

THE CITADEL
INSTITUTIONAL EFFECTIVENESS
SUMMARY REPORT

1 August 2004

Isaac S. Metts, Jr., Ph.D.

Associate Vice President
For Academic Affairs

171 Moultrie Street
Charleston, SC 29409
(843) 953-5155
FAX (843) 953-5896

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Academic Advising	1
Majors and Concentrations	4
Full Reports:.....	4
Interim Report:	
Business Administration	4
Technologically Prepared Workforce.....	15

INTRODUCTION

The Citadel's approach to Institutional Effectiveness integrates the three fundamental components: strategic planning, assessment, and budgeting. The Citadel requires periodic assessment of the programs and services of its budgeted departments and units. The Citadel's approach to assessment is in the main decentralized. That is, the school, department, or operational unit responsible for providing a program or service is responsible for the quality of that program or service and thus for its assessment. It is expected that assessment will be more effective if developed and monitored by the unit providing the program or service. It has also been found that assessment tools that are imbedded in normal operations are in general more effective than "tack-on" or external assessment requirements.

Through the annual assessment report, each budgeted department of the College presents its Mission, measurable Expected Results on which the success of meeting that mission will be judged, Assessment Tools that are used to measure results, the actual Assessment Results, and the Actions Taken or Resources Needed to address issues that have surfaced in the assessment process. In those cases where additional resources are needed to address assessment issues, a Supplemental Assessment Matrix is also presented to summarize the assessment issue and the needed resources. These matrices are presented to the Provost and Vice Presidents to facilitate the inclusion of assessment results in the budgeting process of the College.

Annual assessment reports are collected in hardcopy and provided to the President, Provost, and each Vice President to be used in the institution's budgeting process. These volumes have also been made available in the Office of Planning and Assessment, now the Office of the Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, for the entire institution and serve as the basis for annual Institutional Effectiveness Reports provided to the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education. These volumes also provide the context in which the Strategic Plan Coordination and Implementation Committee, now the Strategic Planning Council (SPC), monitors the implementation of the Strategic Plan. Since the 2002-03 academic year, annual assessment reports have been available electronically on The Citadel's webpage.

Academic Advising

To address the full range of advising needs for its cadets, The Citadel has established a three-tier advising system: the Academic Faculty Advisor (a faculty member from the cadet's major department), the Company Academic Advisor (a member of the faculty or staff assigned as an advisor to each cadet company), and the Cadet Academic Officer (a senior cadet officer who has responsibility to monitor the academic well-being of each cadet in his or her cadet company).

In addition, each freshman cadet is required to enroll in and complete Orientation 101, a one-credit course designed to assist the Fourth Class Cadet in his or her transition to college-level work and cadet life. One of the requirements of the syllabus of this course is that the instructor meet with every student to discuss the student's academic status, any personal issues, and plans for the coming semester. This requirement is intended to complement but not replace the three primary sources of advice. This provides a private, personal, one-on-one discussion between the

freshman student and a member of the faculty or staff who has volunteered to assist the student in his or her efforts to reach full academic potential. The importance of this advising session is assessed in the evaluation of the course.

Cadet Academic Officers are being trained in a variety of areas that should enhance their abilities to assist other cadets in their cadet units (company/battalion/regiment). They all take the Meyers/Briggs and are assisted in understanding what this evaluation can tell about learning styles and most effective approaches to study.

Cadet Academic Officers are also involved in advising and counseling fellow cadets relative to class attendance. The Citadel is convinced that this peer counseling will make a significant difference in helping fellow cadets understand that class attendance is a fundamental duty of cadet life. With the revised electronic Class Absence System, class absences are reported each day, and peer counseling takes place the next day. This system was in place for the 2003-04 academic year, and base line class absence data was collected. The effectiveness of this component of advising will be assessed annually through examination of individual as well as cadet unit class absences.

Mission: The Citadel recognizes that academic advising is integral to the educational process and is committed to providing a comprehensive program of academic advising for all its students. The mission of academic advising is to assist students to attain their academic goals through developing and evaluating their educational and career plans. This process begins with academic orientation and continues until graduation.

