

NCA Self Study
Criterion 3 Documents

Eastern Illinois University

Year 2013

CASA Annual Report 2012-2013

Karla J. Sanders
Center for Academic Support and Assessment

This paper is posted at The Keep.
http://thekeep.eiu.edu/eiunca_teachinglearning_docs/28

Center for Academic Support and Assessment

Annual Report to the

Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs

AY 2012-2013

Prepared June 2013 by Karla Sanders, Ph.D., Executive Director

Eastern Illinois University's Center for Academic Support and Assessment (CASA) offers this report to the Provost/Vice President for Academic Affairs to summarize the unit's work during AY 2012-2013. The Director and staff members for each unit contributed to the information contained in this report, which is organized around CASA's major functions and by unit. As in previous years, AY13 presented both new opportunities and challenges, yet CASA's staff continued to serve Eastern's students well and to provide quality services.

Because CASA provides academic services and offers services to meet individual student needs, it is uniquely suited to meet the University's over-arching goal of integrating the academic and personal development of students. CASA offers academic support services to Eastern students that contribute to educational accessibility, and many of these services take the form of one-on-one counseling for students about academic schedules, major/minor choices, graduation requirements, disability accommodations, study skills and time management, testing needs, and other issues affecting our students. CASA and its units submit this report as an accounting of our work for AY13 and our striving for excellence in our programs and services.

Personnel, Major Purchases, and Goals

In AY13, there were some staff changes. Julie Runyon, the Disability Specialist, has been on short-term disability since February 2012. Her leave will be re-evaluated by SURS after July 31, 2013. Her position remains vacant. A failed search was conducted in Fall 2012; no one was willing to take a full-time, interim position. In Spring 2013, three graduate students were hired to do some of the work the Disability Specialist would normally do, but these students cannot fully take the place of a professional staff member. The Office of Student Disability Services has been down in personnel 25% for 16 months, and this remains true at the writing of this report.

Taisha Mikell resigned from the Student Success Center effective October 2012 as the Student Support Specialist. The title for that position was changed to Assistant Director to reflect better the nature of the position. A search was conducted in FA12, and Brian Gorman joined the staff in January 2013 as the first SSC Assistant Director. Brian had been a GA in the SSC prior to teaching high school for a number of years.

Monica Zeigler, the Director of Academic Advising, and Debbie Hershberger-Kidwell, an academic advisor, have indicated their intentions to retire in the next academic year. Shawn Schultz, an academic advisor, will be on educational leave January-December, 2014. These staffing changes and absences will present some challenges for orientation and advising in the coming year.

In December 2012, an equipment request was made to Academic Affairs. With that money, computers were bought for CASA staff members, including a laptop for Academic Advising.

CASA's ongoing goals include:

- Support student achievement by offering services and programs that aid students in succeeding at Eastern.
- Assist new students in their transition to Eastern and college-level work through concerted University in-class and out-of-class efforts.
- Offer services and resources for faculty and staff in areas of testing and assessment, advising, learning assistance, and disability services.
- Contribute to the University's understanding of our student population and student learning outcomes through assessment efforts.
- Increase University community and local community outreach through on-line resources and programming.
- Work with appropriate University constituencies to improve retention of current students through examining data and creating programming.
- Collaborate with various University offices and staff to facilitate student success and timely degree completion.
- Assess our own services and work to improve those services.

The above goals are the backbone of the unit. Specific AY13 objectives for the various units and specific areas of responsibility are given below.

Collaboration & Student Success

This section will offer examples of collaborative efforts CASA units have established with other offices at EIU; many of these collaborations have been ongoing for several years.

BOOST

AY12 was the seventh and final year for the BOOST program as it will be absorbed into the Gateway program to free CASA staff to devote time to the new Summer Institute for Higher Learning (SIHL). The 2005 cohort had 47 students enrolled; 16 have graduated from EIU (34%). Forty-eight students participated in the 2006 cohort, and 19 have graduated from EIU (40%). The 2007 cohort had 47 students enrolled; 21 have graduated from EIU (45%).

Summer Institute for Higher Learning

The first Summer Institute for Higher Learning (SIHL) took place over five weeks in June-July 2012. The SSC coordinates the program, which is a collaboration of Admissions, CASA, and the departments of English, Sociology, Geology/Geography, and Political Science as well as Financial Aid, New Student Programs, and Housing.

The goals of SIHL are to (a) improve access to higher education, (b) enhance summer (and overall) enrollments at Eastern Illinois University, and (c) improve the success and retention of newly admitted

students with potential academic risk factors. The program grants provisional summer admission to new freshman students with ACTs of 20 or greater but with GPAs between 2.0 – 2.49. Students must earn a 2.5 or higher in the summer to matriculate fall semester. All students take ENG 1001G and choose from a social and behavioral course; these courses' enrollment is limited to students admitted through the SIHL program.

At the conclusion of summer 2012, students were asked to rate their experience with the following components of the SIHL:

Question	Excellent	Good	Satisfactory	Not Very Good	Poor
Faculty	57%	31%	10%	0	2%
Courses	45%	47%	8%	0	0
Peer Learning Assistant	57%	25%	6%	8%	4%
Out-of-class Activities	14%	31%	20%	20%	14%
Residence Hall	27%	53%	14%	4%	2%
Library Resources	65%	25%	8%	2%	0
Overall rating	24%	35%	31%	6%	4%

Fifty-three students started the semester with the program, but one student left before classes truly began, so 52 students completed the program. In summer 2012, 3 students (6%) received below a 2.5, 7 (13%) received a 2.5, 22 (42%) earned a 3.0, 15 (29%) earned a 3.5, and five (10%) students received a 4.0. Of those 52 students, 49 were eligible to return for FA12, and five of these students decided not to attend EIU. One of the ineligible students who received a 2.0 in summer appealed and was admitted for fall.

Forty-five students matriculated in FA12; one student was sent home for behavioral issues in the middle of the semester. And, the student, who earned a 2.0 in SU12 and petitioned for appeal for fall admittance, was dismissed after FA12 for earning a 0.0 semester gpa. Of those remaining 43 students, 17 earned a semester gpa below a 2.0 for fall; because of their summer grades, only nine of those 17 were placed on academic probation.

The performance of these students without a structured program in the fall, prompted us to re-evaluate the SIHL requirements for the entering SU13 cohort. The SU13 SIHL students will have a SSC advisor and academic plan similar to the one used for BOOST students; these students will also be encouraged to take EIU 1111. The first cohort of SIHL students were not encouraged to take EIU 1111 because of the overlap in content from the academic seminar they had in the summer. For SU13, this seminar has been changed, so the overlap with UF will be minimal.

In SP13, SSC staff reached out to SIHL students for one-on-one consultation, and only a few students came in for help. Forty-one SIHL completed that semester. At the end of SP13, 7 (17% of remaining students) of the SIHL students were on probation; 4 (10%) were on warning, and 30 (73%) were in good standing. The others withdrew or did not come back for SP13. At the end of SP13, the SIHL students were at 79% retention rate; if any of these students do not return for FA13, that cohort will be below the institutional average retention rate.

Intra- and Inter-Unit Collaboration

One of the academic advisors (Lora Green) was elected President of the Mid-Illinois Big Brothers/Big Sisters and organized Adopt-A-Family for the holidays for all of CASA to participate in; she also organized a Bowl for Kids Sake activity in the spring. All of CASA participated in giving money to

buy presents, donating goods to the auction, buying and wrapping presents for children, sponsoring a bowler, or bowling to raise funds. These activities facilitated team-building and allowed us to contribute to the greater community; this was our fifth year of participation in these activities.

The Executive Director has served on several coalitions and committees this year, including, the Orientation Advisory Committee, the Student Support Team, the Enrollment Management Advisory Committee (meetings suspended), Committee on Retention Efforts, Honors Council, Undergraduate Research and Creative Activity Committee, Eastern Reads!, Seat Planning, Coalition on Support Services, Disability Issues Committee, OSDS Advisory Committee, the Budget Advisory Group, Enrollment Worx, NCA Self-Study Team, two search committees, as well as on CASL, its subcommittees, and the University Foundations Advisory Committee. The Executive Director also attended Noel-Levitz/Strategic Enrollment Planning meetings as requested.

In addition to her work in CASA, the Office Manager attended the Financial Manager-Travel at EIU presented by Teresa Sims in October 2012 and the Financial Manager-Records Retention Basics by Cathy Kimball in February 2013. She serves as the secretary for CASL, CORE, and UFAC.

The EWP Clerk is serving on CUPB and is working on her bachelor's degree by taking 6 credit hours each semester.

This was the fourth academic year for alerting students via email to their low midterm grades. Rather than sending students a letter with their submitted midterm grades, we moved to an electronic system called Campaign Monitor in AY10. Campaign Monitor allows us to send individual emails to the students and to embed information such as their advisor's name into the email. It also provides links to resources on campus. The cost was \$5 for each email set-up and then 1 cent for each email sent. We spent approximately \$45-50 each semester for Campaign Monitor, and in past years we spent \$2500-3000 on stationary, envelopes, printing, and mailing costs (costs varied depending on the number of on-campus and off-campus students receiving letters).

Midterm grade reports are shared with academic departments, advisors, housing, minority affairs, and athletics, so that they may aid in helping students academically. This year the Executive Director submitted a request to ITS for a report to be placed in Reportal giving chairs and advisors access to midterm grades just as they have for final grades. This report was completed in SP13.

In Fall 2012, 2,402 midterm emails were sent with a total of 3,713 grades submitted; this is an increase of 176 emails and 535 grades from FA11. In Spring 2013, 1,932 emails were sent and included 2,884 submitted grades, which shows a decrease of 308 emails and 561 grades from SP12. For both semesters, faculty submitted grades from 3000 and 4000 level courses; in SP13, 2 fewer grades were submitted from upper division courses than in the previous spring. The Fall 2012 and Spring 2013 Midterm Grades Reports are included as Appendices A and B.

The Executive Director also served on a thesis committee for a student in the Department of Counseling and Student Development; the thesis was on advising of RSOs.

These committee and council memberships contribute to collaboration with student affairs and academic departments. What follows is a brief summation of the work of the committees over which CASA takes leadership.

Committee on Retention Efforts (CORE)

In AY13, CORE continued several initiatives that had begun in prior years: not registered emails and survey and the Early Alert System (EAS) among those.

The not registered list is run twice in the fall and spring semesters: the first list is generated 2 weeks after seniors begin registering, and the second list is run a week after freshman registration begins. Students are sent email registration reminders from CORE and the co-chairs respond to any email responses from students. Chairs are sent a list of their students who have not yet registered with each list generation. The day after grades are submitted two surveys are sent to students who have not yet registered: one to students with a hold and one to students who do not have a registration hold. This year, the fall survey uncovered an issue with students having difficulty knowing where to go to change majors and be advised. AAC has changed its web site to address this issue, but other actions may be needed to assure this academic change is easily made for students. On average, 55% of students who are on this list are registered by 10th day of the following semester.

Changes were made to the EAS based on the first year pilot program from AY12. The EAS GA hired by CASA contacted all off-campus students while the Housing GA sent contact lists to the RAs for students who lived in Housing. In AY12, SSC took care of students who received any kind of assignment alert and Housing took only attendance alerts. The new system allowed Housing to reach out to all students who lived on campus and for whom they already had relationships. In Spring 2013 we discovered a gap in the system with the EAS report and student housing assignments; this issue meant that a number of students had not been contacted. The report is being corrected to avoid this problem for AY14.

FA12 saw an increase of 113 EAS submissions from FA11, but SP13 had a decrease of 187 submissions from SP12. The number of faculty who used the system in FA12 was 101 compared to 102 in FA11; however, spring 2013 saw a sharp decline in the number of faculty submitting from 130 in SP12 to 80 in SP13. FA11 had 585 students submitted to the EAS whereas 642 were submitted for FA12, which is an increase of 57 students. Again, SP13 witnessed a decline with 467 students submitted compared to 564 for SP12 (decrease of 97 students). In FA12 26% of students who received an alert either dropped or withdrew from the course compared to nearly 30% in SP13. In SP13 22% of students received an A, B, or C for the course for which an alert was submitted compared to 30% in FA12.

In Fall 2012 CORE wrote the Retention Plan (see <http://castle.eiu.edu/~core/index.php>) and discussed ways to use the Flat File prepared by ITS. In early Spring 2013, a problem with the Flat File was discovered and reported to ITS; it was still being fixed as of the writing of this report. The data being pulled in was from the current file not from a freeze event, so it was impossible to track a cohort at specific points in time, which is one of the key objectives of the file.

CORE produced two issues of its newsletter, *Assessment Matters*, which can be found on the web site at <http://castle.eiu.edu/~core/newsletter.php>. The semi-annual Retention Forum was held on February 12, 2013. Following the retention forum, the Provost asked the co-chairs to take the retention data and hold discussions on how faculty and advisors can aid in the retention efforts in their classrooms and major departments. The co-chairs led discussions at the following councils: CAA, Faculty Senate, COTE, COS administration council, CEPS administration council, LCBAS administration council, and Continuing Education administration council.

In SP13 the University purchased the Retention Predictor from Noel-Levitz, and the co-chairs participated in a webinar and subsequent meetings on data to prepare for the predictor. It is anticipated that CORE will meet over Summer 2013 to put new strategies in place targeted at our most at-risk students.

Seat Management Committee

The Seat Management Committee studied data related to planning for new freshmen and transfers. Although seats were requested for 1400 freshmen and 1000 transfers for FA13, departments provided

fewer seats due to faculty cuts. A rollout of seats was planned for summer 2013 with approximately enough seats for 1350 new freshmen and 900 new transfers.

Honors seats became an issue this year as well. In FA12 the Honors College asked the advisors in the AAC to place new honors students in only one honors course. The number of dual and AP credit students are bringing in from high school is on the rise, so this request posed a problem in assuring that students would have enough courses to take in the general education to complete the required hours. Credit brought in from high school is on the rise—especially for honors students—and the current University honors program requires students to complete 24 hours of general education courses. The Executive Director requested a report to show the number of credit hours honors students are bringing in along with a list of the most credited courses. These data were shared with the Honors College and department chairs. A seats report for the last five years of honors courses was also generated and shared with these individuals to help them make decisions about courses offered.

Based on issues with summer offerings, the seat planning committee will be asked to review summer offerings planned for SU14. The AAC Director had difficulty finding courses in the 6-week semester for new summer freshmen and guest students. The restrictions for many on-line courses also posed problems for continuing students wanting to take on-line courses in the summer.

Assessment

CASA's assessment objectives for AY13 included:

- Work in concert with CASL on assessment activities/plans.
- Maintain and update the assessment website, including CASL minutes and General Education data.
- Offer guidance/support to departments concerning program assessment and program reviews.
- Continue collection of general education data and share results with the campus community.
- Write and distribute *Assessment Update* newsletter to provide assessment news across campus.
- Provide information on assessment at Eastern Illinois University to students/faculty/advisors.
- Aid CASL chair in college and council meetings.
- Collect and disseminate alumni survey data.
- Develop ways that each unit under CASA can monitor and report activities.
- Collaborate with NCA Self-Study Team

In an effort to promote understanding of University-wide assessment efforts and to aid in departmental assessment activities, CASA staff members served as assessment resources for campus constituencies; this service included the following activities:

- The assessment website (www.eiu.edu/~assess) was maintained and updated as data were gleaned from assessment activities such as the alumni survey, the Watson-Glaser exam, speaking assessment, the EWP readers, and the global survey.
- The Executive Director of CASA provided a written response to each academic department concerning its departmental assessment report submitted in June 2012; this included 78 plans: 19 graduate programs and 59 undergraduate programs. Eighteen programs were on a two-year cycle and will submit in June 2013. Responses were also provided to the deans and chairs. Reports were prepared concerning measures used and levels of assessment progress and were disseminated to the VPAA and deans in August. Separate reports were prepared for graduate

and undergraduate progress in addition to specific college reports. All responses and reports are available at <http://www.eiu.edu/assess/>.

