |
| Speech 201                    | 20         | 18                     | <b>90%</b>                 | Table 7 (Appendix) |

\*Data provided by the Dr. John Bradford (QEP) and the Department of Mass Communications.

## APPENDIX

**Table 4. Improvements by Degree Program**

| <b>PROGRAM</b>       | <b>IMPROVEMENTS</b>  | <b>TYPE</b>  |
|----------------------|--|--------------|
| Accounting, BA       | Initiated Peregrine Academics inbound and outbound exams.  | Assessment   |
| Accounting, BA       | Initiated embedded questions in senior level course.   | Assessment   |
| Art, BA              | Students now using digital media.  | Intervention |
| Biology, BS          | Increased student scores in population biology, evolution, and ecology from a 29 to a 35.  | Learning     |
| Biology, BS          | Students have done a better job graphing, displaying, and analyzing their data, specifically in the results section of their research with scores going from a 2.7 to a 3.3 over the last 3 years.     | Learning     |
| Biology, BS          | Improvements in student's ability to use the microscope from a 2.8 to a 3.6 over the last year and calculating/preparing solutions in the laboratory from at 2 to a 2.2 over the last year.            | Learning     |
| Bioinformatics       | All first-year graduate students present at the university's Graduate Research Day.  | Intervention |
| Bioinformatics       | The category 'Protein/Gene Function' increased by .55 points (from 3.20 to 3.75). Improvement is still needed to meet the 4.0 goal.  | Learning     |
| Bioinformatics       | The percentage of students presenting peer-review research at conferences increased from 20% to 50%.   | Learning     |
| Criminal Justice, MS | Adopted a common grading rubric for all graders of the comprehensive exam to provide more transparency in grading the comprehensive exams.   | Assessment   |
| Elem Ed, BS          | Teacher Interns were assigned specific due dates to plan lessons and activities in a timely manner.  | Intervention |
| Elem Ed, BS          | When specific problems concerning indicators were identified, an Improvement Plan was initiated, for the Teacher Interns.  | Intervention |
| Elem Ed, BS          | A concentrated effort to deliver consistent lesson plan instruction was initiated and implemented in ED 380, Instructional Planning and Adaptive Instruction, and ED 405 and ED 409 Directed Teaching. | Intervention |
| Elem Ed, BS          | Because of consistent and vigorous support provided for interns, there was a 34.4% increase between midterm and final averages.  | Learning     |
| Elem Ed, BS          | The Formative mean average yielded a 2.08. The Summative mean average was 2.3. There was a 10.5% increase between midterm and final averages.  | Learning     |
| Elem Ed, BS          | The Formative mean average yielded a 2.36. The summative mean average was 2.56. There was a 8.47% increase between midterm and final averages.   | Learning     |
| Elem Ed, BS          | The Formative mean average yielded a 2.65. The Summative mean average was 2.71. There was a 2.26% increase between midterm and final averages.   | Learning     |
| Elem Ed, BS          | The Formative mean average yielded a 1.83. The Summative mean average yielded a 2.7. There was a 47.5% increase between midterm and final averages.  | Learning     |
| Elem Ed, BS          | The Formative mean average yielded a 2.5. The Summative mean average yielded a 2.8. There was a 12% increase between midterm and final averages.   | Learning     |
| Govt & Politics, BA  | A new rubric for internship was administered.  | Assessment   |
| History, BS          | Adjusted rubric calculation.   | Assessment   |
| History, BS          | Faculty introduced a new assessment rubric.  | Assessment   |

|                           |  |              |
|---------------------------|--|--------------|
| History, BS               | The AY 2017-18 plan requires rewrites on the first and second assignments.   | Intervention |
| Teaching, MA              | Selected rubrics for measuring children’s language learning process.   | Assessment   |
| Teaching, MA              | Selected rubrics for measuring ability to embrace children’s literature as an instrument of literacy instruction. The Picture book item was removed from the rubric. | Assessment   |
| Teaching, MA              | Selected rubrics for measuring skills of teaching reading in the elementary school.  | Assessment   |
| Teaching, MA              | Emphasis was placed on children’s learning theories and learning assessments.  | Intervention |
| Math, BS                  | Assessment was done later in the semester. That seemed to allow more students time to make a better showing on the assessment.                                       | Intervention |
| Math, BS                  | There was a gain of 5% in the overall class average.   | Learning     |
| Pre-Law/Legal Studies, BA | A new Internship rubric was adopted.   | Assessment   |
| MRPP&P                    | Created a database of possible questions used in preparatory sessions for comprehensive exam.  | Assessment   |
| MRPP&P                    | Created a database of possible questions used in preparatory sessions for research process.  | Assessment   |
| MRPP&P                    | Instituted refresher course in data analysis using SPSS.   | Intervention |
| Sociology, BA             | Revised Rubrics.   | Assessment   |
| Speech, BA                | New rubrics developed for three areas.   | Assessment   |

**Table 5. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Benchmarks. English 101.**

|  | <b>ENGLISH 101<br/>(AY 2016-2017, n=183)</b>                  |   |                                   |
|--|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| <b><u>Benchmarks</u><br/>(Rubric Components)</b> | <b>Number of Students Meeting Benchmark<br/>(2 or Higher)</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark<br/>(2 or Higher)</b> | <b>Overall Benchmark Met- 90%</b> |
| <b>Rhetorical Situation</b>                      | 174   | 95%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |
| <b>Organization</b>                              | 172   | 94%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |
| <b>Content Development</b>                       | 168   | 92%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |
| <b>Conventions</b>                               | 170   | 93%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |
| <b>Syntax &amp; Mechanics</b>                    | 173   | 95%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |
| <b>Reflection</b>                                | 171   | 93%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |
| <b>Writing Process</b>                           | 172   | 94%   | <b>Yes</b>                        |