The advising process is the responsibility of both the student and the advisor. The College publishes in the annual catalog information about requirements, policies, and procedures and assigns each student a knowledgeable advisor who can assist the student to fulfill degree requirements. Specifically, advisors assist students to clarify their career goals and to develop an educational plan for realizing these goals. In addition, advisors monitor students' progress and act as a source of referral to other campus agencies.

Expected Results: The Citadel has expectations of both its advisors and advisees in the advising process.

Expectations of the Academic Faculty Advisor: The academic faculty advisor is expected to be familiar with current college programs, policies, and procedures; to provide accurate and current information regarding core curriculum and major requirements; to assist student with major/career choice; to help students define and develop realistic goals; to monitor students' progress; to provide referrals and encourage students to utilize services on campus; to maintain confidentiality of information discussed in advising sessions; and to keep records of information discussed with students.

Expectations of the Company Advisor: The company Advisor is expected to build a rapport with the members of his or her cadet company, especially the fourth class cadets. The Company Advisor works closely with the Cadet Academic Officer in monitoring the

academic performance and class attendance of the cadets in the company, ensuring that the atmosphere in the company area is conducive to study during Evening Study Period, and monitoring the academic well being of the company as a whole.

Expectations of the Cadet Academic Officer: The Cadet Academic Officer is expected to monitor the academic well being of all cadets in his/her cadet company with special attention to the fourth class cadets. The Class Absence system will be carefully monitored and strictly enforced. Cadets will be made aware of and urged to use academic support services. Cadets whose academic records indicate problems will be referred to appropriate support activities.

Expectations of the Student: The student is expected to read the College Catalog to become knowledgeable about college programs, policies, and procedures; to meet regularly with advisor; to prepare a tentative course schedule prior to the pre-registration conference with advisor; to clarify personal values and goals; to accept responsibility for decisions; and to understand that it is his/her responsibility to adhere to college policies and to meet degree requirements.

The overall expectation of the College for its academic advising program is to help each student reach his or her full potential as a student and to have The Citadel experience provide a strong foundation for future careers and service opportunities. The Citadel hopes to prepare its students to assume leadership positions in whatever careers they might select.

Assessment Tools:

1. Citadel Experience Survey: Graduating seniors are asked to reflect on the quality of academic advising. It is expected that at least 80% of the respondents will respond Satisfied or Very Satisfied with each area of advising.

Satisfaction with availability of academic advisor:
80.95% Satisfied or Very Satisfied

Quality of advising on course selection and requirements:
69.13% Satisfied or Very Satisfied

Quality of advising on academic policies:
77.18% Satisfied or Very Satisfied

2. Orientation 101: Orientation 101 participants are asked, "How helpful was your professor in discussing your adjustments to The Citadel?" At least 80% of the Orientation 101 participants will indicate that the advising sessions were "Helpful" or "Very Helpful."

For fall 2003, 71.7% responded that advising sessions were "Helpful" or "Very Helpful."

Assessment Results/Actions Taken: The expectation of at least 80% satisfaction with each aspect of student advising has not been achieved.

Actions Planned:

1. The College has implemented the Personal Access Web for Students (PAWS). This provides each student with direct electronic access to his or her academic and financial records. PAWS shows the student exactly where he or she is in meeting degree requirements (Degree Audit), current class schedule, and academic classification. PAWS permits the student to register for courses and make schedule changes without advisor assistance. With all these electronic capabilities, perhaps the very nature of student advising has changed. The Advisory Committee on Advising will consider this matter in the fall 2004 semester. Perhaps we should be stressing and evaluating other aspects of advising.
2. With the implementation of the “advising” role of Orientation 101 and the additional role of Cadet Academic Officers relative to class attendance, we have added additional “advisors” for fourth class cadets. Perhaps we are over advising our fourth class cadets. This will also be reviewed by the Advisory Committee on Advising in the fall 2004 semester.
3. Additional training sessions are planned for Company Advisors and Cadet Academic Officers.
4. Assessment tools are being refurbished to provide more specific information on the various components and major players in the advising process.
5. The Advising Handbook will be revised based on the results of actions presented above.

Majors and Concentrations

Full Reports: No programs are scheduled for either SACS or discipline-related accreditation visits.

