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I. Degree Program: Psychology Undergraduate
   1. Assessment Instruments: Major Field Tests, Exit Interviews, Senior Projects
   2. Students Assessed:
      Day: 6
      Evening: 6
      Online: 53
      AHE: 92
   3. Results of Assessment:
      A. MFT Results:
         National Mean (X) =156.2 Standard Deviation(S)= 14.8
         Subcategory 1 (Learning/Cognition): X=56 S= 14.7
         Subcategory 2 (Perception, Sensation, Physiology, Comp/Ethology): X = 56.5  S = 15.2
         Subcategory 3 (Clinical/Abnormal): X=55.8 S=14.4
         Subcategory 4 (Developmental/Social): X=56.1 S=14.7

         DAY
         MEAN: 167 (+10.8) (n=6) (70th Percentile)
         Subcategory 1: 61 (+5)
         Subcategory 2: 64 (+7.5)
         Subcategory 3: 61 (+5.2)
         Subcategory 4: 71 (+14.9)

         EVENING
         MEAN: 155.3 (-.9) (n=6) (45th Percentile)
         Subcategory 1: 49.5 (-6.5)
         Subcategory 2: 48.7 (-7.8)
         Subcategory 3: 60.3 (+4.5)
         Subcategory 4: 57 (+.9)

         AHE
         MEAN: 145.6 (-10.6) (n=92) (20th Percentile)
         Subcategory 1: 46.7 (-9.3)
         Subcategory 2: 47.1 (-9.4)
         Subcategory 3: 49.1 (-6.7)
         Subcategory 4: 48.1 (-8)

         NOTE: Psychology MFT scores vary by campus. Scores were:
Salt Lake City: 160.5 (n=4) (55th Percentile)
Jefferson City: 154 (n=5) (40th Percentile)
Crystal Lake: 153.2 (n=14) (40th Percentile)
San Luis Obispo: 152.2 (n=10) (40th Percentile)
Lake County: 152 (n=1) (40th Percentile)
Moberly: 150 (n=4) (35th Percentile)
Lake Ozark: 146.4 (n=9) (25th Percentile)
Patrick AFB: 144 (n=1) (20th Percentile)
Rolla: 144 (n=6) (20th Percentile)
Jacksonville: 143 (n=5) (15th Percentile)
Ft. Worth: 142.8 (n=6) (15th Percentile)
Christian County: 142 (n=9) (15th Percentile)
Orlando: 140 (n=8) (10th Percentile)
Ft. Leonard Wood: 135.4 (n=10) (5th Percentile)

ONLINE
MEAN: 146 (-10.2) (n = 53) (25th Percentile)
Subcategory 1: 46.8 (-9.2)
Subcategory 2: 47.2 (-9.3)
Subcategory 3: 51.6 (-4.2)
Subcategory 4: 48.2 (-7.9)

B. Assessment of Major Form Comments: The AM forms contributed little to the assessment. Some instructors apparently cut and paste their responses from term to term. Once comment made more than once expressed a need for more physiology/biology/neuroscience based courses in Psychology. Other curricular changes were also suggested.

4. Analysis: The Day college Psychology MFT scores were above the national mean in every category and the Evening campus students scored approximately at the national average. Day students scored approximately 2/3 of a standard deviation above the national mean; those scores were in the 70th percentile nationally. AHE scores vary by location, but the average AHE score (145.6) is significantly below the national mean and is in the 20th percentile nationally. Online campus students scored, on average, in the 25th percentile nationally. For the second year in a row Orlando students scored more than one Standard Deviation below the national mean, and this year the Ft. Leonard Wood students scored significantly more than one Standard Deviation below the national mean. It is also troubling that students at almost all AHE campuses and the Online campus are scoring below, sometimes significantly below, the national mean. Students on seven of the campuses tested scored below the 25th percentile nationally.

5. Recommendation for Improvement: The Orlando and Ft. Leonard Wood concerns should be addressed immediately. Orlando students have performed poorly on the MFT the last two years. The Department recommends requiring
all senior projects from under performing AHE and Online campuses be sent to the home campus for evaluation. If scores do not improve the College should consider more drastic measures. The number of AHE students tested in Psychology is now large enough to begin reaching conclusions. Otherwise the Department should consider whether any deficiencies could be addressed via changes to the curriculum.

II. Degree Program: History Undergraduate

1. Assessment Instruments: Major Field Test, Senior Projects
2. Students Assessed:
   Day: 4
   Evening: 7
   Online: 0
   AHE: 25
3. Results of Assessment:
   A. MFT Results
      National Mean (X) = 145 Standard Deviation (S) = 13.4
      Subcategory 1: (U.S. History): X = 44.8 S = 13.3
      Subcategory 2: (European): X = 45.4 S = 13.4
      Subcategory 3: (African, Latin American, Asian) X = 45.9 S = 13.3

      DAY
      MEAN: 139.25 (-5.75) (n=4) (30th percentile)
      Subcategory 1: Unavailable
      Subcategory 2: Unavailable
      Subcategory 3: Unavailable

      EVENING
      MEAN: 143.3 (n=7) (40th percentile)
      Subcategory 1: 43.4 (-1.4)
      Subcategory 2: 42.7 (-2.7)
      Subcategory 3: 44.1 (-1.8)

      AHE
      MEAN: 141.8 (-3.2) (n=25) (35th percentile)
      Subcategory 1: X = 43.6 (-1.2)
      Subcategory 2: X = 41.9 (-3.5)
      Subcategory 3: X = 41.4 (-4.5)
      NOTE: The n sizes are too small to identify specific weaknesses.