- The Executive Director of CASA met with departmental representatives and chairs concerning plans for assessment in the major. In this academic year, she met one-on-one with representatives of Africana Studies, BGS, Family and Consumer Sciences, Communication Studies, Social Science Teaching, Philosophy, and Applied Engineering Technology.
- In October 2012, CASA sponsored the attendance of 3 faculty members to the IUPUI Assessment Institute in Indianapolis; the Executive Director also attended. Faculty members were asked to report on what they learned, and these observations were shared in the assessment newsletter.
- Two issues of the *Assessment Update* newsletter were published and disseminated to faculty and staff—one each semester. They can be found here: <http://www.eiu.edu/assess/>.
- AY13 CASL continued to create and disseminate executive summaries of the four undergraduate goals and each college's plans, graduate and undergraduate. The Executive Director of CASA, the chair of CASL, and CASL members divided the meetings that were attended in FA12. The Executive Director presented at Deans Council, CAA, and Faculty Senate. These summaries can be viewed at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/caslhome.php>.
- CASA has the responsibility for mailing and data entry for the IBHE-mandated Alumni Survey. In Spring-Summer 2012, surveys were mailed to 1,812 alumni from the class of 2003; 631 returned surveys for a 35% return rate. The executive summary is included as Appendix C; all other reports are available on the assessment web site at <http://www.eiu.edu/~assess/alumnisurvey.php>. IBHE is no longer requiring this survey, so the 2012 survey will be the last.
- The Executive Director attended the third annual conference of the Association for the Assessment of Learning in Higher Education in Kentucky in June 2013 and gave a presentation on assessment practices at EIU.
- In April, the Executive Director attended the pre-conference of the North Central Association with the rest of the NCA Self-Study Team. She continues to meet with this group as they work on the self-study for the October 2014 site team visit.

Most of CASA's overall goals for promoting and supporting assessment activities were met this year through the above activities. Work on the four general education goals is summarized under each goal's section.

Voluntary System of Accountability

In AY12 OTE administered the second testing of the Collegiate Learning Assessment to evaluate writing and critical thinking. The data were received in August 2012 and were shared with CASL that fall. Pertinent data were disseminated in the executive summaries.

NSSE was administered for the second time in Spring 2013 to all freshmen and seniors. Participation rates were low, so an extra push was put on with staff and faculty who had a great deal of contact with freshmen and seniors—senior seminar instructors, housing staff, advising, etc. Data are expected in late summer 2013 and will be shared with the University community in fall 2013.

Electronic Writing Portfolio

CASA oversees the Electronic Writing Portfolio (EWP) process. This oversight includes checking each submission for the new EWP criteria, sending emails alerting faculty to submissions to be rated, uploading student information on requirements met to Banner, maintaining the database, monitoring the writing-intensive course list, monitoring students who receive the writing with distinction award, and answering questions from students, faculty, and advisors concerning the EWP's submission process and requirements. CASA's goals for the EWP this past year included:

- Accept and store student submissions.
- Upload student completion of requirements to Banner.
- Provide EWP information to students, faculty, and advisors.
- Work with students/faculty/advisors/certifying officers on issues surrounding students' successful completion of EWP requirements.
- Work with CATS to maintain the fully electronic version of the EWP that interfaces with Banner.
- Continue to hold EWP readings of completed portfolios and focus groups.
- Share results from portfolio readings with various constituencies.
- Disseminate EWP student brochure at orientation and to faculty who request copies for students.
- Update EWP information as related to changes to the requirement.
- Disseminate major scores to department chairs for use in their department plans.

AY13 was the fifth year of the revised EWP. EWP reminders went out each semester to students who had not completed their portfolios and to faculty when they had papers to rate. We have had difficulty with faculty meeting rating deadlines and have had to ask for proxy raters for a number of faculty members who refuse to complete this task. Department chairs, the Director of OTE, and the Executive Director of CASA have served as proxies; however, this proxy system does not encourage faculty to complete their obligation to their students and the University.

We have also automated the emails that go to students whose submissions receive a 2 or lower rating. These emails are generated as the papers are written rather than once each semester.

EWP brochures for students were disseminated at freshman and transfer Debut and were made available to faculty and departments. Brochures for faculty are mailed to all faculty each fall. The website and brochures were updated to facilitate faculty and student understanding of the process and to address frequently asked questions.

Reports were prepared for each semester of EWP submissions. Departments were sent a list of all submissions made by their majors with an average for the department and college. Deans were given data for the entire college. Spring and Summer data will be shared at the beginning of Fall semester. Summer 2012, Fall 2012, and Spring 2013 reports are included as Appendices D, E, and F.

Readings of completed portfolios moved from Fall semester to spring semester. The 17 readers read 233 portfolios, which encompassed 697 student papers. The Executive Director of CASA prepared a report on the eighth readings based on the focus group information and materials provided by the readers. A draft of the report was sent to readers in February for their input; the report was then revised and disseminated throughout campus via the assessment website. (A copy of this report is available at www.eiu.edu/~assess. An executive summary is included as Appendix I; this report includes information from the past five years of readings.) Scores from the portfolio readers continue to be consistent from year to year although fewer portfolios overall were rated as strong (24%). Poor critical thinking skills displayed in the development trait continues to be the major problem identified

in student writing. The faculty readers called for their colleagues to be more intentional about teaching writing and critical thinking across the curriculum.

In AY14, new portfolio readers will be trained in January and portfolios will be read and focus groups conducted in February.

Critical Thinking

CASA manages the distribution of the *Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal* to Senior Seminar faculty. OTE has the primary responsibility for the *Watson-Glaser*; information is disseminated to chairs and faculty, exams are delivered to departments, exams are scored, and results are sent back to faculty for distribution to students. Our goals for this component of the assessment plan included:

- Manage the distribution of and scoring of the *Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal*
- Offer information to faculty concerning administering the *Watson-Glaser*
- Create reports and disseminate *Watson-Glaser* data to departments
- Help faculty and administrators interpret *Watson-Glaser* results
- Disseminate CLA data
- Investigate new instruments for this goal

The *Watson-Glaser* has been administered in senior seminars since Summer 2003. A total of 1,498 *Watson-Glaser* Critical Thinking Appraisals were distributed in 74 packets to senior seminars in AY13.

Term	Paper-Based Appraisals	On-line Appraisals	Total Scored	Composite Averages
SU12	272	202	474	24.9
FA12	585	132	717	25.16
SP13	633	89	722	24.9

See Appendix G for the annual *Watson-Glaser* report.

CASL continues to struggle with the *Watson-Glaser*'s usefulness as an assessment tool. This academic year, CASL explored alternatives for our critical thinking assessment. CASL used the AY12 EWP portfolios to both test out a critical thinking rubric and survey the kinds of critical thinking produced through courses whose papers were submitted to the EWP. CASL members used Bloom's Taxonomy as a broad definition of critical thinking levels that might be found in college-level papers: knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, synthesis, and evaluation. All CASL members read and rated the same portfolio to work on reliability, and then, portfolios were read by two readers. Where there was not agreement, a third reader (the co-chairs and CASA Executive Director) read the papers and broke the tie.

CASL members learned that there were fewer assignments requiring critical thinking than anticipated. CASL reviewed a total of 160 student portfolios that encompassed 427 papers: 43% showed critical thinking, 53% did not, and 4% were not readable (electronic papers could not be opened). The report is given as Appendix H. CASL also used the EWP portfolios to pilot a CT rubric; members agreed that it was difficult to apply the rubric to assignments that were not explicitly constructed to require elements named on the rubric.

CASL investigated a relatively new critical thinking instrument as well, The Critical Thinking Assessment Test developed at Tennessee Technological University. Members attended a webinar by a professor at TTU. CASL is interested in piloting this instrument in AY14. The CAT is scored locally by a university's own faculty, and there is a separate rubric for each of the 15 questions.

Global Citizenship

AY13 was the tenth year to collect data related to this goal. The following objectives were set by CASA to serve this goal:

- Make administration of the Global Citizenship Survey possible for students at freshman orientation and in Senior Seminars each semester.
- Share data with CASL and place on website for University community.
- Provide information to faculty about the administration of the survey in Senior Seminars and student compliance.
- Troubleshoot issues with access for students.
- Revise surveys in Survey Central for summer distribution.

SU12 was the first year for the revised Global Survey; in the first couple of days of senior administration, there was a technology glitch and not all data were stored from the senior seminars.

Freshman Global Survey

The completion rate for the freshman survey is dependent on freshman students coming through Debut and staying for the entire program. The last three years have had a higher completion rate perhaps due to the change in the Debut schedule which ends earlier than previous years. The Summer 2013 data were not yet available at the writing of this report.

Year	Number Completed	Number Students Seen at Debut	Completion Rate
2003	1,989	2,031	98%
2004	1,744	1,876	93%
2005	1,597	1,789	89%
2006	1,349	1,874	72%
2007	1,442	1,768	82%
2008	1,442	1,848	78%
2009	1,451	1,752	83%
2010	1,347	1,489	90%
2011	1,325	1,386	96%
2012	1,206	1,304	92%

Senior Global Survey

CASA staff members send faculty teaching senior seminars a list of students in their course(s) who have completed the survey and this information can be provided at any time throughout the semester. Some instructors ask for a weekly list while others require only one at the end of the semester. Students are given access to the survey once the 10th day rosters are produced.

Since Fall 2007 the rate of completion by students in senior seminars has significantly fallen although summer semesters tend to have a higher completion rate for some reason. Despite the ease of completing the survey on-line, we still consistently have problems reaching high completion rates—especially in Fall and Spring semesters. Completion rates for AY13 remained extremely low. At the end of Spring 2013, the CASA Executive Director asked OTE for a list of senior seminar instructors who appeared not to be requiring this component of the assessment plan; this list will be shared with chairs and deans in an attempt to increase completion rates.

Semester	Number Completed	Number Students	Completion Rate
Summer 2005	566	732	77%
Fall 2005	490	660	74%
Spring 2006	847	1,172	72%
Summer 2006	467	775	60%
Fall 2006	536	808	66%
Spring 2007	659	978	67%
Summer 2007	515	537	96%
Fall 2007	422	882	48%
Spring 2008	423	844	50%
Summer 2008	383	757	51%
Fall 2008	392	906	43%
Spring 2009	389	996	39%
Summer 2009	463	673	67%
Fall 2009	328	884	37%
Spring 2010	258	946	27%
Summer 2010	393	741	53%
Fall 2010	363	989	37%
Spring 2011	261	957	27%
Summer 2011	310	632	49%
Fall 2011	357	878	41%
Spring 2012	298	968	31%
Summer 2012	164	579	28%
Fall 2012	270	907	30%
Spring 2013	292	938	31%

CASA had planned to share data with departments related to their majors after the first senior administration of the global survey, but the percentage completed will not allow us to sort by major, so that data will not be made available to departments until we have a better completion rate as we do with the other three learning goals.

A report comparing Summer 2012 freshmen with AY13 seniors is in Appendix I. The senior data is native and transfer students. It will be a few years before we are able to compare a single cohort at the freshman and senior level.

Speak Effectively

Data that address this General Education goal were collected for the first time in Fall 2003 from Speech 1310G courses (now Communication Studies 1310G) and in senior seminars for the first time in Fall 2004. OTE has primary responsibility for disseminating forms and collecting speaking data. CASA's AY13 objectives that support this goal include:

- Assist the CMN 1310G coordinator in communicating assessment expectations to graduate assistants and faculty teaching this course.
- Provide informational material for faculty.
- Enter quantitative data in assessment database.
- Disseminate procedures for faculty to return assessment forms to CASA.
- Collect speaking data in the CMN 1310G courses and in senior seminars.
- Disseminate data to the campus community.
- Provide data to departments for their majors.
- Enter subscores into database.

Procedures for collecting and returning data were distributed to CMN 1310G and senior seminar instructors each semester by OTE staff members Karen Easton and Shannon Storm. Speaking assessment sheets were distributed to all sections of CMN 1310G and senior seminars. This year a total of 3,418 completed assessments were returned. Of these, 3,377 were used for reporting (the remaining 41 were incomplete).

Term	Course	# of Submission	# of Majors represented
SU12	EIU 4###G	526	84
	CMN 1310G	15	10
FA12	EIU 4###G	858	93
	CMN 1310G	711	86
SP13	EIU 4###G	834	86
	CMN 1310G	433	80
Total		2218 EIU /1159 CMN	

Two years ago, OTE began putting major on the speaking assessment sheets in order to provide information on speaking assessment to the departments related to their majors. Each semester, OTE provides this data to departments. We are now also able to provide subscores related to students' speeches; these data will give CASL members and others interested in Speaking Across the Curriculum further data on student strengths and weaknesses at the various levels. The AY13 Speaking Report is available as Appendix J.

As with each year, CASA and OTE staff members have worked diligently to administer the University Assessment Plan, to assure that requirements are met and policies followed, and to make the administration of the plan as simple as possible for students and faculty.

University Foundations

Although CASA has oversight of University Foundations (formerly freshman seminar), an Advisory Committee helps to make decisions concerning course content, events, and the faculty workshop. Karla Sanders chairs this committee. Other committee members were Donna Dawson, School of Technology; Cordy Love, New Student Programs; Bobbi Kingery, Career Services; Cindy Boyer, Student Success Center; Jessica Ward, Housing; Wendy Long, Office of Testing and Evaluation, and Maggie Burkhead, TRiO.

In Fall 2012, ten CASA staff members taught the course: the Executive Director, the Directors of the SSC, AAC, and OTE, the Student Support Specialist, and five advisors. Several instructors had to be replaced over summer 2012; Kari Dailey, Greg Aydt, Jackie Collins, and Claire Smith, a peer leader, took the place of four instructors. One instructor quit so close to the beginning of the semester, she could not be replaced, and one quit in October. Fortunately, these were co-taught sections, so the co-teachers, Adam Due and Jessica Ward, taught alone.

UF is a writing-active course with four main objectives:

- Familiarize students with the expectations, policies, resources, and traditions of Eastern Illinois University.
- Develop students' critical thinking, learning, and communication skills.
- Enrich students' perspectives on personal, academic, and moral issues in higher education.

- Engage students in the educational and social life of the University.

The student learning objectives are:

- Describe classroom norms, university policies/procedures (including student code of conduct and catalog information), and faculty expectations
- Explain key moments in Eastern history
- Function as a global citizen in a multi-cultural world
- Use the resources and services provided by Eastern Illinois University
- Identify transitional issues—personal, social, and academic—and learn about resources and services to aid in overcoming those issues
- Formulate educational and life goals
- Articulate values and priorities related to college and your future
- Communicate more effectively (orally and in writing) with professors and peers
- Analyze, criticize, and construct arguments using critical thinking skills
- Employ time management and study skills (including test taking, note-taking, and reading strategies)

In addition to these course goals, the committee was interested in the following annual goals:

- Recruit good teachers to the course.
- Revise the course evaluation materials to reflect changes in the course.
- Revise the faculty workshop to suit the needs of the course and the faculty.
- Recruit and train peer leaders.
- Provide quality programs for Academic Foundation Day and the UF Showcase.
- Promote service learning rather than volunteerism for citizenship project.
- Provide materials for incorporating the EIU Reads book.
- Provide materials for teaching from the textbook.
- Provide resources to instructors via website and publisher sites.

In Fall 2012, 28 sections were offered, and 553 students completed University Foundations (UF); this is approximately 45% of the first-time freshmen, which shows a 2% increase from Fall 2011. Of those students, 52% were minority students and 36% were in the Gateway Program. Gateway students are required to take University Foundations, so 36% of UF students took the course as a requirement and 64% took the course as an elective. Thirty-eight instructors and seventeen peer leaders taught the course with twelve peer leaders and two instructors being new to UF.

Students who elect to take UF or are required to enroll traditionally have lower gpas than their non-UF counterparts. The retention rates for students who take UF have traditionally been higher than their counterparts who do not take the course; however, this did not hold true for the 2011 cohort, which had a 80% UF retention rate compared to an 81% retention rate of those who did not take the course. The retention rate of Gateway students was 72%. The percentage of students from ethnic minority groups rose 8% from the previous fall (44%), which was up 4% from the fall before that (2010). Since minority students are not retained at the same levels as white students, the dip in retention for UF may be caused in part by the increase in minority students and those in the Gateway program (See [Appendix K](#) for the last three years of data on UF students.).

In SP12 the course evaluation was updated slightly to help students understand the questions being asked, but unfortunately, the new questions were not actually updated on the evaluation, so they will be asked in FA13. In FA12 78% of students enrolled in UF indicated they were working less than 5 hours a week at a paid job, and only 9% were working more than 11 hours; however, the percentage working more than 11 hours a week went up by 4% while the percentage working less than 5 hours went down by 6% indicating that more freshmen are holding down part-time jobs. For the fourth year in a row 47% of students indicated they spent less than 6 hours a week studying, and only 18% spent more than 13 hours a week studying; this, however, is 4% more than the percentage spending that

much time the previous year. See Appendix L for year-to-year comparisons of the course evaluation data and student habits.

In May 2013, 16 peer leaders attended the first half day training for UF. Textbooks and the PL training manual were disseminated. Instructors teaching with the peer leaders were invited to lunch to meet their peer leader and to begin talking about their course plans. Currently, 30 sections are planned for FA13. Twelve new faculty members (11 staff/faculty members and 1 GA) were trained in a day and a half workshop. Thirty-two returning faculty/staff members will co-teach the course.