Interim Report: Business Administration

Assessment Philosophy

The overall objective of the School of Business Administration’s assessment program is **continuous improvement** in our programs. We have identified three primary stakeholders -- our graduating students, our alumni, and recruiters from firms who hire our graduates -- from whom we collect information about perceptions of our programs’ quality. Survey results from these groups should tell us how well-prepared graduating students believe they are, how well-prepared our alumni found themselves once they

were in jobs applying the concepts they learned in our programs, and how firms that hire our graduates rate our students' potential and actual job performance compared to the performance of other schools' graduates.

Survey instruments have been designed for each of our three stakeholder groups. We ordinarily conduct our Senior Exit Survey (for undergraduates) annually and our Alumni and Recruiter Surveys once every four years. In addition to the Senior Exit Survey developed and administered by our Department, The Citadel's Office of Planning and Assessment also administers a college-wide *Citadel Experience* Survey to all graduating seniors. We are then able to analyze just the responses of business majors to this college-wide survey.

All of these surveys give us some good information about what our students and graduates think or feel about our program; but for some time now, we have also been concerned about how we might measure what our graduates *know* when they leave our program. To that end, we began using Educational Testing Service's (ETS) Major Field Assessment Tests (MFAT) for both our undergraduate graduate programs for the first time last year.

Expected Assessment Results

Alumni Survey: The objective portion of our departmental Alumni Survey includes questions in four broad categories of knowledge and abilities: knowledge of functional areas, communications skills, analytical skills, and general characteristics. In each question, respondents are asked to rate how well The Citadel's Business Administration program prepared them for their career on a scale from 1 (meaning "very poorly") to 5 (meaning "very well"). The faculty decided that we would feel good about our graduates' satisfaction in areas which receive a mean score of 3.50 or better. We thought that mean responses in the 3.00-3.50 range would indicate room for improvement, and means less than 3.00 would identify our most serious weaknesses.

Recruiter Survey: Our Recruiter Survey asks corporate recruiters to compare Citadel graduates their company has hired with employees who graduated from other schools. The recruiters are asked to supply ratings of Citadel graduates' effectiveness in seventeen different areas using a five-point scale on which 1 meant "worst" and 5 meant "best." A sixth choice for each question was "Not Observed." The faculty decided that we would be pleased with mean scores of 3.50 or better for our students' comparative effectiveness. We thought that mean responses in the 3.00-3.50 range would indicate room for improvement, and means less than 3.00 would identify areas which need our immediate attention.

Senior Exit (Student) Surveys

A. College-Wide (*Citadel Experience*) Survey: We identified a total of nine questions from the college-wide survey which we thought would give us the best information

about how business majors perceived the quality of the education they received in our Department. The first four questions asked students to rate their satisfaction in several areas using these answer choices: “Very Satisfied,” “Satisfied,” “Dissatisfied,” “Very Dissatisfied,” or “No Opinion.” We decided that we would be pleased if 80% of our majors were “Very Satisfied” or “Satisfied” in each of these areas. The last four survey items asked our majors to “Strongly Agree,” “Agree,” “Disagree,” or “Strongly Disagree” with four statements about our curriculum and our professors. We decided that we would be pleased if 80% of our majors “Strongly Agreed” or “Agreed” with these statements.

B. School of Business Survey: In addition to the institution’s annual college-wide senior exit survey, between 1996 and 1999 we had conducted our own (then Department, now School of Business) senior exit survey. This instrument asked more questions specifically designed for our majors. After a three-year period of not using this separate survey, we once again our majors these more specific questions by adding the questions to the *Citadel Experience* college-wide survey. The School of Business portion of the survey was divided into three sections. Section One asked students to rate their satisfaction with the exposure they received in our department to various societal issues using a scale from 1 (meaning “poor”) to 5 (meaning “excellent”). Section Two asks students to rate the effectiveness of various teaching methods used in our department using the same scale, with a sixth possible answer being “not experienced.” The third section is identical to the entire objective portion of our Alumni Survey, so it was subdivided into four categories plus one overall rating question. The faculty decided that we would feel comfortable about our students’ satisfaction in areas which received a mean score of 3.50 or better. We thought that mean responses in the 3.00-3.50 range would indicate room for improvement, and means less than 3.00 would identify our most serious weaknesses.