   B. AM Form Comments: Once again there was no common theme offered by the comments. Some instructors apparently are evaluating only the senior seminar, not the major itself. Instructors were concerned that students cannot appropriately use Chicago Style. The evening instructor indicated students are not required to write research
papers in their other courses (this is a requirement in every History master syllabus).

4. **Analysis:** With a few notable exceptions the History MFT scores are below the national average. Although n sizes are small this is a concern. Individual students scored very well (85th percentile) and very poorly (1st percentile). At this time these scores, while interesting, are too incomplete to be useful. The number of exams given is too small.

5. **Recommendation for Improvement:** Monitor MFT results over time to identify strengths and weaknesses. Begin reconsidering the History curriculum.

III. **Degree Program: Political Science**

1. **Assessment Instruments:** Major Field Test, Senior Project, Oral Presentation

2. **Students assessed;**
   - Day: 3
   - Evening: 0
   - AHE: 2 (both from Hancock Field, NY)
   - Online: 0

3. **Results of Assessment:**
   - **A. MFT Results**
     - National Mean(X) = 150.6 Standard Deviation (S) = 14.6
     - Subcategory 1: (U.S. Government): X = 50.5 S = 14.6
     - Subcategory 2: (Comparative): X = 50.4 S = 14.5
     - Subcategory 3: (International Relations): X = 50.6 S = 15.1

     - **Day**
       - Mean: 161.3 (+10.7) (n=3) (70th percentile)
       - Subcategory 1: Not Reported
       - Subcategory 2: Not Reported
       - Subcategory 3: Not Reported

     - **AHE**
       - Mean: 150 (-.6) (n=2) (45th percentile)
       - Subcategory 1: 48 (-2.5)
       - Subcategory 2: 48 (-2.4)
       - Subcategory 3: 55 (+4.4)

   - **B. AM Form Comments:** The one AHE instructor evaluated the culminating experience course rather than the major. He said the course was too intense for eight-week terms. Otherwise the comments were not helpful.
4. **Analysis**: Day students continued scoring well above the national mean, but the results are too incomplete to be of value. The n size is too small. The two AHE students scored statistically at the national mean.

5. **Recommendation for Improvement**: Monitor MFT results over time to identify strengths and weaknesses. Continue discussing the possibility of moving the research course to the sophomore year.

---

**IV. Degree Program: Sociology Undergraduate**

1. **Assessment Instruments**: Major Field Test, Senior Project

2. **Students Assessed**:
   - Day: 2
   - Evening: 6
   - AHE: 0
   - Online: 0

3. **Results of Assessment**:
   - **A. MFT Results**:
     - **NATIONAL MEAN** (X): 148.7 Standard Deviation (S): 12.3
     - **Subcategory 1 (Core Sociology)**: X=49.4 S=12.2
     - **Subcategory 2 (Critical Thinking)**: X=48.8 S=12.4

     **DAY**
     - MEAN: 164 (+15.3) (n=2) (85th percentile)
     - Subcategory 1: Not Reported
     - Subcategory 2: Not Reported

     **EVENING**
     - MEAN: 158.3 (+9.6) (n=4) (70th percentile)
     - Subcategory 1: 58.3 (+8.9)
     - Subcategory 2: 59.5 (+10.7)

   - **B. AM form comments**: The evening instructor is concerned with the lack of instruction in qualitative research. This is being addressed by the department. He also expressed concern that modern theory is being neglected. This too is being addressed via the curriculum.

4. **Analysis**: The number of students taking the Sociology MFT was too small to draw inferences. Nonetheless, the scores are heartening because only one of the eight students tested scored below the national mean.

5. **Recommendation for Improvement**: Monitor MFT results over time to identify strengths and weaknesses.

---

**V. Degree Program: Philosophy and Religious Studies**

1. **Assessment Instruments**: Senior Project, Oral Presentations

2. **Students Assessed**:
Day: 3
Evening: 0
AHE: 0
Online: 0

3. **Results of Assessment:** Once again only three students graduated with this degree. The instructor reported that they were able to comprehend and analyze classic texts in religious studies and that they successfully completed a major study based on the literature. Students had difficulty defending claims and thinking “on their feet.”

4. **Analysis:** Analysis not possible

5. **Recommendation for Improvement:** Consider separating Philosophy and Religious Studies tracks within the major. Provide students more access to current literature.

**COMMENT:** As stated in the last departmental report, the Assessment of Major forms are not very helpful. Comments often pertain to a particular class rather than to issues common to all venues. Also, MFT results often contradict instructor comments.