Each fall, Academic Foundation Day offers students the chance to attend a major/minor fair and to listen to talks from various departments concerning major choices and careers. On October 2, 2012, 25 presentations were given and 30 departments and units were presented at the major/ minor fair. Each year, it is a struggle to convince departments to participate, and some departments have never come. However, this year we had a couple of graduate departments ask to come to help students begin to think about graduate education; these departments were happy with their results. UFAC will continue to strive to make this a positive experience for both faculty representatives and students.

The citizenship project asks each class to participate in some University-wide, local, state, national, or global citizenship project. Instructors were asked to have students reflect on their experiences through an email assignment, written paper, or presentation. Eight sections required students to participate in group projects; 17 sections allowed individual projects; and 3 sections required a combination of individual and group projects. Of the 28 sections, 26 required service learning projects in which students reflected on their experiences. A total of 552 students volunteered 2,107 hours in Fall 2012, which is an increase of 432 hours from Fall 2011 UF courses. On average, each student completed 3.82 hours. A total of \$1,594 was collected. (Full report in Appendix M.)

Fall 2012 instructors were invited to a “thank-you” lunch in January 2013. Peer leaders and new faculty were recruited in January and February through list-servs, word-of-mouth, faculty/advisor recommendations, and posted flyers.

Academic Advising Center

The Academic Advising Center has nine advisors plus the Director and two support staff. The Academic Advising Center employs appreciative advising to foster student learning and development through its vision statement:

- Assist students in the exploration of educational options and the planning of their academic program.
- Provide accurate information regarding academic progress requirements, policies, and procedures.
- Teach students how to accept responsibility for their choices and decisions concerning their academic and educational goals.
- Consider the personal abilities, talents, and interests of students when advising them about courses or programs.
- Train and assist advisors across campus to ensure they are aware of Appreciative Advising techniques.

Mission Statement:

The **Academic Advising Center (AAC)** assists students with course selection, career goals and major selection. The Center continues to be the hub of the network for those who advise students across the entire campus of Eastern Illinois University. The AAC serves as a resource

to many offices and departments, especially in the area of general education classes. The Center cultivates opportunities for expanded communication, dissemination of information, and clarification of policy and procedure changes. It is often called upon to assist in advising students from other departments because of the wide range of general knowledge the advisors possess about academic policy and the university's majors and minors. This is in addition to its mandated unit responsibilities.

The following goals were set by the Academic Advising Center Director and the Academic Advisors for AY13:

- Focus on advisement
- Build campus relationships
- Provide professional development opportunities for staff
- Continue to support departmental and University activities by participating in various committees and volunteering for University and departmental activities
- Continue to foster community relationships

The above goals were met in the following ways:

- Each advisor had 150-250 advisees at any time in the academic year with the biggest load being in the fall. The Director had a caseload of approximately 100 students in addition to the guest students. Sixty-one percent of students assigned to the AAC saw their advisor 4-10 times over their mandated advising appointments.
- Advisors had over 4,271 in-person contacts with students in this academic year, which is an average of 427 personal student contacts per advisor with 3,030 different students scheduling appointments from May 2012 through April 2013 (this number includes current, incoming, and guest students). These personal contacts include face-to-face meetings only; email and phone calls were not included. The following student groups were advised in the AAC in AY13:
 - 1,094 new freshmen from summer orientation (not including helping Gateway to advise its students); 16 new freshmen in SP13
 - 22 Gateway students transferred to AAC
 - 235 new transfer students (fall) and 56 new transfer students (spring)
 - 1,353 continuing students through the end of SP13
 - 545 student files were transferred to departmental advisors in FA12; 594 student files were transferred to departmental advisors in SP13
 - 274 EC/ELE majors
 - 226 Business majors
 - 3,169 scheduled student appointments from May 2010 through April 2011 (this number included multiple visits from some students)
 - 1,102 students walked in for advisement without appointments
 - 85 students returned after being sent to departments (usually because of a change in major). A number of these students required multiple contacts with the AAC. An additional 50 students were directed to speak to their advisor of record after they tried to make an appointment with the AAC; 113 students assigned to other departments came in, emailed, or called for additional advising advice
 - 22 readmitted students
 - 9 international students
 - 15 summer athletes
 - 72 new transfer students were advised at transfer programs in April for FA13

- This was the third year advisors kept students in the AAC until the students had earned 15 credits instead of 12 credits as in previous academic years. This change was made to help facilitate retention and student success of new students. Many of these students required more advising time because of failed courses or academic warning/probation issues.
- The average GPA of the students who were sent to the departments in FA12 was 2.39; this figure shows a decrease of .06 from FA11. The average credit hours earned for students whose files were transferred was 41 hours for FA12, which is the same as FA11 at the time of file transfer. The average GPA of SP13 students was 2.94 with 30 credit hours on average, which shows no change in average GPA from the previous spring semester and a decrease in 1 credit hour earned.
- In SP13 EC/ELE/MLE majors were sent to the department after achieving a minimum of 15 hours and 2.0 gpa regardless of completing the TAP.
- In Fall 2012, 193 students assigned to the AAC were on academic warning (-50 FA11) and 25 on probation (-10 students FA11). In SP13, 51 were on warning (-20 SP12) and 98 on probation (-19 SP12). Seventy-four students assigned to the AAC were dismissed after FA12, which is 18 fewer students than the previous fall, and 32 were dismissed after SP13, which is 23 fewer students than the previous spring.
- In addition to tracking student contact hours, the AAC also tracks incoming phone calls; there were 5,645 incoming phone calls this academic year, which shows a decrease of 783 calls from the previous academic year: May (399), June (466), July (464), August (867), September (334), October (533), November (510), December (318), January (671), February (233), March (379), and April (471).
- Email communication is another way advisors work with their advisees; a total of 6,430 student emails were received by and responded to by the advisors (decrease of 1,887 emails from AY12): May (485), June (417), July (528), August (851), September (344), October (754), November (603), December (590), January (722), February (285), March (366), and April (485).
- Twenty-three students who could not attend Debut were advised and oriented through Elluminate in collaboration with New Student Programs (increase of 3 students from AY12). The Director advised 28 guest students SP13 and SU13. A special orientation and registration day was held for incoming summer athletes.
- Two advisor coffees were given: 70 attendees participated in Sept. 12, 2012, and 60 attendees participated on Feb. 6, 2013.
- AAC trained Gateway advisors. They also trained professional and faculty advisors on the new Satisfactory Academic Progress Plan.
- The AAC website was updated, including the freshman advising calendar and timeline.
- The main office sent out email reminders to students advised in the AAC to make and come in for their advising appointment. Advisors sent out letters of support and assistance to students on academic warning and probation. Letters were also sent to students who showed academic improvement from the previous semester.
- AAC worked with CATS and ITS on the on-line advising sheet.

- The AAC disseminated 1600 electronic evaluations to students (increase of 53 evaluations from AY12); the return rate was 42.1% (increase of 4% from last year) for advisors and 38% (increase of 2% from last year) for the office staff.

The following table shows the responses to the five questions that directly relate to advisor performance on student outcomes for all 10 people combined:

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
My advisor provided accurate and reliable information.	66.6%	20.6%	7.6%	2.4%	1.9%
My advisor considered my personal abilities, talents and interests when advising me about courses or programs of study.	62%	23.9%	9.3%	3.1%	1.6%
My advisor helped me to have a better understanding of the university policies and procedures.	56.4%	26.7%	11.6%	4.0%	1.0%
My advisor helped me to make important decisions about my education (selecting courses, exploring majors/minors, repeating courses, etc.).	62.6%	22.7%	7.7%	4.5%	1.9%
My advisor helped me find the answer to my questions.	64.8%	22.4%	8.2%	3.3%	1.3%

- In addition to evaluating the advisors, students were also asked to evaluate their experience with the main office: 92.7% indicated that they were greeted properly; 82.4% felt that phone calls were answered professionally; and 92.7% indicated that they were referred to the appropriate offices. These very high percentages indicate the excellent level of professionalism from the front office staff.
- AAC held its retreat on April 29, 2013 where they discussed the program analysis template as well as how the AAC supports the University in its policies, procedures, goals and activities according to the template's guidelines.
- The Freshman Advising Calendar was updated as was the advising web site and the on-line advising sheet. The AAC Facebook page was periodically updated.
- The AAC advising staff held meetings with the following faculty/departments: School of Business; Joy Russell, EC/ELE/MLE; Career Services; Cynthia Nichols, Civil Rights; Linda Simpson, FCS, Disney Internships; Kathy Waggoner, Disability Services; Jeanne Snyder, Lumpkin; Stephen Lucas and Rebecca Throneburg, CAA; Kathlene Shank, Special Education; Jerry Daniels, Music; John Mace, John Best, Bill Addison, Psychology; Applied Engineering. These meetings facilitated understanding of recent changes to requirements or curricula.
- Three advisors attended the NACADA national conference in Nashville, TN in October.
- Advisors attend Open House fairs, some volunteered for Jumpstart to GIVE, fall and spring commencement, the faculty fellows program, convocation, honors awards, athletics awards, faculty receptions, and Prowl events.

- Advisors participated in the following activities/opportunities: the Community College Articulation conference, Temple Grandin presentation, Spring Retention Forum, Adaptive technology presentations, “Faculty Advising: Creating Positive Relationships with Your Advisees,” the annual EIU Diversity conference, advising with iTransfer and U.Select, D2L workshop. Advisors also participated in the following webinars: “Career Advising Using Hapenstance,” “Successful Careers in Student Affairs,” and “Taking the Fear out of FERPA.”
- Advisors served on search committees for the BGS academic advisor, TRiO support staff, veteran’s coordinator, Assistant Director for Community Service, Assistant Director for Student Success Center, and the Disability Specialist for Disability Services.
- Advisors held membership in NACADA and ILACADA. Shawn Schultz was nominated to serve as chair of ILACADA. Greg Aydt was recognized as a 20 Under 40 Leader for Coles County.
- Shawn Schultz, Monica Zeigler, and Greg Aydt presented at ILACADA with other EIU colleagues on “Advising in the Twitterfirst Century: How Technology Complements Academic Advising to Impact Student Success. Shawn Schulz and Nancy Crone in KSS presented at NACADA on “Integrating Technology into Advisement Services: Challenges, Opportunities, and Best Practices.”
- AAC hosted a visit for the Director of Undergraduate Advising from Governor’s State University, who was interested in learning more about the one-day orientation program.
- Met with Dr. Obradovic, a visiting Health Studies professor from Serbia, to discuss advising at EIU.
- Advisors assisted with mock interviews for the CSA program.
- Advisors are also committed to serving in the community through the following activities: Coles County Relay for Life Team, One Stop Community Christmas Event, and presented at Coles County High Schools’ Career Days.
- AAC staff sit on or regularly attend the following committee and council meetings: Council on Academic Affairs, CAA Goals committee, Strategic Enrollment Planning, Council on Teacher Education, Orientation Advisory Committee, Campus Advising Network, Coalition of Support Services, TRiO Scholarship Committee, Alcohol and Other Drug Coalition, Reinstatement Committee, Financial Aid Appeals Committee, Financial Grants Committee, Africana Studies Advisory Board, Pre-Health Advisory Committee, Seat Planning Committee, and the Veterans Advisory Board. One advisor was asked to serve on the NCA Self-Study Committee, which will begin its work with the committee members in June, 2013.
- AAC provided job shadowing opportunities for students interested in pursuing advising as a career.
- New international students were advised and the AAC met with a consultant for international student recruitment.
- Advisors presented to the following units/constituencies: Minority Affairs Academic Recognition and Awards Dinner, Academic Foundation Day, Debut Leaders, Access Granted Students, football and baseball recruits, and UF courses.


Student Disability Services

ODS established these goals for AY13:

- Further streamline exchanges with students, faculty, staff, and the general public through the use of progression technology and access-friendly processes.
- Continue to collaborate with ITS while exploring other existing options in order to design the best database system given the available resources.
- Continue to research and review current trends and issues in the field of disability services in order to function as a resource for the EIU community and provide exceptional services for students with disabilities.
- Seek professional development activities in the areas of disability law and best practices in higher education using creative means given current budgetary limitations.
- Given the addition of a permanent graduate assistant and Redden Grant funds to cover at least one FOCUS mentor, continue to provide the FOCUS program.
- Continue to meet regularly with the Interdisciplinary Team to address needs of students
- Continue to provide E-text for students with visual and other print disabilities using the latest available technology which meets accessibility standards.
- In an effort to improve recruitment and retention, explore new and innovative ways to provide support to students with disabilities who would otherwise be successful given specific types of intervention.


During AY13, the Office of Student Disability Services (OSDS) served 313 students and had one or more contacts with an additional 136 prospective students (this number does not include new students seen during Debut 2012; it represents a decrease of 5 prospective students from AY12). The total number of registered students with ODS for AY13 shows a decrease of 11 students from the previous year.

In order to be consistent with the yearly IBHE data requested by the Office of Civil Rights, these numbers have been based on 10th day counts for fall and spring only. That report does not include summer numbers nor students who register with our office after 10th day. However, when taking into account students who were only registered with ODS during summer 2012 (17 additional students) students who registered with OSDS after 10th day in fall and were here fall only (25 students), and students who registered with OSDS after 10th day in spring (11 students), the actual total number of students served is 366, an increase of 3 students from last year.



Over the academic year, 21 students were academically dismissed, 24 were on warning, 16 were on probation, and 57 students graduated. In Fall 2012, 14% of registered students were freshmen; 20% were sophomores; 24% had junior status; 34% were seniors; and 8% were enrolled in graduate studies. In Spring 2013, 9% were freshmen; 19% sophomores; 26% juniors; 39% seniors; and 7% were pursuing graduate studies.

The following chart represents the kinds of issues students presented to ODS. Students on the Autism Spectrum are included in the psychological category. Miscellaneous health includes chronic health issues, Traumatic Brain Injury, and other low incidence disabilities. As indicated by the chart below, students presenting with ADD, physical/functional issues, learning disabilities and other health-related issues remain consistent; students with issues related to sensory problems are on the decline, and students with psychological disorders are on the rise.



The following paragraphs outline how AY13 goals were met.

- Additional information was added to the OSDS website for faculty including FAQ's as well as information to help faculty prepare for students in their classrooms with visual impairments, hearing impairments, Asperger's and Autism.
- A display board was created for OSDS to use at Open Houses, Transfer days, and College fairs.
- OSDS utilized electronic communication to provide in-services sooner for faculty.
- The Director collaborated with the Chair of the Foreign Languages Department to address students with disabilities' requests for foreign language substitutions.
- The OSDS student survey was sent out through "Survey Monkey" to elicit responses.
- The Director and Alternate Media Technologist continued working with ITS to implement the Symplicity Accommodate database.
- The Director attended college fairs with the EIU Admission Counselors:
 - "Directions" in Arlington Heights, IL on October 2nd, 2012
 - "Lincoln Way High School Turning Point, in Frankfort, IL on November 13, 2012

- “LADSE Post-secondary Fair for Students with Special Needs” in Countryside, IL on November 15th, 2012
- The Director presented information regarding services for students with disabilities at the EIU New Faculty Orientation.
- The Director coordinated a panel presentation on TBI for the EIU campus community and presented as a member of the panel.
- OSDS coordinated and implemented a Faculty Appreciation Event with student recommendations of outstanding faculty.
- OSDS and its graduate students offered an information session on adaptive technology including Inspiration, Dragon Naturally Speaking, Kurzweil 3000, and the SmartPen, for CASA and a separate session for the campus community.
- The Director of OSDS collaborated with Faculty Development to offer a presentation by a panel of students with disabilities for the campus community.
- The Director met with the OSDS Advisory Board comprised of faculty from each college, a representative from Faculty Development and representatives from off campus programs.
- The OSDS Director met with the Interdisciplinary workgroup (EIU Counseling Center, Health Services and the Office of Student Disability Services) to collaborate and provide the best possible support services for students.
- The OSDS Office Manager attended all EIU Open Houses and Transfer Days.
- OSDS received four Redden grants for the year which were used to hire student workers for electronic text conversion and mentors for the FOCUS Program.
- Two work-study students were trained to perform various office tasks and were supervised by the Office Manager.
- A sign language interpreter for a student with a significant hearing impairment was coordinated through this office.
- Referrals were made to the SSC, Academic Advising, Reading Center, Writing Center, Counseling Center, Communication Disorders and Sciences, Career Services, Health Services, Financial Aid, TRiO, Gateway, and Booth Library.
- The Director of Student Disability Services acted as the point person for student veterans with disabilities.
- The Director chaired the University Committee on Disability Issues; this committee met each semester. The Director created and participated in a subgroup of the University Committee on Disability Issues with the ADA Coordinator and the Facilities Planning and Management representative to assess the effectiveness of current procedures for addressing campus accessibility, and disability concerns and issues and to recommend future practices.
- The office was represented at a Meet and Greet with Debut Leaders for summer orientation.