Major Field Assessment Test Results: Because we had never used the Major Field Assessment Tests before, we really didn’t know what kind of results to expect. Several colleagues from other schools who have used this test had advised us that unless we gave students some time of formal review to prepare for the test and unless we made some connection with students’ performance on the test and their grade in some course, then the results of the test were not likely to give us a good idea about how our students compare to those in other programs. We decided to administer the test through our capstone course, Strategic Management (BADM 422 in the undergraduate program and BADM 635 in the MBA program). Having no particular frame of reference, we hoped that our students would score in at least the 50th percentile in all parts of this test.

Actual Assessment Results

Alumni Survey: In our four-year cycles of survey administration, the Alumni Survey is scheduled for administration in the summer of 2004. We are now in the process of preparing that survey for distribution, but we have no results to include in this annual report.

Recruiter Survey: The table below shows the results of this year’s Recruiter Survey, along with (where possible) comparable data from our 1998 Recruiter Survey.

QUESTION	MEAN	MEAN	CHANGE
	2003	1998	1998-2003
1. Communicate ideas orally	4.08	4.17	-0.09
2. Communicate ideas in writing	3.90	3.81	0.09
3. Work as a team member	4.37	(n/a)	
4. Solve problems creatively/analytically	3.95	4.06	-0.11
5. Apply computer technology	4.05	4.06	-0.01
6. Apply accounting/finance principles	3.97	(n/a)	
7. Apply management principles	4.07	(n/a)	
8. Realistic perspective of work environment	3.85	4.05	-0.20
9. Make sound business decisions	4.00	(n/a)	
10. Appreciate workplace diversity	4.22	3.52	0.70
11. Work effectively in global markets	4.00	4.38	-0.38
12. Set/achieve individual goals	4.24	4.45	-0.21
13. Adapt to changing environment	4.15	4.32	-0.17
14. Act ethically	4.54	4.60	-0.06
15. Be effective leaders in workplace	4.39	4.32	0.07
16. Be effective leaders in community	4.21	(n/a)	
17. How do Citadel grads compare to others	4.18	4.26	-0.08

*(n/a) indicates questions which were not included in the 1998 survey

We had said that we would be pleased with mean scores of 3.50 or better. In this year’s survey, all means were greater than 3.85, and twelve of the seventeen means were greater than or equal to 4.00. The lowest mean (3.85) was for Question 8, which asks if our graduates appear to have a realistic perspective of the work environment. The highest mean was for question 14, in which our graduates received high marks for “acting ethically.” This is a very encouraging result, given that our mission is to develop leaders of *principle*. The other highest means were also in areas which we particularly value. Recruiters said that our graduates were particularly good at leading effectively in the workplace, working as a member of a team, setting and achieving individual goals, and appreciating workplace diversity.

In terms of how the results of our 2003 Recruiter Survey differed from the results of our 1998 Recruiter Survey, the single largest different was the improvement in our students’ score for appreciating workplace diversity (Question #10). In 1998, the institution’s transition from single-gender to co-educational was in its very early stages; by 2003,

recruiters have apparently recognized the fact that this transition has gone more smoothly than many might have predicted. The largest single decrease in mean score was for question #11, which concerns working effectively in global markets. This result merits some further inquiry and discussion among the faculty, but it might be related to the lack of enthusiasm our students sometimes demonstrate to recruiters for the prospect of frequent moves as their careers progress.

The results on this year's survey were, for the most part, fairly similar to the results from our 1998 Recruiter Survey. Apart for the exceptions noted above, most of the changes in mean values B positive or negative B were quite small. The fact that the number of respondents this year (53) was more than twice the number we had in 1998 (23) may have contributed to some of these small fluctuations.