**Table 6. Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) Benchmarks. English 102.**

|  | <b>ENGLISH 102<br/>(AY 2016-2017, n=97)</b>                   |   |                                    |
|--|---|---|------------------------------------|
| <b><u>Benchmarks</u><br/>(Rubric Components)</b> | <b>Number of Students Meeting Benchmark<br/>(2 or Higher)</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark<br/>(2 or Higher)</b> | <b>Overall Benchmark Met- 90%?</b> |
| Rhetorical Situation                             | 95  | 98%   | Yes                                |
| Organization                                     | 96  | 99%   | Yes                                |
| Content Development                              | 95  | 98%   | Yes                                |
| Conventions                                      | 95  | 98%   | Yes                                |
| Syntax & Mechanics                               | 97  | 100%  | Yes                                |
| Reflection                                       | 65  | 67%   | No                                 |
| Writing Process                                  | 92  | 95%   | Yes                                |
| Valid Sources                                    | 66  | 68%   | No                                 |
| Integrated Sources                               | 63  | 65%   | No                                 |
| Internal Citation                                | 63  | 65%   | No                                 |
| Bibliography                                     | 66  | 68%   | No                                 |

**Table 7. General Education Benchmarks: Speech 201.**

|   | <b>FALL 2016<br/>(n=112)</b>                             |  |
|---|--|--|
| <b><u>Benchmarks</u><br/>(Rubric Components)</b>                        | <b>Number of Students Meeting Benchmark<br/>(4 or 5)</b> | <b>Percentage of Students Meeting Benchmark<br/>(4 or 5)</b> |
| <b>General</b>  |  |  |
| A. The speaker seemed committed to the topic                            | <b>88</b>  | <b>78.57</b>   |
| B. The speech fulfilled specifics of the assignment                     | <b>68</b>  | <b>60.71</b>   |
| C. The speech promoted identification among topic, audience and speaker | <b>109</b>   | <b>97.32</b>   |
| D. The thesis was clearly stated  | <b>109</b>   | <b>97.32</b>   |

|   |     |       |
|---|-----|-------|
| E. The topic was handled with imagination | 98  | 87.50 |
| F. The time limit was adhered closely     | 103 | 91.96 |

### Substance and Structure

|  |     |       |
|--|-----|-------|
| A. The introduction aroused interest   | 102 | 91.07 |
| B. The speech was easy to follow   | 95  | 84.82 |
| C. The main points were easy to identify   | 97  | 86.61 |
| D. The main points were supported with evidence and documentation  | 65  | 58.04 |
| E. The conclusion helped to remember the speech  | 95  | 84.82 |
| F. Transitions were used effectively   | 95  | 84.82 |
| A. Language was clear, simple, direct, and expressive with appropriate projection                                | 87  | 77.68 |
| B. Grammar was correct   | 65  | 58.04 |
| C. Presentation was conversational with appropriate rate of speaking, use of Pauses, gestures, and body language | 89  | 79.46 |
| D. The speech was presented extemporaneously   | 88  | 78.57 |
| E. Notes/note cards were not Used excessively  | 89  | 79.46 |
| F. Speaker maintained good eye contact   | 91  | 81.25 |

### Appearance

|   |     |       |
|---|-----|-------|
| A. Speaker was dressed appropriately, including shoes and accessories | 104 | 92.88 |
|---|-----|-------|

|   |                 |              |
|---|-----------------|--------------|
| <b>B. Speaker was well-groomed (hair, face, etc.)</b> | <b>107</b>      | <b>95.54</b> |
| <b>Mean Scores of 4 or Above:</b>                     | <b>18 of 20</b> | <b>90%</b>   |

\*Rubric Scores: 5-Exceptional, 4-Above Average, 3-Average, 2-Below Average, 1-Poor.

### **Proficiency Profile Baseline Data**

What follows are summaries of baseline data from the first year of administering the Educational Testing Service PPT, which measures several student proficiencies. The concluding 3 tables compare our students' performance with other institutions. Benchmarks will be set and plans developed following the second administration. Full analysis of this data is not possible until benchmarks are set.

**Table 8. Summary of Proficiency Classifications from the PPT**

| Skill Dimension                                  | Proficiency Classification |          |                |
|--|----------------------------|----------|----------------|
|  | Proficient                 | Marginal | Not Proficient |
| <b>Reading, Level 1</b>                          | 9%                         | 18%      | 73%            |
| <b>Reading, Level 2</b>                          | 0%                         | 9%       | 91%            |
| <b>Critical Thinking</b>                         | 0%                         | 0%       | 100%           |
| <b>Writing, Level 1</b>                          | 18%                        | 55%      | 27%            |
| <b>Writing, Level 2</b>                          | 0%                         | 18%      | 91%            |
| <b>Writing, Level 3</b>                          | 0%                         | 9%       | 91%            |
| <b>Mathematics, Level 1</b>                      | 0%                         | 27%      | 73%            |
| <b>Mathematics, Level 2</b>                      | 0%                         | 0%       | 100%           |
| <b>Mathematics, Level 3</b>                      | 0%                         | 0%       | 100%           |
| <b>Number of Students Tested</b>                 | <b>14</b>                  |          |                |
| <b>Number of Students Included in Statistics</b> | <b>11</b>                  |          |                |