- OSDS met with numerous prospective students and their families throughout the year. Additionally, communication was frequent with high school personnel in order to coordinate successful transition of these students.
- Concentrated involvement was necessary for about 5% of the students registered with OSDS. Significant issues regarding legal situations, faculty concerns, medical issues, etc. required an exorbitant amount of time and department resources.
- The Director attended two sessions on Universal Design at EIU, one presented by Dr. Lunden MacDonald and the other presented by Dr. James Basham.
- The Director and Office Manager attended the round table discussion on “Reframing Documentation Practices in Higher Education” at Millikin University, presented by the Illinois Board of Higher Education, Disabilities Advisory Committee.

OSDS Survey Results

Each semester, students who have received services from OSDS are sent an email asking them to complete an evaluation of their personal experience with the office. This year an email was sent to each student containing a link for survey access on Survey Monkey. Students were asked to rate five statements on a strongly agree to strongly disagree scale. Responses from the two administrations—Fall 2012 and Spring 2013—have been combined.

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	*Combination of Agree & Strongly Agree	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	NA
My experience with the Office of Student Disability Services has been positive.	67.74%	27.42%	95.16%	4.84%	0%	0%
I received courteous service.	71.43%	23.81%	95.24%	4.76%	0%	0%
My requests were addressed in a timely manner.	68.25%	25.4%	93.65%	4.76%	1.59%	0%
I received useful information.	65.08%	30.16%	95.24%	4.76%	0%	0%
I was given the opportunity to express my concerns fully.	69.84%	25.4%	95.24%	4.76%	0%	0%

Alternate Media and E-text

- During AY13, the Alternate Media Technology Specialist (AMTS) supervised the work of one employee who assisted in converting text into an electronic format.

- The AMTS updated the E-text Style Guide, which is used by student workers in the editing and proofing of e-text to assure quality.
- The AMTS continued to improve the process of converting text into electronic format in order to generate material which aligns with standards in the field. While the chart below represents the numbers of books converted in AY13, it does not reflect the increased level of effort required to produce higher quality e-text for students with disabilities. Currently, the e-text library contains 1,353 books.

Semester	# of students requiring e-text	Total # of books provided	# of books converted & edited	# of books provided through Learning Ally
SU12	9	22	10	12
FA12	28	193	60	123
SP13	16	127	57	78
Totals		342	127	213

Transitional Support

Since the beginning of this evolving transition program in 2009, there have been at least 16 students who have received a higher level of assistance in adjusting to college life. These students were chosen because, although they had the potential to do well at EIU, they were at great risk of failure without the proper support. As demonstrated by their high level of academic and social success in past reports, this program is contributing to the Office of Student Disability Services' efforts toward the university's retention of students.

In AY13, this program was not offered since the Disability Specialist was out on medical leave the entire year.

FOCUS

The FOCUS program, which is in its sixth year, was designed to teach students with disabilities specific compensatory strategies and skill sets while increasing their academic confidence and desire to finish college. By identifying students who might require this specific type of support, FOCUS is able to play a significant role in the Office of Student Disability Services' efforts to increase university retention. In conjunction with other campus resources, students in the FOCUS program have a plan that is tailored to take into account the students' unique academic needs related to their disability in order to increase the level of individual success.


One graduate assistant from the Communication Disorders and Sciences program was assigned to run the program and to oversee one student mentor for the fall and spring semesters. In addition to their knowledge of working with students with disabilities, they were trained to identify specific areas of deficit using disability documentation, student interview, and informal assessment of skills.

Using this information, they addressed academic needs in consideration of disability-related skill deficits. Some of the key components of the program are:


- Guided development of critical thinking skills, such as analyzing information, applying it, and illustrating it with the use of the Inspiration software program.
- Reinforcement of the use of designated accommodations.

- Student assistance in determining who to go to when experiencing various difficulties or having questions.
- Thorough demonstration of PAWS, D2L, library webpage, adaptive software such as Kurzweil, Inspiration, and text-to-speech programs.
- Introduction to the Merit Program for those students taking the Test of Academic Proficiency (TAP).
- Exposure to specific methods of taking notes, studying for tests, reading assigned material, etc. (including the use of adaptive technology) using the students deficit areas as a reference point.
- Transition from the highly supported K-12 system to increased self-advocacy skills and independence within the university setting.

In AY13, there were a total of 27 participants in the FOCUS Program. Fifteen students participated both semesters. Eight students participated in fall only and 4 students participated in spring only. The 27 FOCUS participants had the following disabilities: 48% learning disabilities; 11% Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder; 11% multiple disabilities; 15% Autism Spectrum; 4% OCD; 4% TBI; and 4% hearing impaired. Students who had two or more of the following disabilities were included in the multiple issues category: learning disabilities, vision impairments, psychological disorders, and /or health conditions. Typically, the more time students participate in the FOCUS Program, the better they do academically. Ten (67%) of the 15 participants who attended FOCUS the entire year had cumulative GPA's of 3.0-4.0 at the end of the spring semester. All of the 15 participants had a cumulative GPA of at least 2.0. The following chart represents the GPA's of these 15 FOCUS participants.



In the Fall 2012, nine freshman students participated in the FOCUS program. Participants who attended 9 or more meetings had an average GPA of 2.81. Participants who attended less than 9 meetings had an average GPA of 2.3. Therefore, participants who attended 9 or more meetings on average had a GPA of .51 higher than those participants who attended less than 9 meetings. The exceptions are two participants; one who attended 3 meetings and had a GPA of 2.9 and another participant who attended more than 9 meetings and had a lower GPA than the average for this group. The following chart represents the number of meetings freshman students attended in the fall 2012 and their corresponding cumulative gpas.



Participants were also encouraged to submit a summary statement about the program. Some of the areas most commented on were that students:

- experienced less stress
- gained more confidence
- said that they would recommend FOCUS to others
- learned how and when to get help from professors
- studying became much more efficient using strategies and assistive technology learned
- understood more about how their disabilities impacted their learning
- improved academic performance
- helped them come up with non-traditional ways to plan their time and keep track of assignments and tests
- learned how to keep track of grades in each class with the grade tracker
- felt comfortable getting support from people who understood their disability

Office of Testing and Evaluation

The Office of Testing and Evaluation established the following goals for this academic year:

- Provide effective leadership in the Office of Testing and Evaluation
- Maintain a positive and productive environment for faculty, staff, and students
- Provide service to the community
- Provide timely, accurate scanning of exams, evaluations, and surveys
- Develop a pilot Testing Accommodation Center
- Engage in professional development activities
- Begin using new Class Climate Software and create reports for departments
- Pilot electronic evaluation process

OTE has met these goals by providing the following services/activities:

- The Director and staff piloted a Testing Accommodation Center for students registered with OSDS who received testing accommodations. Eight students participated in FA12 with 18 faculty. This pilot was intentionally kept small to test out policies and procedures. Staff proctored 47 exams (14 finals week) in fall semester. A larger pilot with 27 students and 50 faculty members was conducted in SP13. A total of 223 exams were administered (63 finals week). Faculty and students were sent evaluations at the end of spring semester, and the

students were overwhelmingly positive in their support for the TAC (100% agreed or strongly agreed that they were satisfied with the testing environment); faculty were less effusive but overall positive (82% agreed or strongly agreed that the process was easy to use). A proposal has been submitted to Academic Affairs outlining the costs of extending the pilot to encompass all students registered with OSDS who may need testing accommodations. In SP13, there were 152 students. Redden grants have also been submitted to cover some of the initial set up costs.

- From June 2012 through May 2013, the following exams were administered by OTE (The number in parentheses indicates a change from the previous year.): 167 Math Placement Exams (-4); 424 TOEFL (-20); 21 CLEP (+6); 16 Dantes (+12); 23 ACT Residual Tests (+18).
- OTE continued to administer the entry-level and promotional exams for the City of Charleston police department.
- OTE continued to provide proctoring services to non-EIU students. These services were provided to a total of 19 students. OTE also continued providing scanning services for Academic Challenge (1,015 sheets).
- OTE created a total of 44 surveys: 12 surveys were scannable (2,572 sheets) and 32 were web-based. Surveys were created, scanned, and results generated for various search committees, Academic Advising, New Student Programs, SPE, ENG, ELE, MEd and Athletics.
- A total of 95,716 exams scored (4,867 fewer than AY12). This number reflects ONLY exams scored, it does not include surveys, Watson Glaser data, or Community Service scanning.

Unit Requesting Testing Services	Number of Scanned Sheets
Lumpkin College of Business and Applied Sciences	27,578
College of Sciences	39,797
College of Arts & Humanities	10,473
College of Education and Professional Studies	11,471
Lakeview College of Nursing	5,281
Honors College	101
Total	95,716

- Gateway and GST 1000 students utilized the Nelson Denny. A total of 540 sheets were scored.
- OTE processed 60,295 faculty evaluations, a decrease of 4,684 or 8% from the previous year. The following chart shows the number of evaluations processed as well as the response rate by type of administration. The on-line evaluations are behind the paper in-class evaluations by 31%, which is a 13% increase from the previous year:

All Evaluations		All SCANNABLE Evaluations	Online excluding AAC		All Online including AAC Evaluations
Total # of sections	4,101	3,084	Total # of Sections	1,017	1,037
Total forms created	91,106	68,118	Total Audience	22,988	26,357
Total forms	60,295	50,351	Total	9,945	11,227

scored			Replies		
Response rate	66%	74%		43%	43%

- OTE will begin to investigate additional reporting features and other options for using Class Climate. Other universities are incorporating assessment gathering and testing into their uses of this software.
- Staff development activities include:
 - The Director taught a section of EIU 1111 with a peer leader.
 - Wendy Long, Carrie Gossett, and Jennifer Smith attended a two-day Class Climate training in June, 2012.
 - The Director participated in two additional Class Climate webinars.
 - Carrie Gossett participated in 6 Class Climate webinars.
 - Carrie Gossett continues to work with CATS and ITS to further develop options for Class Climate Reporting.
 - All staff members completed the University-mandated Ethics Training and Sexual Harassment and Discrimination Prevention trainings.
 - Wendy Long (25) and Karen Easton (5) were both honored for their continuous years of service.
- The Director served on UFAC, was an EWP reader, attended RAMS training, and was a D2L trainer for CATS.
- The Office of Testing and Evaluation has had a fairly stable year this year. As a department, we look forward to changes in the coming year. Some of our goals for the upcoming year are:
 - Implement additional reporting options using Class Climate for faculty evaluations.
 - Implement the Testing Accommodation Center for all eligible students if given permission from Academic Affairs.

Student Success Center


The Student Success Center and its Director established the following goals for AY13:

- Provide individual learning strategy instruction, ongoing support and referral services for students seeking to improve their learning skills.
- Develop, support, and help implement university-wide learning initiatives, especially in the areas involving retention, at-risk student populations, and students on warning.
- Conduct outreach efforts to enhance the learning environment, including student workshops, classroom visits, presentations in university housing, and staff information sessions.
- Teach EIU 1111: University Foundations.
- Provide and maintain a virtual presence through the website and other technology with links to tutoring and other student support services.
- Collaborate with other University offices and events.
- Serve on university committees that promote student success and retention.
- Engage in professional development activities.
- Oversee SIHL and Reinstated Student Programs.

These goals were met by the Director, the Assistant Director, and the six graduate students in the SSC in the following ways:


- SSC staff consulted with 651 students (Reinstated students 49; EIU 2919 357; Referrals 245), which is an increase of 30% for referrals from AY12).
- There were 1823 total appointments (414 fewer appointments than AY12).
- Graduate assistants and interns were trained on providing SSC services. A total of 6 GAs and 3 interns worked in the SSC AY13.
- SSC conducted 37 (14 fewer workshops than AY12) workshops and classroom presentations and presented to 1364 students (-134 students or a 9% decrease from AY12). Ninety-six percent of students rated the workshops as good or excellent.
- Presentations were conducted for academic classrooms, Basic Skills preparation workshop, Access Granted, EIU 1111, sororities and fraternities, athletics, Gateway, Prowl, Cheer Team, Pink Panthers, Housing, TRiO, and Transfer Relations.
- Each semester the SSC gathers tutoring schedules from the departments and creates a centralized tutoring schedule on its web site.
- Twenty-three sections of EIU 2919 were offered in AY13: 6 in fall and 15 in spring with one on-line section each semester. A total of 523 students were identified as needing EIU 2919 (a 7% decrease or 37 fewer students than AY12), and 428 (82%) enrolled in AY13. A total of 95 students did not return to EIU after being placed on warning.
- Because students cannot be automatically enrolled into EIU 2919, the Director enrolls students who have not enrolled themselves; she collaborated with the Registrar for this notification and placement of students.
- The evaluations for EIU 2919 continue to be extremely positive with the percentages of all questions above 85% with the combined agree and strongly agree categories. The full report is available as Appendix N.

The following chart shows students' academic standing following completion of EIU 2919:




- In AY13, 69 students were reinstated to the University following dismissal (-49 from AY12, which is a 40% decrease); of these 49 students developed and completed their academic plan for a 71% completion rate.

The following chart shows academic standing of reinstated students following the semester of intervention; this chart only represents the students who worked with the SSC and completed their plans. The number of students who achieved good standing in one semester speaks to the strength and success of the program. The students who chose not to contact the Student Success Center or complete their academic plan did not fare as well; **90%** were academically dismissed for a second time.



The chart below indicates the average semester grade point averages of reinstated students the semester prior to intervention compared to the semester of intervention. Additional information on reinstated students is available in Appendix O.



- Students were referred to the Counseling Center, Career Services, Disability Services, Health Services, TRIO, Financial Aid, Minority Affairs, Writing Center, Reading Center, and Academic Advising.

- Students were referred to the SSC by: Academic Advising, Fraternities/Sororities, Disability Services, Gateway, Self/Website, Faculty, Mid-term Email, VPAA's office, TRIO, Athletics, Records, UF 1111, Assessment and Testing, Counseling Center, Academic Affairs, CASA's at-risk EWP email, Housing, and other students.
- The SSC website was updated and maintained.
- The Director attended a lunch meeting with the Lt. Governor by invitation of President Perry.
- The Director taught EIU 1111 and participated in the University Foundations Advisory Committee.
- SSC staff gave presentations to EIU 1111 classes, participated in freshman orientation at the Panther Fair, gave a presentation to Debut Leaders, and served as a resource for other offices.
- The Director and the Assistant Director of the Writing Center collaborated to create the Coalition of Support Services. Support service providers were invited to the coalition. The coalition's aim is to share resources, ideas, and information to help in working with students. One goal that was set for this year was to begin developing a system to share data to look at the impact of support services on retention and graduation rates. This goal will continue into next year.
- The Director serves on CORE, the CSA Days Committee, NCAA APR Improvement Plan Committee, the Graduate School Financial Literacy Committee, and was a thesis committee member.
- The Director served as a consultant to Appalachian State College on its warning/probation/dismissal program.
- The Assistant Director participated in a webinar on the faculty role in promoting student wellness and on summer bridge programs.
- The Director and Assistant Director attended a NACADA webinar on warning/probation/dismissal and another webinar on online tutoring.
- SIHL and the Early Alert System have been discussed in the collaboration section of this report.

The Center for Academic Support and Assessment and its units are proud of their work serving Eastern's students and faculty. We believe that the academic services we provide contribute to the University's goal of being first choice/best in class.

**Midterm Grade Report
October 2012**

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
# Emails Sent	2402	+176	2226	-87	2313
# Grades Given	3713	+535	3178	-133	3311

Note: percentages for this chart and the ones that follow are based on the number of students each semester that received midterm grades.