Senior Exit Surveys

A. College-Wide (*Citadel Experience*) Survey: The Table below shows the percentages of our Majors who were "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" (Questions 1-4) or who "Strongly Agreed" or "Agreed" (Questions 5-8) with each survey item:

<u>Survey Item</u>	<u>1995</u>	<u>2003</u>	<u>2004</u>	<u>Change 2003-2004</u>	<u>Change 1995-2004</u>
% Very Satisfied or Satisfied					
1. Your Major program of study	80.4	89.5	91.3	+1.8	+10.9
2. Instruction in your Major	63.6	82.5	89.1	+6.6	+25.5
3. Academic Advising in course sel/req	40.1	57.0	60.9	+3.9	+20.8
4. Academic Advising for policies	39.3	55.8	69.6	+13.8	+30.3
% Who Strongly Agree or Agree					
5. BA currclm preprd me to use mthdlgs	83.1	82.6	89.1	+6.5	+6.0
6. Major profs interested in my progress	54.2	67.4	78.2	+10.8	+24.0
7. Major profs were accessible	63.6	83.7	87.0	+3.3	+23.4
8. Major profs had enthusiasm for subj	67.3	81.4	87.0	+5.6	+19.7

Our goal had been for at least 80% of our students to be "Very Satisfied" or "Satisfied" with or to "Strongly Agree" or "Agree" with the survey items we had identified as being most important. We exceeded this goal in five out of eight categories and came very close in other one (#7). However, on the questions relating to satisfaction with academic advising (#3 and #4) we fell far short of our goal. The quality of our faculty advising has been a concern of ours for some time, and from 1995 through 2002 we made remarkable and steady improvement in terms of mean scores on this survey. In the 2003 survey, though, our ratings declined noticeably. We are pleased to report that our ratings in the Advising area showed **great**

improvement once again this year (2004). We suspect that the Luncheons/Information Sessions we conducted for each of our three upper classes of majors last October had much to do with these ratings increases. We will be discussing this issue in particular when we go over all of the assessment results at our first School of Business faculty meeting of the new school year.

Short-term Changes: The overall results from this year’s college-wide senior exit survey are encouraging. Compared to the ratings we received in 2003, this year’s mean scores were noticeably improved in each and every category. Last year’s sobering results caught the attention of faculty and administrators alike, and our conscious efforts to improve our “customer service” this year have paid off.

Longer-term changes: In addition to the fact that this year’s mean ratings were higher than the 2003 ratings for all eight questions we particularly look at, the 2004 mean ratings were also quite a bit higher than our 1995 ratings in all eight cases. It is also encouraging that several of the 1995-to-2003 increases in mean ratings were quite large.

B. School of Business Survey: The historical results from our own School of Business Administration survey are shown below. For various reasons, our “internal” senior exit survey had not been given since 1999. In 2003, we began to administer these “internal” questions to graduating senior business majors as a special additional section on their college-wide (*Citadel Experience*) survey. In hindsight, it seems obvious that we are probably asking too many questions B particularly in light of the great length of the college-wide survey itself!

Item #	Variable	Average 1996-99	2003	2004	Chg from 2003	Chg from 96-99 avg.
1	Satisfaction with academic advice	3.50	3.76	3.80	0.04	0.30
2	Satisfaction with career advice	3.44	3.53	3.73	0.20	0.29
3	Satisfaction with personal advice	3.30	3.11	n/a	n/a	n/a
4	Satisfaction with overall advice	3.67	3.55	3.80	0.25	0.13
5	Exposure to cultural differences	3.58	3.73	3.91	0.18	0.33
6	Exposure to ethical issues	3.82	4.07	4.28	0.21	0.46
7	Exposure to gender issues	3.76	3.63	3.57	(0.06)	(0.19)
8	Exposure to racial issues	3.62	3.41	3.57	0.16	(0.05)
9	Exposure to international business	3.65	3.31	3.47	0.16	(0.18)
10	Overall exposure to societal issues	3.84	3.75	4.04	0.29	0.20
11	Effectiveness of casework	3.92	3.82	3.98	0.16	0.06
12	Effectiveness of lecture	3.75	3.59	3.61	0.02	(0.14)
13	Effectiveness of in-class discussions	3.96	4.05	4.00	(0.05)	0.04
14	Effectiveness of group projects	3.93	3.98	3.73	(0.25)	(0.20)