Number of Emails Sent by Student Level

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
Freshmen	887 (37%)	+7	880 (40%)	-45	925 (40%)
Sophomores	659 (27%)	+56	603 (27%)	-21	624 (27%)
Juniors	517 (22%)	+46	471 (21%)	-2	473 (20%)
Seniors	331 (14%)	+62	269 (12%)	-13	282 (12%)
Graduates	2 (<1%)	+1	1 (<1%)	-1	2 (<1%)
Post- Baccalaureates	6 (<1%)	+4	2 (<1%)	-5	7 (<1%)

Student Type (Native/Transfer) of Students Receiving Midterm Emails

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
Native	1631 (68%)	+106	1525 (69%)	-108	1633 (71%)
Transfer	759 (32%)	+64	695 (31%)	+26	669 (29%)
Not Designated	12 (<1%)	+7	5 (<1%)	-4	9 (<1%)

Number of Grades Submitted by Type

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
D	1687 (45%)	+330	1357 (43%)	-122	1479 (45%)
F	1586 (43%)	+180	1406 (44%)	-60	1466 (44%)
NC	205 (6%)	-1	204 (6%)	-32	236 (7%)
NF	76 (2%)	+48	28 (1%)	-16	44 (1%)
RD	25 (1%)	+12	13 (<1%)	+1	12 (<1%)
RF	35 (1%)	-3	32 (1%)	+14	18 (1%)

XD	35 (1%)	-29	64 (2%)	+40	24 (1%)
XF	51 (1%)	-17	68 (2%)	+35	33 (1%)
XNC	13 (<1%)	+7	6 (<1%)	-4	10 (<1%)

Appendix A

Gender of Students Receiving Midterm Emails

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
Female	1218 (51%)	+65	1153 (52%)	+41	1112 (48%)
Male	1184 (49%)	+111	1073 (48%)	-128	1201 (52%)

Ethnicity of Students Receiving Midterm Emails

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
American Indian/Alaskan Native	13 (1%)	-1	14 (1%)	+7	10 (<1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	35 (1%)	+5	30 (1%)	0	21 (1%)
Black, Non- Hispanic	700 (29%)	+95	605 (27%)	+62	546 (22%)
Hispanic	122 (5%)	+1	121 (5%)	+12	85 (3%)
White, Non- Hispanic	1426 (59%)	+103	1323 (59%)	-144	1620 (66%)
Unknown	106 (4%)	-28	134 (6%)	-23	161 (7%)

Number of Grades Received by Students

	FA12	Difference Previous Fall	FA11	Difference Previous Fall	FA10
1 Grade	1501 (62%)	-48	1549 (70%)	-40	1589 (69%)
2 Grades	595 (25%)	+122	473 (21%)	-42	515 (22%)
3 Grades	216 (9%)	+67	149 (7%)	-3	152 (7%)
4 Grades	71 (3%)	+20	51 (2%)	+2	49 (2%)
5 Grades	17 (<1%)	+10	7 (<1%)	0	7 (<1%)

6 Grades	1 (<1%)	+1	0	-1	1 (<1%)
7 grades	1 (<1%)	+1			

Appendix A

FA12 Grades Submitted by Department & Level

Department	1000 Level	2000 Level	3000 Level	4000 Level
ACC			5	
AET	9	21	1	
AFR	9	12		
ANT		10		
ART	38	109	1	
BIO	179	106		
BUS	123	105	79	
CDS		28		
CHM	163	37		
CMN	43	90		
CTE				
ECN		54		
EDF		37		
EDP			3	
EDU		5		
EIU	51	51		15
ELE		20		
ENG	162	24	15	
ENT			6	
ESC	71	20	2	
FCS	36	75	5	3
FLF, FLG, FLS, FLX	55	11	12	
FIN			3	
GEG	76		9	
GEL	9	16		
GST	18			
HIS	63	34		
HST		19		
JOU		2	2	
KSS	45	88	17	9
MAT	449	233	2	
MGT			7	
MIS		6		
MSC		1		
MUS	2	82		
NUR			1	
OPD				
PHI	72	5	4	
PHY	8			

PLS	84	32		
PSY	75	31	9	1
REC			5	
RLS	21			
SED		4		
SOC	87	112	9	
SPE		11	2	2
THA		37		
WST		9		
TOTALS	1948 (52%)	1537 (41%)	199 (5%)	30 (1%)

Number of Grades Given by Course

ENG	1001G	117
MAT	1160G	114
MAT	1271	114
BUS	1950	90
MAT	2120G	87
SOC	1838G	87
MAT	1270	86
BIO	2001G	82
BIO	1100	76
PSY	1879G	75
MUS	2557G	73
PLS	1153G	62
CMN	2010	60
BIO	1001G	59
KSS	2440	59
MAT	2110G	56
ART	2330G	55
GEG	1100G	52
EIU	1111	51
EIU	2919	51
ESC	1400G	51
CHM	1410	50
BUS	2810	48
CHM	1315G	46
BUS	3010	45
MAT	1330	45
ENG	1002G	44
CMN	1310G	43
PHI	1000G	43
CHM	1310G	39
FCS	2100	39
BUS	2101	38
MAT	1400	38

EDF	2555	37
ART	2310G	36
MAT	2250G	34
BUS	1000	33
SOC	2750G	33
ECN	2801G	31
FLS	1101	30

Midterm Grade Report March 2013

	Total SP13 Undergrad Enrollment	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
# Emails Sent	8,114	1932 (24%)	-308	2240	-42	2282
# Grades Given		2884	-561	3445	-6	3451

Note: percentages for this chart and the ones that follow are based on the number of students each semester that received midterm grades.

Number of Emails Sent by Student Level

	SP13 Total Enrollment	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
Freshmen	1287 (16%)	513 (27%)	-166	679 (30%)	+4	675 (30%)
Sophomores	1488 (18%)	558 (29%)	-84	642 (29%)	-42	684 (30%)
Juniors	2083 (26%)	467 (24%)	-68	535 (24%)	-13	548 (24%)
Seniors	3203 (39%)	380 (20%)	+2	378 (17%)	+14	364 (16%)
Graduates	NA	4 (<1%)	+1	3 (<1%)	-2	5 (<1%)
Post- Baccalaureates	53 (1%)	9 (1%)	+6	3 (<1%)	-4	7 (<1%)

Student Type (Native/Transfer) of Students Receiving Midterm Emails

	Total SP13 Enrollment	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
Native	4769 (59%)	1315 (68%)	-242	1557 (70%)	-42	1599 (70%)
Transfer	3334 (41%)	606 (31%)	-69	675 (30%)	+10	665 (29%)
Not Designated	11 (<1%)	11 (1%)	+3	8 (<1%)	-8	16 (1%)

Number of Grades Submitted by Type

	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
D	1307 (45%)	-322	1629 (47%)	+20	1609 (46%)
F	1165 (40%)	-276	1441 (42%)	-17	1458 (42%)
NC	188 (7%)	+8	180 (5%)	+12	168 (5%)
NF	70 (2%)	+42	28 (1%)	-34	62 (2%)
RD	39 (1%)	-8	47 (1%)	+10	37 (1%)
RF	54 (2%)	-2	56 (2%)	-22	78 (2%)

XD	19 (1%)	0	19 (1%)	+3	16 (<1%)
XF	37 (1%)	-6	43 (1%)	+8	35 (1%)
XNC	5 (<1%)	+3	2 (<1%)	-5	7 (<1%)

Gender of Students Receiving Midterm Emails

	Total SP13 Enrollment	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
Female	4785 (59%)	956 (49%)	-190	1146 (51%)	-8	1154 (51%)
Male	3329 (41%)	976 (51%)	-255	1094 (49%)	-34	1128 (49%)

Ethnicity of Students Receiving Midterm Emails

	Total SP13 Enrollment	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
American Indian/Alaskan Native	21 (<1%)	6 (<1%)	-7	13 (1%)	+3	10 (<1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander	71 (1%)	23 (1%)	+7	16 (1%)	-10	26 (1%)
Black, Non-Hispanic	1333 (16%)	653 (34%)	-25	678 (30%)	+92	586 (26%)
Hispanic	337 (4%)	121 (6%)	+10	111 (5%)	-15	126 (6%)
White, Non-Hispanic	5864 (72%)	1038 (54%)	-285	1323 (59%)	-61	1384 (61%)
Unknown	488 (6%)	91 (5%)	-8	99 (4%)	-51	150 (7%)

Number of Grades Received by Students

	SP13	Difference Previous Spring	SP12	Difference Previous Spring	SP11
1 Grade	1275 (66%)	-137	1412 (63%)	-31	1443 (63%)
2 Grades	440 (23%)	-107	547 (24%)	-29	576 (25%)
3 Grades	156 (8%)	-47	203 (9%)	+7	196 (9%)
4 Grades	48 (2%)	-12	60 (3%)	-7	67 (3%)
5 Grades	9 (1%)	-9	18 (1%)	+18	0
6 Grades	4 (<1%)	+4	0		0

SP13 Grades Submitted by Department & Level

Department	1000 Level	2000 Level	3000 Level	4000 Level
ACC			2	4
AET	4	15	2	
AFR	10	2		
ANT		10	6	
ART	12	63		
BIO	106	100		
BUS	36	88	58	
CDS		8		
CHM	171	71	1	
CMN	31	104	7	1
CTE			5	
ECN		33		4
EDF		11		
EIU		114		37
ELE		23		
ENG	157	8	4	2
ESC	46	22	6	
FCS	25	41	8	6
FLF, FLG, FLS, FLX	88		7	
FIN			5	
GEG	67		6	
GEL	2	6		3
HIS	51	8	1	
JOU		7	9	6
KSS	37	68	11	7
MAT	354	117	1	1
MDVL		6		
MGT				2
MIS		5	6	
MUS	2	93	1	
PHI	46	13	3	
PHY	20	2	1	2
PLS	39	36	16	1
PSY	38	13	11	
REC	2			
RLS	7			
SED		1		
SOC	61	67	24	12
SPE		6		2
THA		12		
WST		8		
TOTALS	1412	1181	201	90
Total difference from previous spring	-228 1640	-271 1452	-88 289	-2 92

Alumni Survey 2012, Nine Years Out (2003 graduates) Executive Summary and Analysis of Qualitative Data

There were 631 alumni surveys returned out of 1812 reachable graduates for a 35% return rate. The number of responses given below will not total 631 because some former students gave responses falling into more than one category and others chose not to respond to these questions. What follows are the number of alumni comments that fell into the various categories in response to the following questions: *What had the most positive impact on you during your time at Eastern?* (A total of 496 alumni responded to this question.) And, *What had the most negative impact on you during your time at Eastern?* (A total of 405 former students responded to this question.)

What had the most *positive* impact on you during your time at Eastern?

No response: 134
Total responses: 496 (79% of returned survey respondents)

Academics: 389 (78%)¹

Relationship with professors/advisors: 230 (46%)

Specific programs; small class sizes; overall education, career: 159 (32%)

Student Life: 186 (38%)

Relationships/social activities/Greek system/housing: 120 (24%)

Involvement/activities/recognized student organizations/athletics: 66 (13%)

University-wide Issues: 71 (14%)

Facilities; services; community; diversity: 52 (10%)

Personal growth: 19 (4%)

What had the most *negative* impact on you during your time at Eastern?

No response: 226
Total responses: 405 (63% of returned survey respondents; 266 negative impact (42% of returned surveys)
Nothing negative: 139 (34% of negative comments)

Academics: 155 (38%)

Relationship with professors/advisors: 58 (14%)

Specific programs; scheduling; overall education, career: 97 (24%)

Student Life: 47 (12%)

Relationships/social activities/Greek system/housing: 46 (11%)

Activities/recognized student organizations/athletics: 1 (<1%)

University-wide Issues: 84 (21%)

Facilities; services; community: 52 (13%)

Personal growth/finances: 32 (8%)

¹ Percentages are taken from the total number of responses to each question, rather than the total number of alumni in the cohort or the total number of returned surveys.

Summer 2012 EWP Submission Report

Total Submissions SU12: 346

The following table lists the ratings in this category and the number of submissions that received that rating. The percentage in parentheses after the number of submissions indicates the percentage of total submissions that received this score.

Rating	Number of Submissions
1	0
1.5	3 (1%)
2	8 (2%)
2.5	11 (3%)
3	92 (27%)
3.5	160 (46%)
4	72 (21%)

The following table provides a breakdown of submissions by rating and student characteristics. Percentages are taken from the total number of submissions, which is **346**.

Student Characteristic	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Female		2 (1%)	7 (2%)	5 (1%)	54 (16%)	96 (28%)	47 (14%)
Male		1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	6 (2%)	38 (11%)	64 (18%)	25 (7%)
Native		1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	7 (2%)	38 (11%)	44 (13%)	21 (6%)
Transfer		2 (1%)	6 (2%)	4 (1%)	54 (16%)	113 (33%)	50 (14%)
Unknown						3 (1%)	1 (<1%)
American Indian/Alaskan Native				1 (<1%)			1 (<1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander			1 (<1%)		2 (1%)	2 (1%)	
Black Non-Hispanic		1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	15 (4%)	11 (3%)	8 (2%)
Hispanic		1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)		5 (1%)	6 (1%)	2 (1%)
White Non-Hispanic		1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	6 (2%)	65 (19%)	129 (37%)	55 (16%)
Not Reported			1 (<1%)		5 (1%)	12 (3%)	6 (2%)
Freshman			1 (<1%)	10		8 (2%)	1 (<1%)
Sophomore			1 (<1%)	2 (1%)		5 (1%)	
Junior		1 (<1%)	2 (1%)	3 (1%)	23 (7%)	37 (11%)	18 (5%)
Senior		2 (1%)	4 (1%)	6 (2%)	59 (17%)	110 (32%)	53 (15%)
TOTAL	0	3	8	11	92	160	72

Total Number of Students: 320 (296 students, 93%, submitted one document; 22 students, 7%, submitted two documents; 2 students, 1%, submitted 3 documents)

The following information offers a breakdown of student demographics for all students who submitted summer 2011.

Student Type

Native:	108 (34%)
Transfer:	208 (65%)
Unknown:	4 (1%)

The following table shows the number of submissions by student type.

Student Type	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total
Native		5 (2%)	103 (32%)	108 (34%)
Transfer	2 (1%)	17 (5%)	189 (59%)	208 (65%)
Unknown			4 (1%)	4 (1%)
Totals	2 (1%)	22 (7%)	296 (93%)	320

Gender

Females:	196 (61%)
Males:	124 (39%)

The following table indicates the number of submissions by gender

Gender	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total
Male	1 (<1%)	9 (3%)	114 (36%)	124 (39%)
Female	1 (<1%)	13 (4%)	182 (57%)	196 (61%)
Totals	2 (1%)	22 (7%)	296 (93%)	320

Ethnicity

American Indian/Alaskan Native:	2 (1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander:	5 (2%)
Black Non-Hispanic:	37 (12%)
Hispanic:	13 (4%)
White Non-Hispanic:	241 (75%)
Not reported:	22 (7%)

The following table indicates the number of submissions by ethnicity.

Ethnicity	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total
American Indian/Alaskan Native			2 (1%)	2 (1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander			5 (2%)	5 (2%)
Black Non-Hispanic		4 (1%)	33 (10%)	37 (12%)
Hispanic	1 (<1%)		12 (4%)	13 (4%)
White Non-Hispanic	1 (<1%)	16 (5%)	224 (70%)	241 (75%)
Not Reported		2 (1%)	20 (6%)	22 (7%)
Totals	2 (1%)	22 (7%)	296 (93%)	320

Hours Completed

0-29: 19 (6%)
 30-59: 7 (2%)
 60-89: 78 (24%)
 90+: 216 (68%)

The following table shows the number of submissions by hours completed at time of submission; this includes transfer credit hours.

Hours Completed	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total
0-29 hours		1 (<1%)	18 (6%)	19 (6%)
30-59 hours		1 (<1%)	6 (2%)	7 (2%)
60-89 hours	1 (<1%)	3 (1%)	74 (23%)	78 (24%)
90+ hours	1 (<1%)	17 (5%)	198 (62%)	216 (68%)
Totals	2 (1%)	22 (7%)	296 (93%)	320

Course levels for which the submissions were written are given in the table that follows.

Course Level	Total Number of Courses	Number of Submissions	WI/WC Courses	WI/WC Submissions
1000 Level General Education	7	27	3	22
1000 Level Major	1	5	0	0
Total 1000 Level	8	32	3	22
2000 Level General Education	6	8	5	7
2000 Level Major	3	14	2	12
Total 2000 Level	9	22	7	19
3000 Level General Education	7	20	6	17
3000 Level Major	33	85	3	8
Total 3000 Level	40	105	9	25
4000 Level General Education	16	138	16	138
4000 Level Major	21	49	2	2
Total 4000 Level	37	187	18	140
TOTALS	94	346	37	206 (60%)

Note: 40% (138) of the summer submissions came from senior seminars.

Major	Average Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/Decrease Previous Summer	Previous Summer Average
All Submissions	3.38	346	+.06	3.32
College of Arts & Humanities	3.26	38	+.14	3.12
African American Studies	3.5	1		
Art	3.10	10	-.23	3.33
Communication Studies	3.03	13	-.12	3.15
English	3.75	6	+.25	3.5
Foreign Languages		0		
History	3.4	5	+1.03	2.37
Journalism	3.25	2	-.25	3.50
Music		0		3.20
Philosophy	4.0	1		
Theater Arts		0		2.87
College of Education & Professional Studies	3.39	69	-.03	3.42
Early Childhood/Elementary/Middle Level Education	3.26	21	-.33	3.58
Health Studies	3.37	4	-.13	3.50
Kinesiology & Sports Studies	3.37	32	-.03	3.40
Recreation Administration	3.0	1	-.5	3.50
Special Education	3.72	11	+.5	3.22
College of Sciences	3.43	59	+.15	3.28
Biological Sciences	3.46	16	+.24	3.22
Chemistry		0		3.00
Communication Disorders & Sciences	3.33	3		
Economics	3.5	1		3.50
Geology/Geography	3.5	2		
Mathematics & Computer Sciences	3.25	2	-.08	3.33
Nursing	3.58	6	+.58	3.00
Physics	3.5	3		3.50
Political Science	2.75	4	-.5	3.25
Psychology	3.5	11	+.21	3.29
Sociology	3.5	11	+.2	3.30
College of Continuing Education— Bachelor of General Studies	3.35	92	+.02	3.33
Lumpkin College of Business & Applied Sciences	3.45	86	+.15	3.30
School of Business	3.44	52	+.14	3.30
School of Family & Consumer Sciences	3.40	16	+.2	3.20
School of Technology	3.52	18	+.12	3.40
Center for Academic Support & Assessment—Undeclared	3.13	4		

Fall 2012 EWP Submission Report

Total Submissions FA12: 2739 (-668 decrease from FA11)

The following table lists the ratings in this category and the number of submissions that received that rating. The percentage in parentheses after the number of submissions indicates the percentage of total submissions that received this score.

Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/Decrease Previous Fall Semester
1	15 (<1%)	+3
1.5	7 (<1%)	0
2	77 (3%)	+43
2.5	140 (5%)	+1
3	792 (29%)	+68
3.5	1008 (37%)	+147
4	700 (26%)	+132

The following table provides a breakdown of submissions by rating and student characteristics. Percentages are taken from the total number of submissions, which is **2739**.

Student Characteristic	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Female	5 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	50 (2%)	90 (3%)	473 (17%)	618 (23%)	449 (16%)
Male	10 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	27 (1%)	50 (2%)	319 (12%)	390 (14%)	251 (9%)
Native	11 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	46 (2%)	63 (2%)	411 (15%)	444 (16%)	315 (12%)
Transfer	4 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	31 (1%)	77 (3%)	380 (14%)	562 (21%)	385 (14%)
Unknown					1 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	
American Indian/Alaskan Native					4 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	4 (<1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander			2 (<1%)		5 (<1%)	12 (<1%)	3 (<1%)
Black Non-Hispanic	7 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	28 (1%)	53 (2%)	146 (5%)	48 (2%)	64 (2%)
Hispanic	1 (<1%)		5 (<1%)	7 (<1%)	25 (1%)	27 (1%)	17 (1%)
White Non-Hispanic	6 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	37 (1%)	75 (3%)	561 (20%)	780 (29%)	586 (21%)
Not Reported	1 (<1%)		5 (<1%)	51 (2%)	61 (2%)	53 (2%)	42 (2%)
Freshman	5 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	15 (1%)	20 (1%)	121 (4%)	119 (4%)	99 (4%)
Sophomore	2 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	13 (1%)	29 (1%)	129 (5%)	163 (6%)	96 (4%)
Junior	7 (<1%)	0 (<1%)	24 (1%)	44 (2%)	240 (9%)	315 (12%)	218 (8%)
Senior	1 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	25 (1%)	47 (2%)	302 (11%)	411 (15%)	287 (10%)
TOTAL	15 (1%)	7 (<1%)	77 (3%)	140 (5%)	792 (29%)	1008 (37%)	700 (26%)

Total Number of Students: 2,254 (1838 students, 82%, submitted one document; 347 students, 15%, submitted two documents; 69 students, 3%, submitted 3 documents.) FA12 saw 440 fewer students submitting than FA11.

The following information offers a breakdown of student demographics for all students who submitted Fall 2012.

Student Type

Native: 1,134 (50%)
 Transfer: 1,117 (50%)
 Unknown: 3 (<1%)

The following table shows the number of submissions by student type.

Student Type	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Fall
Native	14 (1%)	132 (9%)	988 (44%)	1,134 (50%)	-312
Transfer	55 (2%)	215 (11%)	847 (33%)	1,117 (50%)	-125
Unknown			3 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	-3
Totals	69 (3%)	347 (15%)	1,838 (82%)	2,254	-440

Gender

Females: 1414 (63%)
 Males: 840 (37%)

The following table indicates the number of submissions by gender.

Gender	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Fall
Male	34 (1.5%)	142 (6%)	664 (29%)	840 (37%)	-192
Female	35 (1.5%)	205 (9%)	1,174 (53%)	1,414 (63%)	-248
Unknown					
Totals	69 (3%)	347 (15%)	1,838 (82%)	2,254	-440

Ethnicity

American Indian/Alaskan Native: 8 (<1%)
 Asian/Pacific Islander: 22 (1%)
 Black Non-Hispanic: 332 (12%)
 Hispanic: 71 (3%)
 White Non-Hispanic: 1704 (76%)
 Not reported: 117 (5%)

The following table indicates the number of submissions by ethnicity.

Ethnicity	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Fall
American Indian/Alaskan Native	1 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	6 (<1%)	8 (<1%)	-7
Asian/Pacific Islander			22 (1%)	22 (1%)	0
Black Non-Hispanic	16 (1%)	54 (2%)	262 (12%)	332 (15%)	+18
Hispanic		11 (<1%)	60 (3%)	71 (3%)	-14
White Non-Hispanic	43 (2%)	259 (11%)	1,402 (62%)	1,704 (76%)	-372
Not Reported	9 (<1%)	22 (1%)	86 (4%)	117 (5%)	-65
Totals	69 (3%)	347 (15%)	1,838 (82%)	2,254	-440

Hours Completed¹

Zero:	163 (7%)
1-29:	178 (8%)
30-59:	378 (18%)
60-89:	667 (29%)
90+:	868 (39%)

The following table shows the number of submissions by hours completed at time of submission; this includes transfer credit hours.

Hours Completed	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Fall
Zero		15 (1%)	148 (6%)	163 (7%)	-27
1-29 hours	1 (<1%)	22 (1%)	155 (7%)	178 (8%)	-27
30-59 hours	8 (<1%)	40 (4%)	330 (13%)	378 (17%)	-97
60-89 hours	31 (1%)	119 (6%)	517 (22%)	667 (30%)	-112
90+ hours	29 (2%)	151 (8%)	688 (29%)	868 (39%)	-177
Totals	69 (3%)	347 (15%)	1,838 (82%)	2,254	-440

Course levels for which the submissions were written are given in the table that follows.

Course Level	Total Number of Courses	Number of Submissions	WI/WC Courses	WI/WC Submissions
1000 Level General Education	26	366	9	297

¹ Some students transferred in hours at different points in the semester, so if they submitted more than once in the semester, the number of hours earned are different for submissions from the same student (for example, one student submitted two papers this semester, one when she had zero hours, and one when she has 43 hours). Therefore, these totals will vary slightly from the other demographic categories.

1000 Level Major	8	60	0	0
Total 1000 Level	34	426	9	297
2000 Level General Education	25	222	12	149
2000 Level Major	53	499	21	305
Total 2000 Level	78	721	33	454
3000 Level General Education	11	78	9	65
3000 Level Major	169	807	61	273
Total 3000 Level	180	885	70	338
4000 Level General Education	17	246	17	246
4000 Level Major	107	344	29	148
Total 4000 Level	124	590	46	394
5000 Level Major	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	416	2739	158 (38% of courses used for submission)	1,483 (54% of total)

- In FA11, a total of 457 courses were represented in the EWP submissions; FA12 shows a decrease of 41 courses from which students chose to submit.
- In FA11, 1799 submissions of the 3407 total submissions came from WI/WC courses (53% of the submissions for the semester); this percentage shows a decrease of 5% from the previous fall in WI/WC submissions. In FA12, 1,483 of the total 2,739 submissions came from WI/WC courses (54% of total), which shows a 1% increase from the previous year but a 4% decrease from FA10.
- Only one submission was received from 93 courses. The most submissions came from ENG 1001G with 183 submissions followed by EDF 2555 with 100 submissions and ENG 1002 with 59 submissions. A total of 246 submissions were received from the 17 senior seminar courses.

Comparison of Ratings from WI/WC Courses and Non-WI/WC Courses

Rating	Number of Submissions from WI/WC Courses	Number of Submissions from Non-WI/WC Courses
1	3 (<1%)	12 (<1%)
1.5	6 (<1%)	1 (<1%)
2	43 (1%)	36 (1%)
2.5	83 (3%)	56 (2%)
3	412 (15%)	380 (14%)
3.5	496 (18%)	513 (19%)
4	440 (16%)	258 (9%)
Average Score	3.39	3.33
Total Submissions	1,483 (54%)	1,256 (46%)

Percentages taken from the total submissions for the semester.

Rating	Number of Submissions from WI/WC Courses	Number of Submissions from Non-WI/WC Courses
1	3 (<1%)	12 (<1%)
1.5	6 (<1%)	1 (<1%)
2	43 (3%)	36 (3%)
2.5	83 (5%)	56 (5%)
3	412 (28%)	380 (30%)
3.5	496 (33%)	513 (40%)
4	440 (30%)	258 (20%)
Average Score	3.39	3.33
Total Submissions	1,483 (100%)	1,256 (100%)

Percentages taken from each course category.

The following table indicates the average ratings by major and college.

Major	Average Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/Decrease Previous Fall	Previous Fall Average
All Submissions	3.37	3,407	-668	3.37
College of Arts & Humanities	3.35	506	-70	3.36
African American Studies	2.90	5	+5	--
Art	3.13	68	-7	3.21
Communication Studies	3.36	199	-15	3.36
English	3.49	62	-11	3.61
Foreign Languages	3.28	16	-7	3.32
History	3.25	61	-37	3.35
Journalism	3.36	40	+1	3.35
Music	3.57	40	-1	3.40
Philosophy	3.65	10	-6	3.12
Theater Arts	3.43	16	+7	3.27
College of Education & Professional Studies	3.40	682	-213	3.38
Early Childhood/Elementary/Middle Level Education	3.48	228	-125	3.44
Health Studies	3.33	61	+3	3.38
Kinesiology & Sports Studies	3.34	248	-23	3.31
Recreation Administration	3.22	36	-1	2.93
Special Education	3.43	109	-67	3.48
College of Sciences	3.36	642	-123	3.39
Biological Sciences	3.33	174	-41	3.36
Chemistry	3.50	13	-1	3.78
Communication Disorders & Sciences	3.44	72	+1	3.35
Economics	3.07	7	-5	2.91
Geology/Geography	3.30	26	-9	3.41
Mathematics & Computer Sciences	3.58	36	-10	3.56
Nursing	3.57	19	+7	2.91
Physics	3.56	8	-16	3.83
Political Science	3.39	32	-12	3.25
Psychology	3.35	159	-14	3.38
Sociology	3.22	96	-23	3.42
College of Continuing Education— Bachelor of General Studies	3.50	240	-40	3.47

Major	Average Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/ Decrease Previous Fall	Previous Fall Average
Lumpkin College of Business & Applied Sciences	3.35	629	-203	3.34
School of Business	3.35	229	-220	3.41
Accounting	3.43	29	-17	3.47
Business Administration	3.25	4	-17	3.54
Finance	3.31	45	-9	3.35
Management	3.46	49	-23	3.40
Management Information Systems	3.56	15	-25	3.47
Marketing	3.15	39	-10	3.40
Pre-Business	3.33	48	-118	3.39
School of Family & Consumer Sciences	3.14	154	-63	3.14
Apparel/Consumer Affairs/Hospitality Management/Merchandising	3.00	34	-46	3.09
Dietetics	3.47	17	-3	3.25
Family Services	3.12	86	-28	3.16
School of Technology	3.47	246	+80	3.30
Organizational & Professional Development	3.55	79	0	3.44
Career & Technical Education	3.34	19	-15	3.36
Applied Engineering Technology	3.33	50	-3	3.32
Center for Academic Support & Assessment—Undeclared	3.40	40	-19	3.32

Spring 2013 EWP Submission Report

The following table lists the ratings in this category and the number of submissions that received that rating. The percentage in parentheses after the number of submissions indicates the percentage of total submissions that received this score.

Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring Semester
1	13 (<1%)	-2
1.5	6 (<1%)	-7
2	64 (2%)	-17
2.5	140 (5%)	-29
3	864 (29%)	-140
3.5	1079 (37%)	-196
4	780 (26%)	+42
3.39 Average	2946	-349

The following table provides a breakdown of submissions by rating and student characteristics. Percentages are taken from the total number of submissions, which is **2946**.

Student Characteristic	1	1.5	2	2.5	3	3.5	4
Female	6 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	41 (1%)	78 (3%)	480 (16%)	639 (22%)	484 (16%)
Male	7 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	23 (1%)	62 (2%)	384 (13%)	440 (15%)	296 (10%)
Native	6 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	39 (1%)	70 (2%)	474 (16%)	526 (18%)	407 (14%)
Transfer	7 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	25 (1%)	70 (2%)	384 (13%)	550 (19%)	373 (13%)
Unknown					6 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	
American Indian/Alaskan Native					9 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	6 (<1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander			1 (<1%)	4 (<1%)	11 (<1%)	13 (<1%)	8 (<1%)
Black Non-Hispanic	7 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	19 (1%)	38 (1%)	186 (6%)	144 (5%)	57 (2%)
Hispanic			7 (<1%)	9 (<1%)	36 (1%)	39 (1%)	32 (1%)
White Non-Hispanic	6 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	35 (1%)	84 (3%)	596 (20%)	835 (28%)	642 (22%)
Not Reported			2 (<1%)	5 (<1%)	26 (1%)	46 (2%)	35 (1%)
Freshman	3 (<1%)	1	10 (<1%)	15 (<1%)	124 (4%)	151 (5%)	105 (4%)
Sophomore	2 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	17 (1%)	28 (1%)	133 (5%)	165 (6%)	139 (5%)
Junior	4 (<1%)		13 (1%)	35 (1%)	262 (9%)	316 (11%)	211 (7%)
Senior	4 (<1%)	3 (<1%)	24 (1%)	62 (2%)	345 (12%)	447 (15%)	325 (11%)
TOTAL	13 (<1%)	6 (<1%)	64 (2%)	140 (5%)	864 (29%)	1079 (37%)	780 (26%)

Total Number of Students: 2372 (1857 students, 78%, submitted one document; 456 students, 19%, submitted two documents; 59 students, 3%, submitted 3 documents.) SP13 saw 288 fewer students submitting than SP12.

The following information offers a breakdown of student demographics for all students who submitted Spring 2013.

Student Type

Native: 1289 (54%)
 Transfer: 1075 (45%)
 Unknown: 6 (<1%)

The following table shows the number of submissions by student type.

Student Type	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring
Native	19 (1%)	198 (8%)	1073 (45%)	1289 (54%)	-169
Transfer	39 (2%)	256 (11%)	782 (33%)	1078 (45%)	-118
Unknown	1 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	2 (<1%)	5 (<1%)	-1
Totals	59 (3%)	456 (19%)	1857 (78%)	2372	-288

Gender

Females: 1409 (59%)
 Males: 962 (41%)

The following table indicates the number of submissions by gender.

Gender	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring
Male	27 (1%)	198 (8%)	737 (31%)	962 (41%)	-67
Female	32 (1%)	258 (11%)	1120 (47%)	1410 (59%)	-221
Totals	59 (3%)	456 (19%)	1857 (78%)	2372	-288

Ethnicity

American Indian/Alaskan Native:	12 (<1%)
Asian/Pacific Islander:	27 (1%)
Black Non-Hispanic:	363 (15%)
Hispanic:	96 (3%)
White Non-Hispanic:	1777 (75%)
Not reported:	97 (6%)

The following table indicates the number of submissions by ethnicity.

Ethnicity	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring
American Indian/Alaskan Native	2 (<1%)	1 (<1%)	9 (<1%)	12 (<1%)	+1
Asian/Pacific Islander	1 (<1%)	8 (<1%)	18 (1%)	27 (1%)	+3
Black Non-Hispanic	9 (<1%)	73 (3%)	281 (12%)	363 (15%)	-38
Hispanic	2 (<1%)	17 (1%)	54 (2%)	96 (4%)	+23
White Non-Hispanic	41 (2%)	342 (14%)	1394 (59%)	1777 (75%)	-221
Not Reported	4 (<1%)	9 (1%)	84 (4%)	97 (4%)	-56
Totals	59 (3%)	456 (19%)	1857 (79%)	2372	-288

Hours Completed¹

1-29:	353 (15%)
30-59:	406 (17%)
60-89:	681 (29%)
90+:	932 (39%)

The following table shows the number of submissions by hours completed at time of submission; this includes transfer credit hours.