15	Effectiveness of in-class experiential exercises	3.86	3.65	3.52	(0.13)	(0.34)
16	Effectiveness of computer assignments	3.96	3.78	3.70	(0.08)	(0.26)
17	Effectiveness of independent research projects	3.84	3.75	3.90	0.15	0.06
18	Effectiveness of internship	3.97	3.7	3.83	0.13	(0.14)
19	Knowledge of accounting	3.66	3.27	3.37	0.10	(0.29)
20	Knowledge of economics	3.93	3.48	3.64	0.16	(0.29)
21	Knowledge of marketing	4.07	3.59	3.95	0.36	(0.12)
22	Knowledge of management	4.18	4.53	4.46	(0.07)	0.28
23	Knowledge of finance	3.64	3.39	3.44	0.05	(0.20)
24	Knowledge of production	3.90	3.57	3.58	0.01	(0.32)
25	Knowledge of MIS	4.08	3.63	3.77	0.14	(0.31)
26	Knowledge of inter-relationship of functional areas	4.01	3.91	3.80	(0.11)	(0.21)
27	Developing writing skills	3.94	4.08	4.04	(0.04)	0.10
28	Developing listening skills	4.17	4.3	4.19	(0.11)	0.02
29	Developing speaking skills	4.22	4.35	4.47	0.12	0.25
30	Developing formal oral presentation skills	4.21	4.36	4.42	0.06	0.21
31	Problem formulation ability	4.07	3.86	3.85	(0.01)	(0.22)
32	Knowledge of sources of business data	4.17	3.82	3.83	0.01	(0.34)
33	Statistical analysis skills	4.04	3.67	3.83	0.16	(0.21)
34	Statistical interpretation skills	4.09	3.68	3.83	0.15	(0.26)
35	Developing computer literacy	4.30	4.19	4.22	0.03	(0.08)
36	Understanding business ethics	4.32	4.31	4.52	0.21	0.20
37	Developing inter-personal skills	4.29	4.15	4.24	0.09	(0.05)
38	Learn stress management skills	4.25	4.09	4.22	0.13	(0.03)
39	Understanding cultural diversity in U.S.	4.02	3.77	3.91	0.14	(0.11)
40	Understanding the legal environment	4.26	3.81	3.98	0.17	(0.28)
41	Understanding international business environment	4.05	3.41	3.57	0.16	(0.48)
42	Coping with uncertainty in decision-making	4.24	3.83	3.91	0.08	(0.33)
43	Preparation in major	4.30	3.94	4.02	0.08	(0.28)
44	Help in career placement	4.26	3.2	3.32	0.12	(0.94)
45	Overall satisfaction with instruction in major	4.40	3.89	3.76	(0.13)	(0.64)

Rating of areas

Advising (Items 1-4)	3.48	3.49	3.78	0.29	0.30
----------------------	------	------	------	------	------

Diversity issues (Items 5-10)	3.71	3.65	3.81	0.16	0.10
Effectiveness of teaching methods (Items 11-18)	3.90	3.79	3.78	(0.01)	(0.12)
Teaching of functional areas (Items 19-26)	3.93	3.68	3.75	0.07	(0.18)
Workplace skills (Items 27-31)	4.12	4.20	4.19	(0.01)	0.07
Quantitative skills (Items 32-35)	4.15	3.84	3.93	0.09	(0.22)
Environment and coping skills (Items 36-42)	4.21	3.91	4.05	0.14	(0.16)
General preparation and placement (Items 43-45)	4.32	3.68	3.70	0.02	(0.62)

Identifying salient themes in the table of responses above is difficult, because the results are quite mixed. In some areas such as faculty advising B ironic, given the results of the college-wide survey questions about advising discussed above B we showed noticeable improvement when comparing this year's ratings to the 1996-99 average ratings (see question #1). In other areas (question #9 regarding exposure to international issues, for example), we see fairly large decreases in ratings. When rating the knowledge they gained in our primary functional areas, seniors seem less satisfied in all areas except management (see questions #19 - #26). It is also obvious that business seniors would like to have more help from faculty with career planning and placement. Again, all of these items will be discussed with the entire School of Business faculty early in the Fall, 2003 semester.

MFAT Results

Presented below are the group percentile scores from our first two years of experience with the MFAT:

Undergraduates:

Subject Area	Fall 2002	Spring 2003	Fall 2003	Spring 2004
Accounting	36.1	35.7	40.4	36.5
Economics	34.1	32.3	38.4	38.9
Management	52.1	52.4	52.9	54.7
Quantitative Business Analysis	49.6	47.9	52.4	46.8
Finance	29.7	29.1	33.3	31.9
Marketing	40.8	38.9	41.7	44.5
Legal and Social Environment	47.2	44.6	42.7	43.5
International Issues	39.4	35.3	37.6	39.4

MBA Students:

Subject Area	Spring 2003	Spring 2004
Marketing	54.3	54.8
Management	48.2	57.3
Finance	41.4	50.8
Managerial Accounting	46.7	47.9
Strategic Integration	56.2	59.8

It appears that the advice we received from colleagues at other institutions was correct. We did not give our students any type of review preparation for the test, nor did we tie their performance on the test to any kind of grade. For those reasons, there was evidently a problem getting all students to take the test seriously enough to try to do their best. Nevertheless, it also appears that the faculty needs to closely student these results to see what curriculum adjustments might be warranted in light of these results. The scores from the past two years do not meet our expectations, and they tend to suggest that our graduating students are not as well-prepared as we want them to be. We are concerned enough about these results that we have decided to hold a faculty retreat devoted to “Assurance of Learning,” and we will spend a great deal of time looking closely at the MFAT and the student results we have seen so far.

Use of Survey Results

Once the surveys have been analyzed each year, the results are used in two ways: (1) the entire faculty discusses the results at a School faculty meeting devoted to assessment issues, and (2) the School of Business’s Undergraduate Program and Assessment Committee (UPAC) and Graduate Program and Assessment Committee (GPAC) carefully study the results to see if curriculum revisions are suggested by the assessment results. They also propose modifications to our survey instruments as they deem necessary.

The improvement in our students’ perceptions about the quality of our advising services we experienced this year can be directly attributed to behavior modifications motivated by last year’s assessment results. The “wake-up call” we received last year in the area of Advising caused us to spend more time talking about these issues with School of Business faculty. Results from our Alumni and Corporate Recruiter Surveys in previous years have led us to make changes such as increasing the exposure of our undergraduate and graduate students to the international aspects of business and making our *Communications in Business* (BADM 316) course a required course rather than an elective.

Continuous Improvement of the Assessment Process

We believe our School has made a good start at assessing the quality of our programs by developing and using our three different kinds of surveys. At the same time, we recognized that the data we had been collecting gave us much more information about various groups’ perceptions of our program than they gave us about students’ mastery of our discipline’s subject matter. We believe the introduction of the *Major Field Assessment Tests* into our undergraduate

and graduate capstone courses will be an important step in the evolution of our departmental assessment program.

Technologically Skilled Workforce

The Citadel prepares its students to be principled leaders in an ever more technologically dependent world. Electronic information management technology is, therefore, incorporated in every aspect of the student's educational experience. Students and faculty have ready access to 15 fully equipped, general purpose computer labs; special purpose labs in Civil Engineering, Electrical Engineering, Computer Science, Physics, and Modern Languages; and 80 multimedia classrooms and lectures halls.

The Citadel campus is fully networked giving students and faculty direct access to each other, other resources on campus, and the Internet. Each faculty member has a state-of-the-art PC linked to the campus network and with a full range of application software. Each student is encouraged to have a computer in his/her barracks room, and in the 2003-04 academic year more than 90% of day students had personal computers that were linked to the campus network. Electronic communication has become the norm for students, faculty, and staff. Perhaps most important, The Citadel has moved aggressively to provide users access to library information through electronic databases. This enables students and faculty to find and retrieve information when they need it and where they are working. This capability is used in practically every course offered.

The Citadel requires that every student demonstrate "computer literacy" either by passing a test developed and administered by Information Technology Services or by completing an approved computer-related course. Since fall 1999, each entering freshman has also been required to complete Citadel 101, a course intended to help the student make the academic/emotional transition to college/cadet life and ensure that the student has, or is aware of, the tools needed to reach his/her full potential. As part of this course, students are provided workshops on the computer as an essential tool for success at The Citadel and in professional life. Students are introduced to the electronic resources of the College; email as an efficient communication tool; on-line access to their academic records through "PAWS"; and access to library holdings and the internet.

The Web address of The Citadel's Title II report is:

<http://www.citadel.edu/academicaffairs/index.html>