Hours Completed	3 Submissions	2 Submissions	1 Submission	Total	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring
1-29 hours	2 (<1%)	52 (2%)	299 (13%)	353 (15%)	-52
30-59 hours	5 (<1%)	70 (3%)	331 (14%)	406 (17%)	-84
60-89 hours	25 (1%)	154 (6%)	594 (25%)	773 (33%)	-92
90+ hours	39 (2%)	201 (8%)	692 (29%)	992 (42%)	-60
Totals	59 (3%)	456 (19%)	2,094 (79%)	2660	-288

¹ Some students transferred in hours at different points in the semester, so if they submitted more than once in the semester, the number of hours earned are different for submissions from the same student (for example, one student submitted two papers this semester, one when she had zero hours, and one when she has 43 hours). Therefore, these totals will vary slightly from the other demographic categories.

Course levels for which the submissions were written are given in the table that follows.

Course Level	Total Number of Courses	Number of Submissions	WI/WC Courses	WI/WC Submissions
1000 Level General Education	25	417	14	356
1000 Level Major	11	34	0	0
Total 1000 Level	36	451	14	356
2000 Level General Education	30	248	14	143
2000 Level Major	46	483	17	301
Total 2000 Level	76	731	31	444
3000 Level General Education	15	87	9	54
3000 Level Major	184	919	66	339
Total 3000 Level	199	1006	75	393
4000 Level General Education	14	273	14	273
4000 Level Major	120	485	22	110
Total 4000 Level	134	758	36	383
5000 Level Major	1	2	0	0
TOTALS	446	2646	156 (35% of courses used for submission)	1576 (60% of total)

- In SP12, a total of 466 courses were represented in the EWP submissions; SP13 shows a decrease of 20 courses from which students chose to submit.
- In SP12, 1662 of the 3295 submissions were from WI/WC courses or 50% of the total submissions. In SP13, 1576 submissions of the 2646 total submissions came from WI/WC courses (60% of the submissions for the semester); this percentage shows a 10% increase from the previous spring in WI/WC submissions.
- Only one submission was received from 127 courses (+11 courses from SP12). The most submissions came from ENG 1002G with 210 submissions followed by EDF 2555 with 93 submissions and EIU 4151 with 76 submissions. A total of 273 submissions were received from the 14 senior seminar courses.

The following table indicates the average ratings by major and college.

Major	Average Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring	Previous Spring Average
All Submissions		2946	-349	3.35
College of Arts & Humanities	3.40	554	-44	3.31
African American Studies	3.25	2	-1	3.50
Art	3.21	76	-11	3.34
Communication Studies	3.38	235	+9	3.22
English	3.48	72	+2	3.40
Foreign Languages	3.50	11	-7	3.30
History	3.47	59	-32	3.37
Journalism	3.36	45	-15	3.31
Music	3.65	40	+2	3.44
Philosophy	3.25	2	-1	3.50
Theater Arts	3.05	9	-2	3.31
College of Education & Professional Studies	3.41	679	-126	3.37
Early Childhood/Elementary/Middle Level Education	3.44	191	-60	3.42
Health Studies	3.48	65	0	3.31
Kinesiology & Sports Studies	3.33	291	-42	3.33
Recreation Administration	3.40	26	-2	3.16
Special Education	3.50	126	-20	3.46
College of Sciences	3.40	752	-49	3.36
Biological Sciences	3.39	172	-48	3.33
Chemistry	3.54	17	+19	3.35
Communication Disorders & Sciences	3.47	64	+2	3.42
Economics	3.36	11	0	3.50
Geology/Geography	3.41	46	+7	3.41
Mathematics & Computer Sciences	3.64	35	+3	3.62
Nursing	3.33	12	-8	2.87
Physics	3.14	14	-1	3.60
Political Science	3.48	36	-10	3.42
Psychology	3.34	174	-31	3.36
Sociology	3.35	149	+15	3.35
College of Continuing Education— Bachelor of General Studies	3.46	219	-25	3.40


Major	Average Rating	Number of Submissions	Increase/Decrease Previous Spring	Previous Spring Average
Lumpkin College of Business & Applied Sciences		793	-56	3.33
School of Business	3.33	441	-45	3.31
Accounting	3.51	65	+22	3.31
Business Administration	3.35	7	-4	3.50
Finance	3.40	39	-9	3.34
Management	3.33	68	-2	3.42
Management Information Systems	3.33	15	0	3.43
Marketing	3.36	44	-7	3.36
Pre-Business	3.36	159	-44	3.31
School of Family & Consumer Sciences	3.24	207	-13	3.21
Apparel/Consumer Affairs/Hospitality Management/Merchandising	3.24	57	-14	3.07
Dietetics	3.19	21	-13	3.38
Family Services	3.24	114	+15	3.25
School of Technology	3.33	112	-20	3.51
Organizational & Professional Development	3.35	61	-3	3.52
Career & Technical Education	3.44	9	-7	3.25
Applied Engineering Technology	3.29	42	-10	3.44
Center for Academic Support & Assessment—Undeclared	3.15	30	-14	3.23

AY 2012-13 Watson-Glaser Report

The Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal is given in senior seminars the twelfth week of each semester or at the corresponding time for weekend and summer sessions. The majority of administrations take place in the classrooms, but students taking on-line classes have the option to take the WGCTA on-line.

The chart below indicates the average composite scores by semester. Because we are using the short form of the Watson-Glaser Critical Thinking Appraisal, only the composite score is considered valid. Comparisons may be made from spring semester to spring semester, fall semester to fall semester, and summer to summer.


The highest possible composite score is a 40. The chart below offers the average composite scores for the last five years, 15 semesters of data. The scores for the past 5 semesters remain relatively stable from the all-time low of 22.82 in SU09.



The following three charts offer the subscores for each semester in AY13 compared to the corresponding semester in AY12. These charts as well as the data by major and the composite average are shared with department chairs.


Watson-Glaser Analysis

Summer 2011 & Summer 2012 Mean Score Comparison




Watson-Glaser Analysis

Fall 2011 & Fall 2012 Mean Score Comparison




Watson-Glaser Analysis

Spring 2012 & Spring 2013 Mean Score Comparison



The chart below offers the composite means by academic year for each college. With the exception of AY11, the trajectory for each college is relatively stable with the College of Sciences averaging the highest scores and the College of Education and Professional Studies with the lowest scores.



CASL Report on CT in AY12 Read Portfolios

CASL EWP Review for Critical Thinking AY13 from AY12 Portfolios

Total Portfolios Reviewed: 160

Total Papers Reviewed for Critical Thinking: 427

Total Papers Where CT was Clearly Evident (High level based on Bloom: 136 (32%)

Total Papers Where CT was Not Evident (Low level based on Bloom: 154 (36%)

Total Papers Where there Was Bloom Agreement between 2 Reviewers: 290

Total Number of Papers Labelled Low CT Required: 154 (53%)

Total Number of Papers Labelled High CT Required: 136 (47%)

Tie Broken

High Levels of CT: 183 (43%)

Low Levels of CT: 225 (53%)

CT Level by Course Level--% Each Level

Level	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low	% Total Reviewed
1000	21	37	58	36.21%	63.79%	14.22%
2000	36	51	87	41.38%	58.62%	21.32%
3000	66	68	134	49.25%	50.75%	32.84%
4000	56	56	112	50.00%	50.00%	27.45%
not given	4	13	17	23.53%	76.47%	4.17%
Total	183	225	408			100.00%

CT Level by Course Level--% Total

Level	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low
1000	21	37	58	5.15%	9.07%
2000	36	51	87	8.82%	12.50%
3000	66	68	134	16.18%	16.67%
4000	56	56	112	13.73%	13.73%
not given	4	13	17	0.98%	3.19%
Total	183	225	408	44.85%	55.15%

CT Level by Course Type--% Each Type						
Level	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low	% Total Reviewed
GE	66	73	139	47.48%	52.52%	34.07%
Major	113	138	251	45.02%	54.98%	61.52%
FYE		1	1	0.00%	100.00%	0.25%
not given	4	13	17	23.53%	76.47%	4.17%
Total	183	225	408	44.85%	55.15%	100.00%

CT Level by Course Type--% Total					
Level	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low
GE	66	73	139	16.18%	17.89%
Major	113	138	251	27.70%	33.82%
FYE		1	1	0.00%	0.25%
not given	4	13	17	0.98%	3.19%
Total	183	225	408	44.85%	55.15%

13 were honors courses: 9 high; 4 low

CT Level by Course Level & Type--% Each Level										
Level	High GE	Low GE	Total GE	% High GE	% Low GE	High Major	Low Major	Total Major	% High Major	% Low Major
1000	21	32	53	39.62%	60.38%	0	4	4	0.00%	100.00%
2000	17	19	36	47.22%	52.78%	19	32	51	37.25%	62.75%
3000	6	6	12	50.00%	50.00%	60	62	122	49.18%	50.82%
4000	22	16	38	57.89%	42.11%	34	40	74	45.95%	54.05%
Total	66	73	139			113	138	251		

CT Level by College--% Total					
College	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low
CAH	79	72	151	19.32%	17.60%
CEPS	23	56	79	5.62%	13.69%
COS	33	40	73	8.07%	9.78%
LCBAS	43	36	79	10.51%	8.80%
Cont. Ed	1	8	9	0.24%	1.96%
CASA		1	1	0.00%	0.24%
not given	4	13	17	0.98%	3.18%
Total	183	226	409	44.74%	55.26%

CT Level by College No GE--% Total					
College	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low
CAH	38	24	62	15.14%	9.56%
CEPS	21	52	73	8.37%	20.72%
COS	22	21	43	8.76%	8.37%
LCBAS	31	33	64	12.35%	13.15%
Cont. Ed	1	8	9	0.40%	3.19%
Total	113	138	251	45.02%	54.98%



CT Level by College--% Within Each College					
College	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low
CAH	79	72	151	52.32%	47.68%
CEPS	23	56	79	29.11%	70.89%
COS	33	40	73	45.21%	54.79%
LCBAS	43	36	79	54.43%	45.57%
Cont. Ed	1	8	9	11.11%	88.89%
CASA		1	1	0.00%	100.00%
not given	4	13	17	23.53%	76.47%
Total	183	226	409		




CT Level by College No GE--% Within Each College					
College	High	Low	Total	% High	% Low
CAH	38	24	62	61.29%	38.71%
CEPS	21	52	73	28.77%	71.23%
COS	22	21	43	51.16%	48.84%
LCBAS	31	33	64	48.44%	51.56%
Cont. Ed	1	8	9	11.11%	88.89%
Total	113	138	251		

CT Level by Course Level and College--% within Each College										
	CAH	CEPS	COS	LCBAS	Cont. Ed	CAH %	CEPS %	COS %	LCBAS %	Cont. Ed %
High 1000	18	0	3	0		12.00%	0.00%	4.11%	0.00%	
Low 1000	29	1	3	3		19.33%	1.27%	4.11%	3.80%	
High 2000	22	5	4	4	1	14.67%	6.33%	5.48%	5.06%	11.11%
Low 2000	13	15	11	7	5	8.67%	18.99%	15.07%	8.86%	55.56%
High 3000	28	6	14	18		18.67%	7.59%	19.18%	22.78%	
Low 3000	18	15	15	17	3	12.00%	18.99%	20.55%	21.52%	33.33%
High 4000	11	12	12	21		7.33%	15.19%	16.44%	26.58%	
Low 4000	11	25	11	9		7.33%	31.65%	15.07%	11.39%	
Total	150	79	73	79	9	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%



**Global Survey
Summer 2012 Freshmen Compared to AY13 Seniors**




Demographic Questions







Leadership Experience















Participation in Co-Curriculum and Volunteer Work













Political Activity and Party Affiliation




Staying Informed













Beliefs and Decision-Making







SA = strongly agree; A = agree; D = disagree; SD = strongly disagree









The Role of Citizens




College Expectations Compared to Actual College Experience

Note: in the 5 charts that follow the question is phrased as it was asked for the freshmen. Seniors were asked if they participated in these activities/opportunities while at EIU.







Speaking Across the Curriculum Report Data through Summer 2005-Spring 2013

At the University level, speaking data are collected in two required general education courses: at the 1000 level in CMN 1310G and at the senior level in the senior seminar courses. The following chart offers the speaking data collected over time from the freshman level course. Scores are based on the 4-point Likert scale adopted by Eastern wherein 4=highly competent; 3=competent; 2=minimally competent; and 1=not competent. Scores come from instructors who have given the assignment in the respective courses.


Freshman Holistic Scores by Academic Year (CMN 1310G)

	4-Highly Competent	3-Competent	2-Minimally Competent	1—Not Competent	Total ¹
Fall 2003	118	429	185	4	746
Spring 2004	145	361	152	18	676
Total AY04	263 (18%)	790 (56%)	337 (24%)	22 (2%)	1,422
Summer 2004	9	18	2	1	30
Fall 2004	290	543	216	12	1,093
Spring 2005	152	257	82	7	516
Total AY05	451 (28%)	818 (50%)	302 (18%)	20 (1%)	1,639
Summer 2005	9	16	7	0	32
Fall 2005	178	423	145	6	791
Spring 2006	177	313	107	6	653
Total AY06	364 (25%)	52 (51%)	259 (18%)	12 (1%)	1,476
Summer 2006	0	16	14	0	31
Fall 2006	198	398	123	4	806
Spring 2007	145	244	119	2	542
Total AY07	343 (25%)	658 (48%)	256 (19%)	6 (0%)	1,369
Summer 2007	4	21	5	0	30
Fall 2007	240	401	70	8	774
Spring 2008	154	328	98	6	613
Total AY08	398 (28%)	750 (53%)	173 (12%)	14 (4%)	1,417
Summer 2008	5	22	7	0	37
Fall 2008	253	491	121	2	880
Spring 2009	153	291	85	8	542
Total AY09	411 (28%)	804 (55%)	213 (15%)	10 (4%)	1,459


¹ This column may include forms submitted without an overall holistic score.

Summer 2009	3	8	5	0	18
Fall 2009	251	488	81	4	827
Spring 2010	188	347	54	4	594
Total AY10	442 (31%)	843 (59%)	140 (10%)	8 (<1%)	1,439
Summer 2010	10	17	4	0	31
Fall 2010	221	419	113	4	57
Spring 2011	149	245	61	1	456
Total AY11	380 (31%)	681 (55%)	178 (14%)	5 (<1%)	1,244
Summer 2011	8	14	11	1	34
Fall 2011	196	460	110	9	775
Spring 2012	146	216	57	4	423
Total AY12	350 (28%)	690 (56%)	178 (14%)	14 (1%)	1,232
Summer 2012	0	15	0	0	15
Fall 2012	185	417	100	9	711
Spring 2013	157	228	43	5	433
Total AY13	342 (30%)	660 (57%)	154 (12%)	14 (1%)	1,159

The following chart compares holistic scores from freshman speaking data by academic year for the past 5 years. From the Communication Studies courses, we see that while enrolled in their speaking course in the general education, a little less than one-third of the freshmen are highly competent, while a majority of them, around half of the freshmen, are competent. And, only 12% were rated minimally competent in their speaking skills at the freshman level while less than 1% of freshmen taking CMN 1310G are not competent. It is interesting to note that the number of students deemed not competent has remained the same for the past 3 academic years. In fact, many of these ratings remain fairly consistent across the years.



The chart below compares the holistic scores from freshman AY10 with seniors from AY13. While we have not adjusted to assure that we are only comparing students who were freshmen in AY10 with those who were seniors in AY13, this does show a snapshot of freshmen compared to seniors after four years. We can make a reasonable assumption that many of the same students are included in both groups.



The chart above shows the kind of growth in skills that the University strives to achieve with 63% of seniors at highly competent while only 31% of the freshmen had reached this level. Both groups showed very few students at the not competent level, and there is an 8% difference between the senior and the freshman ranked minimally competent. Ninety-seven percent of seniors were rated as highly competent or competent by their senior seminar faculty in AY13 compared to 90% of freshmen four years earlier.

We began collecting speaking data in the senior seminars in Fall 2004. The following chart gives the holistic scores since the beginning of data collection for this goal.


Senior Holistic Scores by Academic Year (EIU 41XX)

	4-Highly Competent	3-Competent	2-Minimally Competent	1—Not Competent	Total ²
FA04	249	266	25	0	545
SP05	328	320	48	4	770
Total AY05	577 (44%)	586 (45%)	73 (6%)	4 (<1%)	1315
SU05	245	319	36	0	610
FA05	283	273	13	0	578
SP06	437	516	29	6	1052
Total AY06	965 (43%)	1108 (49%)	78 (3%)	6 (0%)	2,240
SU06	283	309	38	0	652
FA06	275	338	21	6	690

² This column may include forms submitted without an overall holistic score.

SP07	470	362	30	0	871
Total AY07	1028 (46%)	1009 (46%)	89 (4%)	6 (0%)	2,213
SU07	376	279	23	1	684
FA07	363	324	54	1	759
SP08	412	314	22	0	767
Total AY08	1,151 (52%)	917 (41%)	99 (4%)	2 (0%)	2,210
SU08	343	219	7	1	574
FA08	437	227	41	1	711
SP09	496	347	42	2	889
Total AY09	1,276 (59%)	793 (36%)	90 (4%)	4 (<1%)	2,174
SU09	312	231	11	0	556
FA09	498	245	18	0	767
SP10	465	341	31	2	842
Total AY10	1,275 (59%)	817 (38%)	60 (3%)	2 (<1%)	2,165
SU10	389	203	27	0	619
FA10	494	260	44	3	801
SP11	573	237	14	0	824
Total AY11	1,456 (65%)	700 (31%)	85 (4%)	3 (<1%)	2,244
SU11	311	249	20	0	580
FA11	390	272	31	0	693
SP12	569	323	26	1	919
Total AY12	1270 (58%)	844 (39%)	77 (4%)	1 (<1%)	2192
SU12	319	193	14	0	526
FA12	525	308	23	2	858
SP13	564	252	17	1	834
Total AY13	1408 (63%)	753 (34%)	54 (2%)	3 (<1%)	2218

Over the nine years that we have been collecting speaking data, the senior holistic scores have remained relatively consistent with a couple of years only significantly higher than predecessors (AY13 and AY11). In AY13 only 3 senior students' presentations were rated as not competent; these ratings are so infrequent that the several years of <1% are not reflected on the chart below.



The next chart displays the subscores given in each course in AY13. This is the second academic year in which OTE provided data on the subscores on the rubric. What follows are the averages for each course and the difference in averages from the previous year. In future years we will offer data to compare freshman level scores with senior scores in four years time.

Trait	AY13 CMN 1310 Average	+/- Previous AY	EIU 4### Average	+/- Previous AY
Organization	3.31	+0.14	3.60	+0.02
Language	3.20	+0.01	3.65	+0.03
Material (Content)	3.10	+0.05	3.57	+0.01
Analysis	3.16	+0.01	3.55	+0.02
Nonverbal Delivery	3.00	-0.07	3.51	+0.21
Verbal Delivery	3.14	+0.07	3.50	+0.06
Holistic Score	3.15	+0.03	3.61	+0.07

The following chart indicates the average holistic scores by college and major for speeches given in CMN 1310G and Senior Seminars for AY13.

Major	CMN Average Rating	Number of Submissions	+/- Previous AY	EIU 4### Average Rating	Number of Submissions	+/- Previous AY
All Submissions	3.15	1159	+.04	3.61	2215	+.07
College of Arts & Humanities	3.17	163	-.02	3.64	394	+.08
African American Studies		0	--	3.0	1	+3.0
Art	3.28	25	+1.2	3.52	48	+2.20
Communication Studies	2.96	45	-.22	3.56	156	=
English	3.38	24	+1.2	3.85	46	+1.4
Foreign Languages	3.0	4	=	3.90	10	+4.0
History	3.0	17	-.32	3.78	51	+2.20
Journalism	3.30	20	+1.1	3.58	33	-.05
Music	3.32	19	+1.7	3.74	26	+1.10
Philosophy	3.0	3	=	3.83	6	+4.0
Social Science	3.5	2	=	3.75	4	+2.25
Theater Arts	3.0	4	+1.7	3.20	10	-.47
College of Education & Professional Studies	3.16	269	+.03	3.60	505	+.05
EC/ELE/MLE	3.23	92	+0.9	3.71	150	+1.8
Health Studies	3.0	23	-.36	3.58	45	+0.8
Kinesiology & Sports Studies	3.06	96	-.04	3.52	203	-.02
Recreation Administration	3.0	13	-.50	3.75	20	+3.8
Special Education	3.36	45	+2.0	3.54	87	-.09
College of Sciences	3.18	330	-.02	3.66	472	+.10
Biological Sciences	3.28	67	+0.7	3.60	70	-.10
Chemistry	3.44	9	+2.3	3.62	13	+3.3
Clinical Laboratory Science	2.40	5	-1.0	3.5	2	-.05
Communication Disorders & Sciences	3.57	21	+3.4	3.64	36	-.15
Economics	3.33	3	+1.6	3.40	10	-.27
Geology/Geography	3.67	3	+2.5	3.65	23	+0.6
Mathematics	3.0	23	-.38	3.74	19	+0.9
Mathematics & Computer Sciences	2.67	6	-1.0	3.75	4	+2.5
Nursing		0	--	3.78	18	-.02
Physics	2.70	10	-.66	4.0	5	+3.3
Political Science	3.44	9	+1.6	3.55	31	-.03
Pre-Health Professions	2.97	67	-.21	3.77	26	+0.9
Psychology	3.30	61	+2.1	3.65	125	+2.3
Science TC	3.0	3	=	3.75	16	-.05
Sociology	3.16	43	+0.6	3.64	74	+2.5

Major	CMN Average Rating	Number of Submissions	+/- Previous AY	EIU 4### Average Rating	Number of Submissions	+/- Previous AY
College of Continuing Education—Bachelor of General Studies	3.0	2	+.75	3.55	259	+.06
Lumpkin College of Business & Applied Sciences	3.13	217	+.02	3.59	556	+.04
School of Business	3.11	145	-.03	3.62	292	+.04
Accounting	2.67	3	-.83	3.73	55	+.10
Business Administration		0	--	3.69	13	-.02
Finance	3.5	2	+.05	3.53	53	-.21
Management	3.67	3	+3.67	3.65	65	+.16
Management Information Systems	3.0	1	=	3.71	21	+.23
Marketing	-	0	-4.0	3.60	60	-.01
Pre-Business	3.11	136	-.01	3.48	25	+.02
School of Family & Consumer Sciences	3.12	43	-.02	3.51	151	+.07
Apparel/Consumer Affairs/Hospitality Management/Merchandising	3.33	18	+.16	3.62	55	+.12
Dietetics	3.50	4	+.5	3.38	13	-.17
Family Services	2.86	21	-.31	3.46	83	+.07
Business		0	--		0	-3.33
School of Technology	3.24	29	=	3.64	113	+.09
Organizational & Professional Development	3.5	2	+3.5	3.67	63	+.17
Career & Technical Education	3.0	5	-.57	3.78	9	+.1
Applied Engineering Technology	3.27	22	+.50	3.59	41	+.04
Center for Academic Support & Assessment—Undeclared	3.07	175	+.17	4.0	2	+.62

Longitudinal Data¹ on Eastern Illinois University's University Foundations Course (Freshman Seminar)

Total Number of First-time Freshmen

Year ²	Number of Students Participating in UF	Number of Students Not Participating in UF	Total First-time Freshmen	Percentage of Class in UF
2010	603	872	1,475	41%
2011	583	777	1,360	43%
2012	553	681	1,234	45%

200 students were in Gateway and in UF in Fall 2012 (36% of UF students were Gateway students, an increase of 11% over the previous year).

Gender Breakdown

Year	UF Males	Total First-Time Freshman Males	UF Females	Total First-time Freshman Females
2010	34%	38%	66%	62%
2011	33%	37%	67%	63%
2012	32%	36%	68%	64%

Ethnic Background Breakdown

Year	UF Minority	UF White	Total First-Time Freshman Minority	Total Freshman White
2010	40%	57%	26%	71%
2011	44%	52%	29%	68%
2012	52%	46%	34%	64%

Retention Rates

Years	University Foundations Students Returning Fall (not Gateway/ BOOST) ³	Gateway Students Enrolled in UF Returning Fall	BOOST Students Enrolled in UF Returning Fall	Non-University Foundations Students Returning Fall
Fall 2009-Fall 2010	84%	74%	79%	79%
Fall 2010-Fall 2011	79%	70%	79%	80%
Fall 2011-Fall 2012	80%	72%	87%	81%
Average	82%	76%	78%	79%

¹ All data was provided by the Office of Planning and Institutional Studies.

² Freshman Seminar was a one credit hour course for the first 8 weeks of the semester from 1995-1999. In Fall 2000 a pilot of the 2-credit hour course was offered with 14 sections of the course team-taught.

³ These percentages include BOOST students until the Fall 2009-Fall 2010 year when BOOST were broken out as we do the Gateway data.

Cumulative GPA after First Three Semesters

Year	University Foundations Students ⁴	Gateway Students in UF	BOOST Students in UF	Non-University Foundations Students
2009	2.71	2.41	2.27	2.87
2010	2.81	2.57	2.46	2.90
2011	2.79	2.51	2.36	2.93
Average	2.78	2.46	2.36	2.86

First-Time Freshmen ACT Scores

	Non-UF	UF ⁵	Non-UF	UF	Non-UF	UF	Non-UF	UF
	<18	<18	19-20	19-20	21-25	21-25	>26	>26
2010	7%	16%	25%	36%	50%	44%	18%	4%
2011	5%	19%	26%	28%	49%	47%	20%	6%
2012	3%	41%	21%	26%	53%	29%	23%	4%

High School Rank

	Participants in UF		Non-Participants in UF		Gateway		BOOST	
2010	Top Half	51%	Top Half	59%	Top Half	57%	Top Half	32%
	Bottom Half	49%	Bottom Half	41%	Bottom Half	43%	Bottom Half	68%
2011	Top Half	53%	Top Half	57%	Top Half	48%	Top Half	48%
	Bottom Half	47%	Bottom Half	43%	Bottom Half	52%	Bottom Half	52%
2012	Top Half	50%	Top Half	62%	Top Half	40%	N/A	
	Bottom Half	50%	Bottom Half	38%	Bottom Half	60%		



Percentage of Students on Probation after First Year



Year	University Foundations Students ⁶	Gateway Students	BOOST Students	Non-University Foundations Students
2009	8%	9%	20%	6%
2010	7%	5%	16%	6%
2011	6%	4%	20%	4%

⁴ Includes the BOOST students from 2005 through 2008.

⁵ This percentage includes Gateway students until Fall 2002; BOOST students are included for all years that that program existed. Probation and Major Declared numbers include BOOST students in the overall UF numbers.

UF Course Evaluations FA08-FA12





University Foundations Citizenship Activity Report Fall 2012

Number of Total Sections: 28
 Number of Group Projects: 8
 Number of Individual Projects: 17
 Number of Both Group & Individual: 3
 Number of Students: 552
 Service learning projects: 26
 Volunteerism: 2

Total Money Collected:



\$1070—American Cancer Society
 \$524—Coles County Humane Society

Students also collected several boxes of food for the Charleston Food Pantry and made 20+ fleece blankets for the Student Volunteer Center's project for sick children

Sample Projects:

- Walked and groomed animals at the Animal Shelter and cleaned out cages
- Visited with nursing home residents and played games and painted nails
- Cleaned trash around town—one class took on the local high school campus
- Worked on Habitat for Humanity homes
- Adopt-a-Soldier—sent letters and packages
- Worked at the health fair on campus
- Sent care packages for survivors of Hurricane Sandy
- Assisted in the Red Week activities
- Special Olympics—friend for a day
- Participated in Relay for Life & Stand Up to Cancer
- Clean-up at Douglas-hart nature center
- Walked in the ALS walk
- Teen Reach—tutoring and games with local teens
- Made Christmas cards for residents at CCAR
- Aided in Girls on the Run
- Making sets for A Christmas Carol
- Tutored local children through after-school program
- Sasha's Softies—making fleece blankets
- YMCA after school program
- Lincoln Log Cabin volunteer
- Organizing storage unit at DOVE Domestic Violence program
- Prepare meals for PADS shelter
- 2 sections embraced the Civility Campaign and students created individual or small group projects based on these themes

Total hours volunteered for the semester: 2107 This number shows an increase of 432 hours from 2011 (565 students). Average hours completed: 3.82 hours, which shows a decrease of .86 hours from the previous fall and is the highest average since FA08.




EIU 2919 AY13


The heart of the Student Success Center's programming is a mandatory one credit hour intervention course, EIU 2919: Strategies for Academic Success, for students who reach Academic Warning status (cumulative GPA below 2.00). Typically between 500-600 students go on academic warning each year. (23) sections of the course were offered in AY 13 with 428 students enrolled (460 students enrolled in AY 12). Additionally, the Student Success Center provides: individualized consultations for students who are referred to the Center or self-refer for assistance with time management, test-taking, study habits, note-taking, goal setting and faculty relations.

One of the goals for the Center outlined in the grant was to increase the percentage of students who regain Good Standing after they were placed on Academic Warning from the pre-grant level of 34% to 60% by 2011.


The following chart shows the improvement of students who regained good standing following the implementation of a mandatory course for students on Academic Warning for the first time. Prior to the required course, only 34% of students ever regained good standing after going on Academic Warning.




The following chart shows the class standing of students enrolled in EIU 2919.





EIU 2919 Evaluation Analysis AY08 – AY13





EIU 2919 Evaluation Analysis AY08 – AY13 Continued





Evaluation questions appear on following page.

Percentage of Students Who Answered Strongly Agree or Agree:


1. My instructor demonstrates command of the subject/discipline. 98%
2. My instructor effectively organizes material for teaching/learning. 97%
3. My instructor is readily accessible outside of class. 92%
4. My instructor presents knowledge or material effectively. 96%
5. My instructor encourages and interests students in learning. 96%
6. This course caused me to reconsider many of my former attitudes. 95%
7. My instructor suggests specific ways I can improve. 95%
8. This course shows sensitivity to individual interests/abilities. 92%
9. An instructor/student partnership in learning is encouraged. 93%
10. My instructor readily maintains rapport with this class. 94%
11. The objectives of this course were clearly explained to me. 96%
12. Lecture information is high relevant to course objectives. 95%
13. This course will be of practical benefit to me as a student. 94%
14. My instructor develops classroom discussions skillfully. 95%
15. This course provides an opportunity to learn from other students. 88%
16. My final grade will accurately reflect my overall performance. 90%
17. The assigned readings significantly contribute to this course. 89%
18. Assignments are related to goals of this course. 95%
19. This size of class is appropriate to course objectives. 95%
20. These items let me appraise this course fully and fairly. 93%

Report on the Seventh Year of the Reinstated Student Program AY 13


In an effort to increase retention and academic success of students who have been reinstated to the university following academic dismissal, all students reinstated after academic dismissal were required to meet with a Student Success Center staff member and enter into an academic plan as part of the terms of their reinstatement. Students were assessed in the areas of study skills, note-taking, time management, test-taking, motivation, goal setting, self-responsibility and college involvement. A plan was developed addressing the needs of each individual student. Needs were determined through diagnostic measures, such as The Study Behavior Inventory, the Noel-Levitz College Student Inventory, and an interview with their assigned SSC advisor. Individual academic plans offer the opportunity to diagnose the student's academic malaise and prescribe academic and behavioral interventions that meet the needs of the individual student. These interventions include: time management instruction, note-taking techniques, test-taking skills, goal-setting exercises, GPA calculation, informal counseling, referral to Career Services, Counseling Center, Financial Aid, The Writing Center, the Reading Center, Minority Affairs, and Disability Services. Failure to complete the plan resulted in an academic hold being placed on the student's record if they were not adhering to the plan by midterm of the semester in which they were reinstated.

This program has fulfilled its anticipated potential to help students succeed who have a track record of failure at Eastern. It also allows Eastern to monitor student progress to better gather data on which students are good risks for reinstatement.

In AY 13, 69 students (40% fewer students than in AY 12) were reinstated to the university. Of these students, 49 developed and completed their academic plan. This is consistent with previous years. The following chart shows academic standing for all reinstated students:




The following chart shows academic standing for reinstated students who completed the academic plan:



Many students who are reinstated to the university have extremely low GPAs upon reinstatement which makes it difficult to regain good standing in one semester. The number of students who achieved good standing in one semester speaks to the strength and success of the program. The students who chose not to contact the Student Success Center or complete their academic plan did not fare as well; **90%** were academically dismissed for a second time.

The following chart shows the average term GPA increase for students prior to their reinstatement and following the completion of their academic plan:



The following chart shows the term GPA for all reinstated students:

