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Chapter One

Introduction to the Institution

In the academic year, 1998-1999, Southeast Missouri State University celebrated 125 years of service to its region, the State of Missouri, and the nation. Southeast was established as the Missouri Normal School for the Third District in 1873 and remains the only four-year institution within the portion of its service region outside of St. Louis County and City.

In 1919, the Missouri General Assembly enacted legislation changing the name of the institution to Southeast Missouri State Teachers College, and empowered the college to grant degrees. In 1946, the legislature confirmed the broadening scope of the curriculum by changing the name to Southeast Missouri State College. In recognition of the needs of the region and growth of the institution, Southeast Missouri State College began offering graduate degrees in the mid 1960's. Recognition by the Missouri Coordinating Board of Higher Education of the changing role of the institution led to passage of legislation in 1972 authorizing a name change to Southeast Missouri State University.

Southeast Missouri State University was first accredited by the North Central Association as a teacher training institution in 1915 and has held continuous accreditation for the past 85 years. In 1966, accreditation through the Master's degree was granted by the North Central Association and in 1973 expanded to include the Educational Specialist degree.

Context for the Self Study

Since the last comprehensive review in 1990, Southeast Missouri State University has benefited from strong support from the State of Missouri, the development and utilization of a viable strategic planning process (described in Chapter eight), and exceptional support by its publics with respect to contributions to the University Foundation. New buildings, outreach activities, new and enhanced academic programs, and significant improvements in information technology have been made possible through these initiatives.

The 1990 Evaluation Team cited institutional planning as a strength of the institution. The development in the mid 90's of a dynamic strategic planning and assessment process is undergirded by Mission Enhancement Funding (see Chapter two) which has allowed the institution to transform itself while holding dear its core values. Through the planning process, the institution is in a constant self-study mode. All academic units and many of the support units prepare annual reports which speak directly to progress toward their strategic goals. The use of a Quality Improvement Process (QUIP) initiated in the former Division of Finance
and Administration has helped to study and where appropriate, streamline processes which affect the day-to-day work of faculty and staff.

The self-study will validate that through its planning process, the University is a dynamic institution which takes seriously the needs of the region it serves. The University was the first in the state to develop program-to-program articulations with community colleges. The development of programs to serve non-traditional students, and serious efforts to address diversity issues will be validated by the self-study report. The formation of consortia and establishment of cooperatively offered courses and programs, both on and off-campus, have enhanced the institution’s ability to serve the region.

Moreover, mindful of its moderately selective admission designation, through its consortial agreements, Southeast Missouri State University has been instrumental in providing lower division course work to students who do not reside in a community college district. At the other end of the continuum, cooperation between Southeast Missouri State University, regional community colleges, Lincoln University and the University of Missouri has provided access to degree programs from the Associate level to the Doctorate in Education to students who might otherwise be denied these opportunities. The decade of the 90’s has been one of significant change which has positioned the University to continue to serve as a highly effective institution in the next century.

**Response to 1990 Evaluation Team Concerns**

The last comprehensive review by the North Central Association was completed October, 1990. The team recommended that the next comprehensive review be scheduled for the year 2000. The 1990 team report enumerates eleven concerns. These concerns and progress toward addressing each follow:

1. *Failure to address enrollment issues in a timely manner and to develop an enrollment management plan.*

In 1995, the Enrollment Development Task Force recommended targets for optimal enrollment and the desired student mix. These targets were subsequently incorporated into the University’s Strategic Plan. An Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management was employed in 1996 and is advised by a campus wide Strategic Enrollment Management Committee. Through reorganization the University has created the position of Associate Director for Minority Recruitment, an outreach office in St. Louis, a Director of International Programs, and Southeast P.M. which is designed to serve working adults. As recently as summer 1999, a position as Vice President for Administration and Enrollment Management was created to further underscore the institution’s commitment to
planned growth. Data presented in the body of the report provide information related to the results of these efforts.

2. *The fiscal implications of residence hall occupancy rates (2,000 out of 2,900).*

Since the 1990 review, the Residence Hall system has undergone extensive restructuring and remodeling. One hall was closed and subsequently reopened to meet the need for additional student accommodations. The Towers and Greek complexes have been remodeled to provide more up-to-date facilities for students while maintaining some traditional settings at a lower cost. Occupancy at the start of the 1999-2000 AY was at ninety eight percent of capacity. Despite offering fewer spaces than in 1990, actual occupancy at the start of the fall term was higher than in 1990. The Residence Life system is fiscally stable.

3. *Need for competitive faculty salaries (as identified in the Self Study) and inadequate compensation for other university employees.*

Southeast Missouri State University judges its progress in maintaining competitive faculty salaries through comparisons with sixteen peer institutions. Since the last NCA review, the University has made a concerted effort to raise faculty salaries. In FY99, at every rank, the average salary of faculty at Southeast Missouri State University is higher than the peer group average (see exhibits for documentation). A committee driven classification system determines staff salaries. Equity studies are done to ascertain whether or not staff position salaries need to be adjusted due to market forces. Formal comparisons are made to CUPA and local data. The most recent study can be found in the exhibits. In most recent years, the Budget Review Committee has recommended higher percentage increases for clerical staff than for faculty and administration.

4. *Need to further develop institutional research and institutional databases to support present planning process.*

Annual fact books containing essential institutional data were published from 1992-1997. This system is presently being replaced with a system that aligns it with the reporting of data to support the strategic planning process and provides former fact book information on a Web site. Databases have been developed to track student test scores, enrollments in the major, graduation rates, retention rates, etc. Recognizing its need to increase the support for Institutional Research, the office has been reorganized to employ an Information Specialist, a Research Analyst, and a Graduate Assistant in addition to the Director.

5. *Unequal distribution of work loads. University expectations for faculty productivity (teaching, especially at the graduate level, and scholarly activity) should be reflected in load assignments and planning for needed faculty positions.*
The base faculty load is twelve semester hours, which is consistent with peer institutions. Each college, however, is able to make adjustments based upon its curricula and course offerings. For example, in the College of Education, faculty teaching only graduate courses have a nine-hour load with other faculty receiving additional load credit for teaching one graduate class. The Harrison College of Business faculty generally carry a nine-hour load. All of the colleges make adjustments for faculty teaching clinical or laboratory courses as a means of controlling workload. College responses to this issue can be found in the exhibits.

6. *Institution's lack of attention and progress on affirmative action in increasing the employment of women (especially faculty) is incomprehensible.*

Over the past ten years, Southeast Missouri State University has actively recruited female faculty and administrators. In the fall of 1998 there were 140 female faculty members or 37 percent of the total faculty. Thirty-eight percent of all executive/administrative staff are female as compared to 32 percent in 1994. Among the administrative staff are a female Provost, Vice-President for Administration and Enrollment Management and three female deans. At all professorial ranks, the percentage of female faculty has increased since 1994 (see exhibits for documentation).

7. *Evidence of racial unrest as reflected in the "Quality of Institutional Student Life," the report of the Task Force on Ethnic Diversity, and as reported to the Evaluation Team needs to be addressed before there is a serious disruption of university-community relations.*

Under the leadership of former President Nitzschke and continuing with President Dobbins, the university has made significant efforts to develop a campus that is welcoming to minority students. A comprehensive report, *Minority Participation at Southeast Missouri State University* can be found among the exhibits. President Nitzschke began his administration by meeting on a regular basis with an advisory group of African-American students. Based on this input, significant efforts to improve the campus climate were initiated. These include the establishment of the Office of Minority Student Programs, faculty and staff training programs to develop sensitivity to minority issues, continuation of the Minority Mentor program, the President's Commission on Minority Affairs and other initiatives outlined in the documentation. Since the 1990 review, two minority students have been elected to the presidency of Student Government. Later sections of the self-study will speak specifically to the results of these initiatives. Financial assistance targeted to minority students is available. At the community level, the Cape Girardeau Chamber of Commerce in partnership with the University has sponsored a number of initiatives designed to improve the community climate for minority students.
8. Lack of a systemic faculty evaluation system.

Every faculty member is evaluated each semester through student evaluations of instruction and annually through the preparation of merit reports. Student evaluations are meant to be used by faculty and chairpersons as a means of improving instruction and may be used by faculty as evidence to support tenure, promotion, and merit. Since the early 1990's, all salary increases have been awarded on the basis of merit reports which provide evidence of the faculty members' progress toward meeting the departmental criteria for Teaching, Professional Growth, and Service (see Faculty Handbook).

9. Need, as recognized by the institution, to improve handicapped accessibility.

In the early 1990's campus accessibility was evaluated by the State of Missouri and financial assistance provided to reach compliance. By 1998, the University had completed over $2,700,000 in ADA improvements. A complete report for 1992-1998 can be found among the exhibits.

10. As a regional university, the institution's commitment to serve the region in terms of external learning and economic development is yet to be realized.

The 1995 Strategic Plan recommitted the University to serving its region. With respect to external learning, the data shows a virtual explosion in off-campus centers, courses, enrollments, and delivery modes. The section of the report on Extended Learning and exhibits provide documentation. The College of Health and Human Services through its “Bootheel Initiative” is attacking systemic problems of unemployment and social ills in the area south of Cape Girardeau. Through the statewide plan for technology education, Southeast Missouri State University was designated as one of two comprehensive institutions charged with increasing access to technological careers. As part of the Strategic Plan, the University developed the School of Polytechnic Studies, which houses the Manufacturing Resource Center. The center provides area industries the opportunity to test new manufacturing technologies, provides customized training, and supports students and faculty in applied research. The Harrison College of Business supports a Small Business Development Center, a Center for Business and Economic Research, a Center for Entrepreneurial Studies and Small Business Management, and a Management Assistance Program. Each of these, along with the student internship program provides, business organizations, faculty, and students an opportunity to enhance economic development in the region. The exhibits include materials related to these efforts.
11. *Student assessment, as required by NCA is not fully developed.*

NCA completed its review of the Assessment Plan with no recommendations. The section of this report on assessment will demonstrate that Southeast Missouri State University has an exemplary assessment review process and is well on its way to incorporating assessment of student learning into the culture of the institution.

**Self Study Process**

In preparation for its self-study, the Steering Committee approved five objectives to guide its work. They are as follows:

1. To gather the necessary data to assess the current strategic plan and form the basis for a new five year plan.

2. To verify the effectiveness of programs designed to assess student academic achievement.

3. To demonstrate that Southeast Missouri State University is an effective institution that is organized to continue to accomplish its purposes.

4. To engage the broadest possible constituency in a comprehensive review of the institution.

5. To use the self-study process as a means of focusing attention on the strengths of the institution and the challenges it faces.

Moreover, due to a renewed emphasis on service to its region, the self-study also includes an Institutional Change Request. In the 1990’s, the institution received authorization from the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the North Central Association to offer a limited number of degree programs at off-campus sites. The new request can be found in Chapter Nine of the self study and asks for a change in scope to read, “No prior commission approval required for offering degree programs at new sites within its service area including those utilizing alternate forms of delivery.”

The actual self-study process began in January 1999, following appointment of the self-study coordinator and a sixteen member Self Study Steering Committee. The Steering Committee is composed of faculty, staff, and a student. To capitalize on the institution’s committee structure, the members of the Steering Committee provided leadership for the existing committees who served as sub-committees of the Steering Committee. In a few cases where an appropriate committee did not
exist, ad-hoc subcommittees were formed. A listing of all sub-committees and their membership as well the self-study plan can be found in the appendices. Perhaps even more helpful to the process was the Board of Regent’s decision to begin the new strategic planning process during the period of self-study. This initiative allowed the University to gather comments from both external and internal groups related to the University’s progress in meeting its prior strategic goals and in setting new goals for the 2000-2005 Strategic Plan.

Organization of the Self Study

The self-study report is organized around the five criteria for accreditation with the exception of assessment. Due to the importance of assessment of student learning, a separate chapter on the assessment process and results was developed. Supporting information can be found in the appendices or in the exhibits prepared for the evaluation team. A list of exhibits will be provided the team. As is common in most self-study processes, institutional committees and units tended to develop self-study reports that were rather lengthy. Original, unedited copies of some of the reports can be found in the exhibits.
Chapter 2

Criterion One: Institutional Mission and Purposes
Chapter Two

Criterion One: Institutional Mission and Purposes

Criterion One states that “the institution has clear and publicly stated purposes consistent with its mission and appropriate to an institution of higher education.” This chapter will demonstrate that the institution fulfills its statutory mission and has clearly stated, publicly disseminated purposes and values. Southeast Missouri State University meets Criterion One.

Mission

Southeast Missouri State University publishes its Mission, Role and Scope and Institutional Purposes statements in its Graduate and Undergraduate Bulletins. Since the 1990 NCA review, the Role and Scope statement was revised in recognition of encouragement by the General Assembly and Coordinating Board for Higher Education for greater accountability in higher education. Based on the Task Force for Critical Choices report prepared by a citizen’s committee, Missouri public institutions of higher education were asked to consider the development of admission criteria (ranging from open to highly selective). The admission criteria then triggered a series of goals relating to retention rates, graduation rates, minority enrollment, student assessment and other measures of institutional effectiveness.

More recently, as part of the self study and the University’s strategic planning process, the Mission, Role, and Scope as well as the University purposes have been reviewed and revised. The statement approved in January 2000 by the Board of Regents follows.

Southeast Missouri State University is a regional comprehensive institution of higher education that derives its authority from the people of Missouri through the Missouri State Legislature. While serving the region, state, nation, and world, the University maintains a strong commitment to the diverse twenty-five counties of southeast Missouri. As a multi-purpose institution the University achieves its educational goals through the offering of degree programs and other learning experiences to its varied constituents.

Recognizing its responsibility for excellence in teaching and student learning, the University supports a wide array of on-and off-campus instructional, research, and public service programs that address the intellectual, professional, personal, social, and cultural needs of its constituent groups.
The University provides education related services to individuals, agencies, businesses, industries, and schools throughout the region, and fosters research applicable to professional, institutional, and regional objectives. The academic leadership responsibility of the University provides an avenue for outreach programs and services that address individual, societal, and employment needs in the region. The research, scholarly activity, and creative endeavor of faculty members, professional staff, and students alike are fostered throughout these efforts as an integral component of the educational process.

In addition to the traditional mission statement as part of its strategic planning process, the University adopted and disseminated a brief statement of mission.

Our Mission

The purpose of the University is to provide students with high-quality, accessible and affordable educational programs responsive to the needs of the region, the nation, and the world. Southeast is an “engaged” university supporting a wide array of research and public service programs that enrich and extend the learning environment.

Institutional Purposes

The statements of institutional purpose were also revised by the University Planning Committee and accepted by the Board of Regents in January, 2000. These most recent purposes are as follows:

Southeast Missouri State University, recognizing its overall responsibility to provide high quality educational services in the region, the state, the nation, and the world, maintains the following purposes consistent with its mission as a basis for planning. To fulfill its mission and its purpose to pursue excellence in teaching and student learning, the University will:

1. Encourage the development of an intellectual orientation by offering a core undergraduate program that stimulates student learning, specifically to think critically; to locate and synthesize knowledge; to develop the capacity for written, oral, and mathematical communication; to understand human experiences and relate them to the present; to integrate the breadth and diversity of knowledge and experience; to make informed value judgments; to appreciate critically their own culture and behavior, as well as the cultures, behaviors, and value systems of others; to make informed aesthetic responses; and to function responsibly in the natural, social, and political environment.

2. Assist traditional and nontraditional students in the processes of identifying and achieving appropriate goals, in developing and maintaining a sense of self-esteem
and confidence, in increasing their desire for self-directed learning, and in expressing themselves as thoughtful citizens.

3. Offer an undergraduate program that extends students’ academic abilities by providing academic and experiential learning opportunities, as well as co-curricular programs, leading to certificates or the associate or baccalaureate degree. Students will be prepared with academic degrees amenable to work situations, advanced education, and life-long learning.

4. Provide multi-faceted graduate education leading to the master’s, specialist’s or cooperative doctor’s degree in academic disciplines with resources of sufficient quality and quantity to support the needs of students. The graduate faculty and students, through research, teaching, and service, work to both create and disseminate current and relevant knowledge in their respective academic disciplines.

5. Provide increased access to the University’s educational resources through the use of technology, campus centers, and on-site instruction for the purpose of acquiring new knowledge and skills, updating knowledge and skills, and satisfying the need for life-long learning.

6. Provide a global perspective in its programs that prepares citizens to respond to the challenges of a diverse society. These goals will be accomplished through the integration of international students in academic and student-service programs, the establishment of a variety of exchange programs, the worldwide promotion of the University and its programs, and the development of a global perspective in the community and region.

7. Contribute to the general advancement of knowledge and student learning by stimulating research and other scholarly and creative endeavors consistent with the mission and other academic purposes of the University.

8. Exercise leadership in the region by providing services, by offering the expertise of faculty and staff, and by encouraging participation of students, alumni, and the general community in addressing the diverse needs of the region.

To achieve these purposes, the University strives to create and nurture a diverse and global community which fosters mutual trust and respect among students, faculty, staff, administration, alumni, and other University constituents and which provides for the open and amicable expression of differences. It seeks to provide an environment that facilitates involvement in intellectual and cultural activities, and fosters informal interaction among students, faculty, staff, and administration, alumni, and other University constituents.
To achieve these purposes, the University encourages and seeks to attract and retain a faculty and staff committed to them, sensitive to the variety of ways in which they can be realized, and competent in achieving them. To this end, the University assists in the further education and professional development of its personnel. It seeks to maintain and encourage an administrative cadre which sees as its primary leadership responsibility to create and foster a climate for the realization of these purposes.

Through an active University Foundation, the University strives also to provide the necessary resources, both human and material, to enable the faculty, students, and staff to carry out their responsibilities. In all its activities, the University encourages the achievement of excellence by all members of its various constituencies.

Values

As part of the University’s strategic planning process, a set of core values was articulated and posted in most offices on the campus. These values flow from the Mission and Purposes of the University.

Learning: Ours is a learning organization. We teach through involvement in learning. We prepare students for tomorrow and beyond through integrated professional and liberal education.

Each individual is important and deserving of our respect. We treat one another with dignity and consideration. Our reasons for being are the success of the students we serve.

Access/Accommodation/Affordability: We offer affordable programs of high quality, accessible to the greatest possible cross section of the people of Southeast Missouri and the world.

Regional Service: We are dedicated to bringing a universe of possibilities to the people of the region we serve. We develop the region’s human capital and serve regional development in other ways.

Now and always, Southeast is committed to serving people of all races and creeds—to offer a supportive environment for people across the range of human diversity.

The University’s commitment to these values will be evident throughout the self-study. Increased efforts to afford students the opportunity to engage their disciplines through internships and research opportunities can be found in the reports of the academic units. The growth in outreach to the region as well as
public service initiatives important to meeting the educational, economic, and social needs of the region are documented.

**Mission Enhancement**

In the mid 1990’s, the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and Missouri General Assembly provided public institutions of higher education with an opportunity to focus and enhance their missions to meet important state needs. Approval of plans by the legislature carried with it significant base budget increases appropriated over a four year period to support institutional plans. For Southeast Missouri State University, having just completed its *Strategic Plan*, the timing was fortunate. Other institutions elected to adopt a thematic approach to mission enhancement such as a liberal arts or international focus. Southeast Missouri State University, however, determined that as the only four year institution in its region and with a clear sense of the needs of its constituents gathered through the planning process, its *Strategic Plan* represented the goals through which its mission could be enhanced to better serve the needs of the region and state.

The full *Mission Enhancement Plan* and four year budgets can be found in the exhibits. Highlights of accomplishments to date include $5,917,000 in additional funding to support:

- Development of the School of Polytechnic Studies
- Development of additional off-campus centers
- Development of a distance-learning network
- Development or enhancement of nine academic programs
- Establishment of expanded outreach opportunities through Continuing Education
- A focus on diversity through establishment of Offices of International Programs and Minority Student Programs along with expanded minority student recruitment and scholarship programs.
- Support for student experiential learning
- Development of a higher education consortium designed to meet regional needs using the strengths of multiple institutions.

Mission enhancement funding has allowed Southeast Missouri State University the unique opportunity to not only shape its future but to actualize its planning goals. A review of mission enhancement budgets and the annual *Results* reports provide an impressive record of an institution that is proactively engaged in affecting student learning, meeting regional needs, and contributing to state-wide goals for higher education.
General Institutional Requirements

1. It has a mission statement, formally adopted by the governing board and made public, declaring that it is an institution of higher education.

The statements of mission and purposes are published in the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins and on the University’s Web page.

2. It is a degree granting institution.

Southeast Missouri State University offers Associate, Bachelor’s, Master’s and Educational Specialist degrees. Complete listings of all degree can be found in the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins.

3. It has legal authorization to grant its degrees, and it meets all legal requirements to operate as an institution of higher education wherever it conducts its activities.

Southeast was established as the Missouri Normal School for the Third District in 1873. In 1919, by legislative enactment, Southeast Missouri Normal School was established. In 1946, with permission of the Missouri General Assembly, the name was changed to Southeast Missouri State College. In 1972, the Board of Regents, with permission of the Missouri Legislature and in recognition of the institutions evolving mission approved the name change to Southeast Missouri State University. The Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the North Central Association granted authorization for extant off-campus programs degree programs.

4. It has legal documents to confirm its status: not-for-profit, for profit or public.

Southeast Missouri State University was established through legislative enactment in 1873 as a public institution of higher education.

5. It has a governing board that possesses and “exercises necessary legal power to establish and review basic policies that govern the institution.”

By statute, the University has a six member Board of Regents appointed by the Governor of the State of Missouri to six-year terms. In addition, a non-voting student representative is appointed to a two-year term. The Commissioner of Education is an ex officio member. The board operating under its legal authority
must approve all new institutional policies, budgets, proposed budgets, and requests for new programs. Copies of Board Minutes are available in the Office of the President.

6. Its governing board includes public members and is sufficiently autonomous from the administration and ownership to assure integrity of the institution.

The board of Regents consists of six non-University representatives appointed by the Governor of the State of Missouri. By law, half of the members must be Democrats and half Republicans. The Governor also appoints the non-voting student member. In recognition of the breadth of the Institution's service region, members of the board generally reside in urban (St. Louis), rural, and the immediate Cape Girardeau area. While the Commissioner of Education is a nominal member of all regional institution boards, neither the current commissioner nor any of his predecessors has ever participated in board deliberations.

7. It has an executive officer designated by the governing board to provide administrative leadership for the institution.

The chief executive officer for Southeast Missouri State University is its President, Dr. Kenneth Dobbins. The President has day-to-day responsibility for providing institutional leadership and with his administrative team manages the day-to-day operations of the University.

8. Its governing board authorizes the institution’s affiliation with the commission.

Board of Regents minutes of March 24, 1999, reflect the authorization to continue the institution’s affiliation with the Commission.

9. It employs a faculty that has earned from accredited institutions the degrees appropriate to the level of instruction offered by the institution.

Full time faculty employed by Southeast Missouri State University must hold a terminal degree to gain eligibility for tenure. Over ninety percent of the faculty hold tenured or tenure track positions and are qualified by experience and education to develop curricula and provide instruction. Faculty vitae can be found in the Resource Room.

10. A sufficient number of faculty are full time employees of the institution.
Ninety percent of the faculty are full time, including a preponderance of those teaching in evening and off-campus programs.

11. Its faculty has a significant role in developing and evaluating the institution’s educational programs.

New courses, programs and revisions are developed by the faculty and approved by the originating department, the College Councils, and where appropriate the University Studies and Graduate Councils. The Academic Council also approves new majors as well as minors. The Board of Regents and the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education must approve new majors.

12. It confers degrees.

Southeast Missouri State University grants about 1500 Associate and Baccalaureate degrees and 175 graduate degrees annually.

13. It has degree programs in operation with students enrolled in them.

Southeast Missouri State University offers 116 undergraduate majors and 31 graduate majors. A list of programs including enrollment in each can be found in the appendices. Program listings can be found in the bulletins.

14. Its degree programs are compatible with the institution’s mission and are based on recognized fields of study at the higher education level.

The institution’s degree programs directly support its mission as the only four-year institution in its service region. The programs are comparable with those found at similar institutions. Changes in the last ten years reflect program responsiveness to the region.

15. Its degrees are appropriately named, following practices common to institutions of higher education in terms of both length and content of programs.

All programs at Southeast Missouri State University are either accredited by the appropriate discipline accrediting body or submitted for external review, thus validating that the content is common to institutions of higher education. Students are required to complete a minimum of 124 semester hours. Degree titles reflect the common language of higher education.
16. Its undergraduate degree programs include a coherent general education requirement consistent with the institution's mission and designed to ensure breadth of knowledge and to promote intellectual inquiry.

The University Studies requirement consists of 48 semester hours (9 at the upper division level). The University Studies program is organized around nine objectives which form the basis for courses included in the curriculum. All freshman are required to enroll in UI100, First Year Seminar. The remaining 39 hours of the core curriculum are organized around three perspectives. Students must complete a minimum of 12 semester hours in each perspective. The nine hours of upper division work consists of six hours of interdisciplinary courses and an interdisciplinary senior capstone seminar. The program is fully described in the *Undergraduate Bulletin*. All Associate degrees require a minimum of 21 hours of University Studies courses.

17. It has admission policies and practices that are consistent with the institution’s mission and appropriate to its educational programs.

In the early 1990’s a “Task Force on Critical Choices” was charged by the legislature with charting the course for Missouri public higher education. From this report came the recommendation that public four-year institutions define their level of selectivity in admissions along a continuum from “open admission” to “highly selective.” The Board of Regents of Southeast Missouri State University authorized Moderately Selective admission criteria. Admission information is consistently provided prospective students, their parents, and high school counselors. The University’s admission policies are focused on the admission of students with sufficient educational background and ability to be successful while maintaining the quality and integrity of the educational process.

At the graduate level, faculty in the programs determine the base admission practices that in all cases must meet or exceed the institutional requirement established by the Graduate Council.

18. It provides its students access to those learning resources and support services required for its degree programs.

The institution provides appropriate access to learning resources through Kent Library and access to databases throughout the state and nation. Throughout the 1990’s, building computer labs for students has been a major priority. Academic advising, tutoring, a large honors program, and other support services for student academic achievement are described in the self-study.
19. It has an external financial audit by a certified public accountant or a public audit agency at least every two years.

An external Certified Public Accounting firm audits the University annually and reports its findings to the Board of Regents. Audit reports from FY 98 and 99 are provided to the evaluation team and audits for the prior three years are available in the Resource Room.

20. Its financial documents demonstrate the appropriate allocation and use of resources to support its educational programs.

Southeast Missouri State University utilizes a budget review system which involves representatives of all internal constituencies and the Board of Regents. Budget planning is aligned with strategic planning to assist the institution in meeting its educational purposes.

21. Its financial practices, records, and reports demonstrate fiscal viability.

Even in times of limited resources, Southeast Missouri State University has always lived within its means. The annual audited reports demonstrate fiscal viability.

22. Its catalog or other official documents includes its mission statement along with accurate descriptions of its educational programs and degree requirements; its learning resources; its admission policies and practices; its academic and non-academic policies and procedures directly affecting students; its charges and refund policies; and the academic credentials of its faculty and administration.

Both the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins include the institution’s mission and purposes and complete descriptions of the educational programs, admissions policies, academic policies, refund information, and the credentials of faculty and administrative staff. The student handbook focuses on student life opportunities and policies.

23. It accurately discloses its standing with accrediting bodies with which it is affiliated.

Both the Undergraduate and Graduate Bulletins include a listing of all accreditations.
24. It makes available upon request, information that accurately describes its financial condition.

As a public institution, the budget and annual audit are disclosed in open meetings of the Budget Review Committee and Board of Regents. Financial documents are a matter of public record. Annual reports of the Southeast Missouri State Foundation are also open to public scrutiny and are widely distributed.

Conclusion: Southeast Missouri State University satisfies the General Institutional Requirements of the North Central Association’s Commission on Institutions of Higher Education.

Self Evaluation

Southeast Missouri State University through its planning processes is responsive to the needs of its region and the State of Missouri. Chapter Eight will provide detail as to the willingness of the University to connect with its external and internal constituencies in setting its course for the future. The following chapters will demonstrate that the University is organized to effectively use its resources in meeting its primary mission.
Chapter Three

Criterion Two: Institutional Resources

Criterion two states, "the institution has effectively organized the human, financial, and physical resources necessary to accomplish its purposes." This chapter presents a pattern of evidence that supports the accomplishment of Criterion Two by the University.

The chapter provides an overview of the processes that serve to support the institution in accomplishing its mission and ultimately support the teaching-learning process. It is important to note that since the last NCA review two important initiatives have assisted the University in achieving its goals. The allocation of Mission Enhancement funds and the appropriation of capital funds for both maintenance and new facilities have allowed the institution to further fulfill its commitment to serve the region through program development and enhancement.

Organizational Structure

State statute establishes the Board of Regents of Southeast Missouri State University as the policy-making board for the institution. Members of the Board are appointed by the Governor from the University’s service area, and are approved by the state Senate. The Board consists of six voting members, half Democrats and half Republicans, who serve six-year terms which are staggered so that the terms of one-third of the members expire every two years. In addition, there is a non-voting student member of the Board, who also goes through the appointment process.

The agency with responsibility for the public universities of the state is the Department of Higher Education, headed by the nine-member bipartisan Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE). The CBHE is not so much a policy-making body for the respective universities as it is a policy-coordinating mechanism for the institutions of higher education throughout Missouri. It receives the annual budget request from the public universities and makes funding recommendations to the Governor and to the state legislature. The CBHE also approves new degree programs, collects and analyzes relevant data, and coordinates the planning for higher education in the state. Though the CBHE actions can have an impact on the processes and policies of the University, the Board of Regents has the ultimate decision-making authority regarding the proposed policies developed through the university’s governance procedures.

The organizational structure of the University has changed over the past ten years, probably at least in part because of changes in the Presidency and the different
priorities and preferences of the persons holding that position. The current president is the fifth since 1990, including two interim presidents and two of longer service. Though the current four vice president-level positions are the same in number as existed in 1990, the responsibilities of each have been changed. Most of that change resulted from the abolition of the position of Vice President for Student Affairs, and the distribution of those duties between the Provost and the Associate Provost and Dean of Students and, a newly-created position of Vice President for Administration and Enrollment Management. The latter acquired the areas of admissions, food service, transportation, and some student-related facilities, while the Provost assumed responsibility for programs in student development, including career services, health and counseling, and other student programming. Though the number of vice presidents has remained constant at four, a temporary new position of Chancellor for Development of the River Campus and Polytechnic Institute was created. The major responsibility of this position is to develop financial support through a capital campaign for those two major thrusts, the proposed River Campus for visual and performing arts, and the School of Polytechnic Studies.

The number of academic colleges remains at 1990 levels with five, though there are also four schools: University Studies, Polytechnic Studies, Graduate Studies, and Extended Learning. The latter two were one unit until 1998, and the School for Polytechnic Studies was created in 1999 as part of the strategic planning and mission enhancement processes. In 1998, the title of the Director of Kent Library was changed to Dean of Academic Information Services and Director of Kent Library to reflect the changing nature of libraries in the information age. While the Crisp Bootheel Educational Center in Malden existed ten years ago, additional Centers have since been created in Sikeston, Perryville, and Kennett, and responsibility for these centers belongs to the School of Extended Learning. Relevant organization charts can be found in the Appendices.

Governance

The University’s Board of Regents has been empowered by state statute to make policy for the institution. In practice, what this has meant in most cases is that the Board makes the ultimate decision about whether or not to approve the policy recommendations developed through the University’s governance process.

The actual governance process is not readily explained with brevity. In 1976 the Board approved the Governance Document, a portion of a Faculty Senate bill which called for a collegial system of governance based on the principles of shared authority and responsibility whereby all members of the university community--administration, faculty, staff, and students--have opportunity to participate directly in the decision-making process. That document also affirmed the role of the Faculty Senate as the established representative body through which the faculty could make “formal recommendations for new academic policy
and changes in existing policy.” Subsequent Presidents and Boards have reaffirmed their commitment to these principles.

As the institution has grown in size and complexity, there have been occasional differences of opinion about which groups should have primary responsibility for developing certain recommendations, and which groups should be consulted during that process. By and large, however, the committee process influences policy deliberations. Particularly in some of the administrative or non-academic areas, there have been Quality Improvement Groups (QuIP) constituted from those most closely involved with a process, in order to develop recommendations for improvement of that process.

Some of the employee groups have been working to improve their own internal processes in order to more smoothly interact with others regarding university policy development. The Faculty Senate, for example, has significantly revised its committee staffing method and operating procedures during the past ten years. Yet it remains a challenge to conduct what at times is a necessarily “messy” act of democratic governance within a complex institution that is increasingly open to its environment.

As in any institution of higher education, much of the collegial nature of the governance process is vested in the committee structure. The University vests specific responsibilities in its committees. The membership of institutional level committees is drawn from administration, faculty, staff, and students. The faculty are represented by the Faculty Senate, the staff by either the Professional Staff or Clerical, Technical, and Service Councils, and the students by Student Government.

In order to collect data for this self-study regarding university governance issues, a survey instrument was developed by the Faculty Senate Governance Committee, and was administered to the representative bodies of the various groups of the university community. The primary purpose of this instrument was to measure agreement with and progress on some of the governance-related observations included in the 1990 Self-Study. Where possible, the wording of individual survey questions duplicated that found in the 1990 document. The responses were gathered during the Spring 2000 semester for use in this report. Preliminary results were collected and are reported in the Exhibits section of this document. Additional, more sophisticated analysis of the responses will be done in the future and will be shared with the participants.

The 1990 Self-Study described the university planning and budgeting processes without actually making qualitative judgments about them. For this reason, survey questions were developed about those areas, and the responses to them may be found in the Exhibits. There were, however, specific evaluative statements made about general governance and organization in the 1990 Self-Study section on Governance, including the following:
“The University is committed to an open, participatory style of governance.”
“...the concept of collegiality is not fully developed...”
“...the degree of openness, faculty input, and information sharing is significantly
greater than evidenced at most institutions.”
“...[in 1981] the Faculty Senate seemed unwilling to debate controversial
issues... [though by 1986 it] was beginning to mature...”
“...[in 1981] the committee structure was overly complex..., [though by 1986] the
committee structure had been improved...”

To assess the applicability of these statements to the 2000 situation, questions on
each were developed and administered to representatives of the six main
constituency groups: Student Government, academic Department Chairs, the
Administrative Council, Faculty Senate, the Professional Staff Council, and the
Clerical/Technical Staff Council. In some cases, the number of potential
respondents in each group is very small, and as a result, the number of responses
were small (it must be noted that less than one-third of the Department
Chairpersons responded). In the chart that follows, the mean response of each
group is reported, based upon the following values:

1-- “strongly agree”
2-- “agree”
3-- “neutral”
4-- “disagree”
5-- “strongly disagree”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Student Govt. (n=25)</th>
<th>Dept. Chairs (n=10)</th>
<th>Admin. Council (n=20)</th>
<th>Faculty Senate (n=28)</th>
<th>Prof. Staff Council (n=6)</th>
<th>Clerical Techni (n=11)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University is committed to an open, participatory style of governance.</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The degree of openness, input, and information sharing on campus is sufficient.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collegiality (as I understand the term) is fully developed on campus.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The group of my primary affiliation is willing to debate controversial issues.</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University committee structure is appropriately designed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees have clear responsibilities.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees are permitted to make meaningful decisions.</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A cursory analysis of this table discloses that all groups tend toward agreement or
neutrality in their responses with the Student Government Senate uniformly more
favorable about these issues than that of any other constituency group. Second,
the views of the Administrative Council are also uniformly more favorable on these issues than those of any of the other employee groups. Whether these differences are statistically significant will be determined through further analysis of the data. In response to an observation in a previous self-study, today all groups feel willing to debate controversial issues. It does appear, that some improvements in fostering communication can be made. The latter point has been noted in other university studies and is being addressed by the current president. President Dobbins maintains a Web site open to all, sponsors breakfasts and lunches with faculty, staff, and students and recently, with the executive staff, held a “brown bag lunch” question and answer session open to entire university community. In most cases, the respondents believe that committees are allowed to make meaningful decisions, and that the University is committed to an open, participatory form of governance.

Faculty and Staff Resources

Southeast Missouri State University has an outstanding community of faculty and staff who understand that their primary goal is to support the University’s mission and purposes through assisting students in meeting their educational goals. Staff are classified as Executive/Administrative, Professional, Technical, Clerical, Skilled Crafts, and Services/Maintenance. Specific data can be found in the exhibits. The University employs 615 persons in non-faculty positions. Among these, 55% are female. Moreover, 39% of all Administrative personnel and 57% of all professional staff are also female. The University has made a strong commitment to reflecting the diversity of the region among its employees. Nine percent of the staff represent minority groups including 13% of those classified as Executive or Administrative staff.

Detailed faculty data can be found in the annual reports and in the exhibits associated with this chapter. Southeast Missouri State University employs a full-time faculty that numbers 390. Among the faculty, in the fall of 1999, 32% were female. 345 of the fall 1999 faculty are tenured or on a tenure track with 96% holding the doctorate. Despite its best efforts toward enhancing diversity among the faculty, the minority faculty represent only nine percent of the total.

Faculty, in general, carry a workload of approximately 12 semester hours. As indicated in Chapter One, deviations are made at the discretion of the academic deans in recognition of laboratory assignments, professional accreditation standards, heavy involvement in graduate education, and scholarly involvement. Southeast Missouri State University, in the mid 1980’s adopted the “teacher-scholar” model and expects its faculty to demonstrate effectiveness in teaching, scholarly/creative activities, and service to the University and region. Details of these faculty activities can be found in Chapter Five and in the annual reports of the academic departments and colleges.
Faculty Development

The University encourages the professional development of faculty and staff in various ways. These include leave programs, travel funds, workshops, and training programs. Details of programs can be found in the Faculty and Staff Handbooks. The University also provides an extensive wellness program for all faculty and staff. The importance the University attaches to professional development begins with new faculty who are required to attend a weeklong Teaching Effectiveness Workshop prior the start of the fall term. The workshop is conducted by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning and is consistently evaluated positively by the participants. The report of the Center will articulate numerous professional development activities.

In addition, as an expression of its commitment to maintaining a quality learning environment and to enhance professional competence, the University provides a sabbatical leave program for tenured faculty. The procedure for sabbatical leave applications is described in the Faculty Handbook. Opportunities for professional travel to attend conferences, etc. is provided through base allocations to the departments and colleges. Each department receives an allocation equal to $350 per FTE faculty to distribute based upon their procedures. The colleges receive an additional $300 per FTE to be distributed based on procedures approved by the college faculty. The Offices of the Provost, Dean of the Graduate School, and Dean of University Studies have additional funds that are targeted to support faculty development. A Grants and Research Funding program administered by the Faculty Senate provides funds for faculty research projects. Through these various accounts, in FY2000, approximately $500,000 was available to support faculty travel and research.

On-campus activities for improving teaching effectiveness and updating expertise with technology have been well attended (see reports of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning). Also, systems for distributing faculty development funds ensure that most faculty can pursue their professional goals with at least some support from the University, even if it is not at a level that everyone feels is adequate

A perennial challenge is securing the necessary funding to support a level of faculty development activities in the areas of scholarship and teaching enhancement. The University's avowed adherence to the teacher-scholar model presupposes that faculty will be adequately supported in their efforts to grow professionally. Further, if participation in professional activities is to weigh significantly in tenure, promotion, and merit pay decisions, then faculty should not have to feel they must pay a significant percentage of the costs of these activities out of their own pockets.
Two award programs recognize the development of faculty through monetary awards in addition to the merit pay system that is grounded in teaching effectiveness, professional development, and service. The Alumni Merit Award is given annually and recognizes the excellence of all faculty through an award to one of its members through nominations to the Alumni Council. The Pride Award was established by former administrators and recognizes one faculty member through nominations to the Council of Deans. Additionally, each college and the School of Polytechnic Studies has a fund dedicated to faculty recognition which is administered in a manner suitable to the college or school.

**Staff Development**

The University has a very active program designed to meet the development needs of the technical and clerical staff. These activities are directly linked to the University’s strategic plan, in particular Priority 5 (enhance the campus community): Goal 21 (create a positive work environment) and Goal 23 (continuous quality improvement). A list of all seminars offered by the Training and Development Office can be found in the exhibits, as can the Training and Development reports for FY 1992-98.

**Training and Development**

The Training and Development function was established on July 1, 1988, as a part-time assignment under the supervision of the University Payroll Manager. In September of 1995, as a result of the increased need for training, Training and Development became a separate, full-time office.

Currently, the Training and Development Office offers over 100 training seminars each year on a wide variety of topics including mainframe computer applications, University policies and procedures, personal development, manager/supervisor training, clerical training, and training for student workers. Topics are determined through a periodic campus needs assessment, feedback on seminar evaluation forms, changes in University policy, and changes in legal and/or environmental conditions.

In addition, the Training and Development Office conducts five or six New Staff Member Orientations each year and presents an ongoing customer service program called CONNECTIONS™. The objective of these programs is to focus attention on serving our students and on creating a community of sharing and learning.

In FY 98, under the direction of the Office of the President, the Training and Development Office developed and implemented the first campus-wide diversity program called *Embracing the University Portrait*. The first year of the program was devoted to raising awareness of diversity issues. During the second year, the
focus shifted to the improvement of campus community using the six principles outlined in the Carnegie Foundation book *Campus Life: In Search of Community*.

In response to University and environmental needs, special events have been conducted. As part of the diversity program, national speakers were brought to campus to speak on topics of interest. In response to rulings by the United States Supreme Court regarding sexual harassment, an Equal Employment Opportunity Commission Supervisory Administrative Judge gave a presentation to faculty and staff, with special sessions for individuals in supervisory positions.

Utilizing the Show Me Challenge for Education, a self-assessment tool from the Excellence in Missouri Foundation, the Training and Development Office coordinated three Show Me Challenge events aimed at identifying the top three opportunities for improvement within the University.

In 1998, the American Council on Education presented a workshop for Missouri Department Chairs and Deans. This program featured national presenters from the ACE and was offered to higher education institutions in Missouri. This was the first time this program was offered in Missouri on a state-wide basis. Ninety-nine individuals from seven Missouri institutions participated in the program.

Offerings by the Training and Development Office have grown from 18 seminars in its first year to 113 seminars and 27 diversity sessions during the last fiscal year. Participation has grown from 323 in FY89 to 2623 in FY99. The campus has consistently rated offerings high, averaging 3.55 or higher on a 4-point scale. The only training to fall below this mark was the diversity program (3.39) during its first year.

Computer training for PC software and computer networking is the responsibility of the Computer Services Office. Offerings are updated regularly as the University updates its software and hardware.

The Wellness Advantage Office offers seminars on health and lifestyle topics, and the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning offers seminars designed to meet the specific needs of faculty members. The Wellness program also offers a range of activities for faculty and staff. Additionally, many offices across campus send individuals to off-campus seminars both locally and out of the area. The year-end reports for the Wellness program, including participation rates and evaluation numbers, can be found among the exhibits.

As it matures, the Office of Training and Development faces several challenges. At present, the University does not have either an approved University Training Policy or official procedures. Consequently, there is inequity across campus in access to training programs. Additionally, because the University has no "directed" training, many individuals in management or supervisory positions have not had the opportunity to gain the skills needed to manage effectively. A
draft policy has been developed and will be forwarded through appropriate channels for approval.

Because several different offices have training responsibilities and separate registration systems, it is difficult to identify the overall number of training seminars offered on campus and/or the total number of hours utilized by employees for training. Additionally, with the implementation of a University Training Policy, it will be necessary to clearly track employee utilization of training opportunities. As a result, a new registration system is being developed for shared use by Training and Development, Computer Services, and Wellness Advantage. This system, which is scheduled for implementation July 1, 2000, will provide on-line registration for employees and improved reporting capabilities.

The last University-wide training needs assessment was conducted during FY97. The results of this assessment have guided training offerings since that time. During the Spring semester of FY2000, the Training and Development Office plans to conduct another needs assessment to determine the future direction of programs. This will include meetings with University administrators and focus groups, a campus-wide survey, and the feedback obtained from training evaluation forms. On an ongoing basis, the feedback from training evaluation forms is used to identify additional training needs.

**Financial Resources**

Southeast Missouri State University has effectively organized its financial resources to support its educational mission by implementing a budget review process that productively reviews the University's distribution of operating funds, evaluates proposals with regard to the strategic plan, considers the financial needs of students as various fee rates are established, and provides for shared governance through participation by a representative University-wide committee. In addition, the University has maintained a fiscally responsible pattern of controlling expenditures and increasing its fund balances for future needs.

Annually, the University submits an operating budget request for state appropriations to the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education (CBHE), the Missouri State Legislature, and the Office of the Governor. This request includes detailed funding appeals for base operational dollars, inflationary increases, and programmatic enhancements.

At the University level, a recommended annual budget for Education and General (E&G) expenditures is developed through its 27-member Budget Review Committee (BRC) which represents all major constituencies of the University. The BRC conducts budget hearings during which it evaluates institutional, divisional, and departmental budgets and related enhancement requests, while taking into account the University's strategic plan. During the deliberation
process, the BRC considers the projected level of state appropriations, student fees (including anticipated enrollment), and other revenues, and then prioritizes expenditure requests. The BRC forwards a balanced budget to the President for review and approval by the University’s Board of Regents.

For self-supporting operations, Auxiliary Enterprise budgets are established annually through a review of current and projected revenues and expenditures. Inflation and other relevant factors are considered during this process. Working with the Budget Director, the Auxiliary directors submit balanced budgets to the appropriate Vice President. The budgets of the various auxiliary units are then consolidated and forwarded to the President for review and approval by the University’s Board of Regents.

All recommended changes to student fees and other charges (e.g., housing) are included within the above processes and approved by the Board of Regents. Prior to such approval, various student groups vote on these recommendations. For the past several years, these groups have supported the recommended changes.

Budget Administration

The Vice President for Finance has the overall responsibility for the preparation and administration of the University’s annual budget. Locally, the budgeting, allocation, and control operations are the responsibility of the Budget Office that reports directly to the Vice President of Finance.

Access to departmental budgets is very decentralized with budget custodians having on-line access to their accounts. Departmental budget custodians are authorized to make the necessary budget transfers within their departments with a review of these performed daily by the Budget Office to ensure compliance with University procedures. In an effort to aid budget custodians, the Budget Office has developed pro-active monitoring reports that periodically provide to custodians the financial status of budgets that fall below a “normal-usage” rate. In addition, the Budget Office sends notifications to the custodians when a budget falls into or remains in a deficit status.

Salary management reports are generated routinely to track salary savings resulting from retirements and other position vacancies. These reports are generated monthly by the Budget Office and provided to the Vice President for Finance for distribution to Executive officers. The salary savings are partially allocated back to the respective divisions to fund divisional initiatives and unforeseen needs. The remaining portion of savings dollars is used to fund institutional one-time or unplanned expenditures.

The University has experienced a steady increase in fund balances over the last ten years. As of June 30, 1999, consolidated fund balances totaled $192.4 million. Of this amount, $163.1 million (85%) represented the University’s
significant investment in plant assets. This investment in plant has increased 61% since 1990. Significant capital appropriations from the State of Missouri, as well as bond financing secured by the University, are the primary contributors to this increase.

The University has experienced significant growth in its Current Funds balance. Since 1990, this fund balance has more than tripled from $5.1 million to $18.3 million in 1999. During this same time period, current funds revenues have increased by 59%, from $63.6 million to $101 million.

The largest source of general operating revenues continues to be state appropriations. Since 1990, state appropriations have increased by 48%, from $30.3 million to $44.8 million in 1999 (See Figure 1). Since 1996, state appropriations have increased by 22%, from $36.7 million to $44.8 million in 1999. A primary factor contributing to this increase is "Mission Enhancement" funding provided by the state. This funding is a result of the University’s Strategic Plan approved by the Board of Regents in 1996 that confirmed that there were serious unmet postsecondary education needs in the University’s service region. The State provided the opportunity for additional funding for institutions that redefined their missions in order to meet important state needs. The University has received $1,479,250 annually in fiscal years 1998, 1999 and 2000 for Mission Enhancement, and has requested the final year’s funding for the same amount in fiscal year 2001.

Student tuition and fees represent the next largest component of the University’s operating budget (Figure 1). Although student fee rates have increased over the last ten years, the percentage of educational costs paid by students has declined in the last five fiscal years, from 35.4% in fiscal year 1995 to 32.5% in fiscal year 1999 (Figure 2).
Figure 1 - Composition of General Operating Revenues

Figure 2 - Tuition and Fees as a Percent of General Operating Revenues
Capital Improvement Financing

One of the six priorities of the University's strategic plan is to build, maintain and operate first-rate physical facilities for delivering education to its students. The University has used a variety of capital funding sources over the last ten years to meet this goal. The annual operating budget request includes a core budget appropriation for ongoing physical plant maintenance and repair efforts. The state appropriation budget provides approximately 1.25% of the physical plant replacement value annually for maintenance and repair efforts. The University internally reallocates funds to match this allocation so that the annual maintenance and repair budget is between 1.5% and 1.75% of the physical plant replacement value. An annual budget of projects to be completed with state maintenance and repair dollars is submitted to the Board of Regents for approval prior to the beginning of a new fiscal year. The core budget appropriation for maintenance and repair dollars has nearly tripled in the last five years (See Figure 3).

Figure 3 - State Maintenance and Repair Dollars Appropriated

The State of Missouri conducts a biennial capital appropriation request process. State institutions submit a two-year capital budget request, which also includes a five-year plan summary. The long range planning process requires the institution to outline maintenance and construction needs on campus in order to secure future
funding. The capital appropriations process is used to fund major maintenance and repair, renovation and rehabilitation, and new construction programs.

The University annually assesses major capital needs on campus, in conjunction with the Strategic Plan and Campus Master Plan. The University has received over $36 million in state capital appropriations over the last ten years. State capital funds have been a major source of funding for construction of new teaching facilities such as Robert A. Dempster Hall, Sikeston Area Higher Education Center and the Otto and Della Seabaugh Polytechnic Building.

In addition to state funding, the University has issued tax-exempt bonds to meet capital financing needs, primarily for its auxiliary operations. In 1993, the University issued $17,555,000 of bonds for residence hall renovations. In January 1998, the University issued $8,655,000 of bonds for the expansion/improvement of the Student Recreation Center and recreation fields. In September 1998, the University issued $10,605,000 of bonds to renovate and expand certain student housing facilities. Revenues from these facilities have been pledged to repay these bonds. These revenues consist primarily of room, board, and other student fees.

The University contracts with an external Certified Public Accounting firm to annually examine the financial statements of the University and the internal controls that dictate employee practices related to the expenditure of University funds. Audit reports are prepared for the financial statements of the University and its bond funds. A review is also performed of the financial activity of Intercollegiate Athletics department, based on certain agreed-upon procedures. In addition, an A-133 audit of Federal expenditures is completed in accordance with Federal regulations. Audited statements are presented to the Board of Regents for their acceptance, prior to dissemination to pertinent state and federal agencies.

In general, fiscal strengths include a positive enrollment trend; considerable increases in state appropriations for operations and capital projects; the minimization of fee increases to students; and deliberative, inclusive, and effective budgeting processes which are linked to the University’s strategic plan. Identified fiscal concerns include maintaining competitive compensation packages for faculty and staff and the allocation of incremental resources between new or existing programs and support. In summary, the University considers itself to be fiscally very sound.

Enrollment Management

In 1993, the Assistant Vice President/Dean for Enrollment Development position was created. The purpose of the position was to coordinate the activities and personnel that affect the quality, diversity, and number of students enrolled at the University. The need for a focus on enrollment management was revealed in the 1990 NCA Self Study.
The Enrollment Development Task Force, composed of representatives campus-wide, began discussions in 1995 which focused upon enrollment goals for the Strategic Plan. These discussions led to the hiring of an Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management (AVPEM) on August 18, 1997. The AVPEM reported to the Vice President of Student Affairs who, in turn, served as a member of the Executive Staff. Units reporting to the AVPEM were as follows: Admissions, Pre-collegiate Programs (Talent Search/Upward Bound/National Youth Sports Program [NYSP] & Minority Recruitment), Registrar, New Student Programs, Testing Services, and Financial Aid.

Initially, the primary focus of the AVPEM was to analyze the recruitment function and make it as highly successful as possible. Undergraduate and Minority Recruitment Marketing plans were composed in the fall of 1997 and are updated/refined each year. The AVPEM began laying the foundation for Strategic Enrollment Management (SEM) at Southeast by virtue of a presentation to the Board of Regents in March 1998. Shortly thereafter, a campus-wide SEM Committee was formed and began the process of understanding what SEM is and how it could benefit the institution. In addition, this committee was exposed to detailed demographic research that led to a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) Analysis revealing areas needing attention. The goals outlined in Strategic Plan guided the recruitment activities and initiatives pursued.

Retention strategies were coordinated by the Vice President of Student Affairs, with the Dean of Students playing a key role in retention initiatives via units like the Campus Assistance Center and Office of Minority Programs.

In July of 1998 the University experienced a reorganization that eliminated the Student Affairs Division. The AVPEM, who now reported to the Executive Vice President for Finance and Administration became responsible for oversight and coordination of the following units: Admissions, Registrar, New Student Programs, Testing Services and the University Outreach Office in St. Louis. During this time, the AVPEM continued to aggressively pursue undergraduate recruitment enhancement while, at the same time, a half-time position was created to work on retention as a faculty associate in the Executive Vice President’s Office.

Fall 1998 enrollment was strong in targeted undergraduate areas. New beginning freshmen were up 12% and there was also an increase in minority students as well. In addition, spring 1999 enrollment of new beginning freshmen increased 23%. On April 1, 1999 a SEM Initiatives and Strategies document was prepared as the first outline for a comprehensive SEM plan.

In July 1999 with the appointment of Executive Vice President Ken Dobbins to the Presidency of Southeast Missouri State University, further restructuring led to
the creation of the position of Vice President for Administration and Enrollment Management. The AVPEM reports to the Vice President for Administration and Enrollment Management. In early August, the SEM Committee was further developed via the establishment of four subcommittees each of which pursues issues and concerns related to one of the following undergraduate areas: recruitment, retention, research and process/procedures. Graduate School issues are pursued by the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council.

The following table presents actual enrollment figures for targeted populations designated in Priority 2 of the Strategic Plan. Stretch Goal figures, when compared with actual annual enrollment numbers from 1995 through 1999, can be used to determine how close Southeast has come to meeting goals articulated in the strategic plan. It should be noted that the projected were to be accomplished in a five to ten year period as seen in the Strategic Plan. Fall 1999 echoed success similar to that experienced in the previous fall. Enrollment of new beginning freshmen was up 11% and there was an increase in the minority student cohort. This represented a two-year increase in first time beginning freshmen of 24%. In addition, residence halls were at full capacity and the University experienced its largest total enrollment since 1985, a time at which admission was “open”, not moderately selective.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freshmen</td>
<td>1,447</td>
<td>1,282</td>
<td>1,217</td>
<td>1,362</td>
<td>1,509</td>
<td>1,554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>1,343</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>1,122</td>
<td>1,237</td>
<td>1,378</td>
<td>1,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW STUDENT TOTAL</td>
<td>2,002</td>
<td>1,807</td>
<td>1,870</td>
<td>1,938</td>
<td>1,982</td>
<td>2,243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRAD. TOTAL</td>
<td>7,347</td>
<td>7,341</td>
<td>7,346</td>
<td>7,449</td>
<td>7,480</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE TOTAL</td>
<td>765</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>1,389</td>
<td>960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL ENROLLMENT</td>
<td>8,112</td>
<td>8,217</td>
<td>8,234</td>
<td>8,494</td>
<td>8,869</td>
<td>10,308</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Progress toward meeting enrollment goals is extremely positive, if not ahead of schedule. At the same time well-managed enrollment growth has been recognized, steady progress has been made toward attainment of Goal 9: Student Quality. Beginning freshman ACT average scores have gradually increased since 1995 averaging 22.5 in 1995 and 22.8 in 1999.
institutions make it increasingly difficult to attract high caliber students. The A+ school movement attracts some students first to community colleges indicating a need for the University to continue to work on enhancing its transfer recruitment. The southern portion of the service area know as the “boothel” presents special challenges due to extreme poverty, high drop-out rates in the high schools, and the lack of a culture which places value on college attendance among many of the citizens. While development of a complete strategic enrollment management plan is underway, the completion of that plan is necessary for full implementation of the University’s strategic plan. A part of that plan should address efforts to increase student retention, as retention rates have not improved markedly as a result of increased admission standards. In order for such a plan to be successful, the campus must first be involved in its development and accept it as both realistic and desirable.

These challenges will continue to be addressed by increasing access to higher education via centers, electronic delivery, and cooperation with community colleges into the foreseeable future. Most recently, an outside consultant completed a Strategic Management Enrollment Audit. As a result, a steering committee has been selected to pursue development of the next phase of a Strategic Management Enrollment plan.

**Facilities Management**

Facilities Management plays a crucial role in the guarantee that student, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors to the Southeast Missouri State University campus experience a physical environment that contributes to high quality living, teaching and learning. The department is responsible for all facilities planning and construction on campus as well as operations and maintenance of all University facilities and grounds. Employees in Facilities Management maintain 90 buildings amounting to 2,438,792 square feet of building space, 39 paved parking lots, 19 gravel parking lots, one combination paved and gravel lot, and 254 acres of main campus grounds. The 152 permanent department employees and at least 60 temporary and student employees support a full and part-time student population of approximately 8,200 as well as a full time faculty and staff of approximately 1,000.

The condition, availability and servicing of the physical resources is the direct responsibility of the Director of Facilities Management, who reports to the Vice-President for Administration and Enrollment Management.

The departmental mission of Facilities Management is to assure that occupants of experience a physical environment that is conducive to a high quality standard of living, teaching and learning and every recipient of our services experiences a personal response by department staff that exhibits high regard for their personal dignity and the value of their contribution to the University. The department is responsible for all facilities planning and construction on campus as well as
operations of all University facilities and grounds. Unit goals include development of a student first maintenance program; expansion of the student learning experience through internships and student employment; and combining technical training sessions with local industry through interaction with the Small business Development Center. Continuous improvement is addressed through use of the Quality Improvement Process (QuIP). Since the last accreditation visitation of 1990, numerous initiatives have been successfully pursued which have strengthened these resources and thus have helped to enable the university’s accomplishment in the task to provide a productive student-learning environment and in the ability to increase its future effectiveness. In the 1990 review, the need for campus signage and space for the Harrison college of Business were specifically discussed. Both of these items have been addressed. Over the decade since 1990, approximately 81 million dollars in major projects have been completed. The most recent projects include an addition to the student recreation center, construction of the Sikeston Higher Education center, and the opening of the Kennett Higher Education center. A list of 1990-1999 major projects can be found in the exhibits. As the next decade begins, the construction of the Seabaugh Polytechnic Building and the planning of the River Campus will challenge the Department of Facilities Management.

In the fall 1995, Mackey Mitchell Zahner Associates, in association with JBM Engineers and Planners and Paulien and Associates, were retained to develop a Campus Master Plan for Southeast Missouri State University. The design team worked closely with the Strategic Planning Committee and the Master Plan Committee in developing the Master Plan Document.

The Campus Master Plan (see exhibits) is a direct result of the University strategic plan priorities. Its purpose is to address issues brought forth by the University Strategic Plan. The task for Facilities Management was to develop a Master Plan to address planning through a coordinated and structured process of the construction and renovation of facilities.

The Master Plan Committee developed 10 Master Plan Goals based on the Strategic Plan Priorities.
- Create a Sense of Community on Campus
- Create a Student Oriented Campus
- Optimize Existing Space Utilization & Allocation
- Identify Space for New Programs and Technologies
- Improve Campus Transportation
- Access for Public and Students: Parking, Transit System, Safety
- Enhance Campus Image
- Provide First Rate Facilities
- Integrate Technology with Academic Planning through the Master Plan
- Identify Capital Budget Requests for the next five to ten years
The Committee identified 12 Focus Groups from the Southeast Missouri State University community. The Committee established an overall schedule and approved a process, which involved several stages. The input from the Focus Groups was summarized into a Campus Master Plan Issues Document. The Campus Master Plan is constantly being revised to adapt to the recent developments in Southeast Missouri State University’s campus extensions (River Campus) and the change in needs articulated by the campus community.

The initiative to facilitate continuous improvement and delivery of services to the University’s internal and external customers were introduced to the campus in December of 1994. Initially, four projects were identified as areas that could be improved through a Quality Improvement Process dubbed QuIP. To date, sixteen campus QuIP groups have been formed to address issues concerning processes and situations on the Southeast Missouri State University campus and with the surrounding communities. Included among these are QuIP groups that addressed issues such as classroom furnishing and remodeling, fleet management, and parking.

Contained within the exhibits are the results of the actions taken in order to fulfill the mission, goals, and objectives or Facilities Management. The driving force behind these actions is the commitment to the Southeast Missouri State University campus community, as well as its extended community.

In an ongoing effort to continuously improve service capabilities to the community and the Southeast Missouri State University campus, Facilities Management seeks to meet or exceed its mission to assure that occupants of university buildings experience a physical environment that is conducive to a high-quality standard of living, teaching and learning. The department looks forward to the opportunity to engage in these numerous projects and to improve service operation capabilities while accomplishing these challenges. The most recent challenge faced by Facilities Management is the opportunity to extend the Southeast Missouri State University campus. This extension, also known as the River Campus requires an active revision of the Campus Master Plan to dynamically adapt the university to this changing environment, and redirect efforts to maximize the advantage of the additional resource. The River Campus will allow the alteration of the projected space utilization plan and change the five to ten year focus for the Southeast Missouri State University campus.

Remaining challenges include the construction and utilization of the new Facilities Management building and the installation of new and streamlined Feedback Procedures. A constantly changing environment is a way of life in higher education. In order to increase the capability to respond to the present and future needs of students, faculty, staff, alumni and visitors the unit needs to expand and enhance internal and external feedback activities so as to be able to measure the responses from service recipients. Current plans are to utilize a comprehensive survey tool.
Student Services Overview

Southeast Missouri State University provides a variety of student support services, which support the academic mission of the institution by facilitating intellectual and personal development, both in and out of the classroom. In 1998, the division of Student Affairs was eliminated. Departments that were previously part of Student Affairs were integrated into Academic Affairs and the division of Finance and Administration. Specifically, the offices reporting to the Dean of Students became part of Academic Affairs while enrollment offices and auxiliaries became part of Finance and Administration. During another reorganization in 1999, the division of Administration and Enrollment Management was created which encompassed the areas of enrollment and auxiliaries with the exception of Financial Aid Services.

Offices under the supervision of the Associate Provost and Dean of Students include Career Services, the Center for Health and Counseling, Judicial Affairs, the Learning Enrichment Center which includes tutoring and disabled student services, Minority Student Programs, Student Life Studies and Commuter Student Services, Student Support Services, Substance Abuse Prevention and Education and Project Upward Bound. Offices reporting to the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management are Admissions, New Student Programs, Testing Services, and the Registrar. The University Center, Residence Life, Dining Services, and Recreational Sports report to the Director of Student Auxiliary Services.

As part of the University’s efforts related to continuous improvement and strategic planning, assessment plans were recently approved for the areas of Student Development and Enrollment Management. Although departments within these areas have always conducted individual program evaluations, these newly developed plans will put their outcome data more in line with that of the overall priorities of the institution in terms of student outcomes.

Student Development

The area of Student Development is an academic unit that promotes the holistic education of students and provides leadership in making the University a truly student-centered institution. The departments within the unit provide direct intervention with students as well as consultation with faculty and staff colleagues that promote the intellectual, ethical/moral, social, and career development of students. Specifically, offices help students acquire the skills necessary to act responsibly and persist in their educational pursuits on campus, ultimately becoming productive members of the University community and the larger, ever-changing global society. This is accomplished by providing personal counseling and health services; career counseling and development; academic success skills training and tutoring; accommodations for disabled students; advocacy for general student concerns; and, programs such as mentoring that integrate student
populations historically underrepresented in higher education into the community of scholars at Southeast. In addition, we have a pre-collegiate federal grant program that prepares high school students from the region for success in higher education.

**Associate Provost /Dean of Students**

The Associate Provost and Dean of Students reports to the Provost and is the primary advocate for students on campus. The Dean works collaboratively with faculty, staff and other administrators to enhance student learning and personal development. The Dean also ensures that students understand their responsibilities and rights as members of the academic community. The Dean is responsible for coordinating the University's response to psychological and behavioral crises occurring in the student population. In addition, the Dean is responsible for the development, supervision and evaluation of units assigned to the area of Student Development. Furthermore, the Dean is a faculty member in the College of Education and a member of the Council of Deans. Some of the responsibilities of the position include responding to student, parent, and faculty concerns. The Dean also meets regularly with groups of faculty and students to keep abreast of their interests and routine issues they face on campus and serves on a variety of University and city committees.

**Library and Learning Resources**

Kent Library, like other academic libraries, is undergoing significant changes in order to re-engineer its staff, operations, services, collections, building, and use of resources to accommodate technological advances that have revolutionized the way information is organized and accessed.

Southeast Missouri State University has a procedure for continuous improvement of its programs that requires that all such programs that are not subject to periodic systematic review by accrediting agencies must undergo review every five years. In the fall of 1996, the Provost initiated planning for such a review for Kent Library. As a result, both an internal review and an external review were undertaken and the resulting reports (see exhibits) have been the catalyst for changes that are now occurring in Kent Library. The release of the external and internal review reports and the concurrent retirement of the Library Director was followed by the appointment of a new administrator. The position of Director was elevated to that of Dean of Academic Information Services and Director of Kent Library.

A broadly representative Library Master Plan Committee chaired by the Dean of Academic Information Services was appointed in the fall of 1998. The University contracted with Hidell Associates Architects who worked with library consultant Florence Mason to develop an overall plan for the renovation of Kent Library. At the root of the space utilization study were concerns about whether or not the
space allocated to library operations within the Kent Library building was adequate. An examination of space utilization also required a study of collections, services, technological developments, staffing and the inter-relationship between these elements. Utilizing a series of focus groups, the library consultant elicited the information necessary to begin the planning process. The report *Kent Library Space Utilization Study* (see exhibits) was issued in May of 1999 and presented to the Board of Regents. This master plan for Kent Library analyzes the physical plant, collections, and services and calls for a complete remodeling of all four floors of the existing building in six distinct phases. The projected cost for the complete project is over twelve million dollars. Since its development, the *Kent Library Space Utilization Study*, along with the internal and external reviews, have facilitated planning and the establishment of priorities which are reflected in the *Kent Library Strategic Plan: 1999-2005*. (See exhibits.)

While the collections in Kent Library have adequately supported the various department accreditation reviews that have been conducted, the book collection was heavily criticized in the internal and external reviews, by the focus groups utilized in the space utilization study, and in several articles in the student newspaper for being old with inadequate amounts of recent publications. During the 60's and 70's academic libraries enjoyed generous acquisitions budgets. Kent Library includes a noticeable number of volumes with copyright dates from this period. Until now, weeding of the collection has not been a high priority so almost everything which has been added since the library's inception was still here. An examination of table 1 reveals yet another factor which contributed to this situation.

**Table 3-1. Annual Allocations For Books And Periodicals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fiscal Year</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Change From Previous Year</th>
<th>Periodicals</th>
<th>Change From Previous Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>$265,867</td>
<td>+1.0%</td>
<td>$415,350</td>
<td>+8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>$268,746</td>
<td>+0.5%</td>
<td>$450,350</td>
<td>+4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>$270,246</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>$472,350</td>
<td>+10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>$266,197</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$522,900</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$266,197</td>
<td>+10.7%</td>
<td>$522,900</td>
<td>+10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>$260,815</td>
<td>+0.5%</td>
<td>$576,152</td>
<td>+10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>$256,815</td>
<td>-1.5%</td>
<td>$625,357</td>
<td>+8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>$256,815</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$718,237</td>
<td>+14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$288,945</td>
<td>+12.5%</td>
<td>$797,284</td>
<td>+11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>$313,945</td>
<td>+8.6%</td>
<td>$871,203</td>
<td>+9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the funds budgeted for the acquisition of periodicals (including electronic databases) more than doubled, funds allocated for purchase of books remained relatively flat until the last two years when increases were made in order to begin book approval plans. This lack of growth in the book budget was somewhat countered by the establishment of an endowment fund of over one million dollars which annually generates funds for the supplemental purchase of $50,000 of materials over and above that provided by the annual book allocation. In the
spring of each year, faculty are given an opportunity to submit requests for funds for purchase of materials through the endowment.

The library will have the approval plans for all departments in place in the spring of 2000. At that point the library will be receiving new materials appropriate to the profile for each department on an annual basis. A major weeding project was begun in fall of 1999 to identify and withdraw outdated materials. It is anticipated that this project will be completed in the spring semester of 2001.

Some of the increase in funding for periodicals in the past ten years has gone toward combating inflation and some toward acquiring databases, many of which are full-text. Yet there have not been funds routinely made available for new subscriptions (or monographs) for newly established courses and programs. For some time, departments wanting to add periodical titles have had to identify titles within their discipline to drop in order to pay for the additions. The most likely solution to this dilemma is to conduct an overlap study to identify which journal titles are made available in multiple formats, most especially print and full-text online. Working closely with the faculty, the library may be able to drop some paper subscriptions to free up funds that could be reallocated to acquire subscriptions for new and growing programs. While such a project has not yet been initiated, the groundwork for it is now being laid.

Kent Library has long housed an archive and some special collections including the Brodsky-Faulkner Collection and the Harrison Collection. Reporting lines for these collections were somewhat unclear until the fall of 1998 when the Provost placed the collections under the administration of Kent Library. While some of the operational and support issues remain to be resolved, considerable progress has been made. A priority matter is creating electronic records according to national standards to enable local, state, national, and international scholars to identify the existence and location of these materials. Until this is done, the world-class Brodsky-Faulkner Collection cannot achieve its potential for bringing recognition to the university and providing suitable access to scholars everywhere. In October of 1999 a consultant was brought in to advise the university administration on these matters. The report makes recommendations to address these issues particularly in regard to the Brodsky-Faulkner Collection. (See exhibits.) Merging archives and special collections into a single unit is a strategic opportunity for Kent Library. A position for a special collections and archives librarian has been added and a search is being conducted to fill that position.

Kent Library is open for service over 95 hours each week. The catalog and online databases, many of which are full-text, are available through the library’s web page. The Internet is accessible from public terminals in the library and reference librarians provide assistance in its use. Interlibrary loan requests and reference questions may be submitted online. The university has established a courier system to link the main campus with its activities in Sikeston, Poplar Bluff and Malden, which is the site of the library’s storage facility. The courier system
operates five days each week delivering and returning library and other materials
to support both local and distance education programs of the university. Kent
Library continues its tradition of supplying services to local patrons.

Southeast Missouri State University is a member of a statewide consortium of 49
institutions of higher education called MOBIUS which will link academic
libraries in the state through implementation of an integrated online system from
Innovative Interfaces to establish a common library platform. (See exhibits
Missouri Academic Libraries and Their Automated Futures and Memorandum of
Understanding.) The system will be run on servers located at the University of
Missouri-Columbia. Institutions are divided into clusters based on geographic
proximity and each cluster will share a common server. Statewide
implementation of the system should be completed in three years with Kent
Library’s implementation scheduled for July – December of 2001. Southeast will
share a server for the Southeast Cluster with Three Rivers Community College
and Mineral Area College. These developments have precipitated what have
become regular meetings of library directors of these institutions. Such meetings
have provided opportunities to discuss support of programs shared by our
institutions that are designed to broaden educational opportunities for our service
region.

As a result of the common library platform, access to the collections of all
participating libraries will be expanded throughout the state. A library user will
not only be able to easily check the holdings of the local catalog, but can just as
easily check the holdings of the state-wide MOBIUS catalog and electronically
submit a direct request to borrow a book from any of the 49 member libraries
throughout the state of Missouri. In October of 1999 MOBIUS contracted with
Lanter to provide courier services which link the libraries, thereby providing an
efficient delivery system to support the electronic lending/borrowing capabilities
that are being put in place.

Other notable consortially-based activities which have greatly benefited Kent
Library are the state-wide purchase of databases by MOREnet and the opportunity
for participation in group purchases of databases through MLNC.

In addition to collections, adequate staffing to provide services is vital to making
sure students can and do use the information resources which are so critical to
their education. Besides traditional services such as circulation, reference, and
interlibrary loan, the librarians at Kent Library have long been participants in
teaching at least one session of each section of the required beginning University
Studies course. To date, this activity has been the backbone of the bibliographic
instruction program. With the pervasive impact of technology on the access to
information, the role of the library in the development of students’ information
literacy is more important that ever before. With further development, the
library’s instruction program has the potential to contribute to the university’s
retention efforts by increasing opportunities for teaching students to find the
information they need and thereby increasing their chances for academic success.
Several changes in staffing and services have been made. At the end of the spring semester of 1999, the library staff was reorganized from the large units of Public Services and Technical Services with a coordinator in each unit into four departments with department heads. (See exhibits.) The new organization provided for a more structured approach to planning, operations, and accountability. Library hours were extended. Reference was scheduled to have double coverage during most evenings and peak daytime hours. A Bibliographic Instruction Coordinator was named. An electronic classroom for bibliographic instruction is being added. The Instructional Materials Center extended its hours of service. Fourteen public PCs were added in the reference area and Internet access was made available to library users. Additional emphasis is being placed on staff development at all levels. All positions that become vacant are re-evaluated in the context of the strategic plan and are reassigned within the Library when appropriate.

While much development is occurring in Kent Library, there is one challenge that seems to periodically emerge and fade, only to re-emerge again. There is a continuing need to increase resource support for the revitalization of Kent Library, part of which requires working on basic infrastructure that is inadequately developed compared to academic libraries at similar institutions. Much time and effort is going and will continue to go into “catch up” activities such as weeding, establishing approval plans, analyzing the impact of using Dewey classification and deciding what if anything should be done about it, instituting a strong professional development program across all levels of staffing, cataloging the large and currently inaccessible special collections, and converting to use of an online serials record. In order to accomplish these very basic goals, increases in staffing and budgets will have to occur not just for two or three years, but rather over a sustained period of time. Realistically there will be stiff competition for such resources across the entire university.

There is considerable evidence that the planning, prioritizing and implementation aspects of continuous improvement are being practiced in Kent Library. What is needed next is to further develop the evaluation piece of the cycle. Currently there are inadequate measures in place to document that the collections and services provided by Kent Library have an identifiable positive impact on student learning at this institution. This is an important challenge that will require attention in the next accreditation cycle.

Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning

The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CSTL) is located administratively in the School of University Studies and is charged with promoting excellence in teaching, supporting effective teaching, and assisting faculty with pedagogic research and the use of instructional technology for the purpose of enhancing teaching. Specifically, the staff of the CSTL are expected to nurture faculty efforts to improve teaching and learning, cultivate faculty
interest in seeking funds for projects designed to improve teaching and learning, support student evaluations of teaching effectiveness, and provide workshops to support the improvement of college teaching. A number of services are available to faculty and graduate assistants through the Center to improve teaching effectiveness and promote student learning. These include individual consultations, classroom observations, teaching enhancement workshops, assistance in interpreting student ratings, collaborative research publications, and a faculty computer lab with multimedia capabilities.

In support of the move of the University to embrace the Teacher-Scholar model, the Center was renamed the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CSTL) in 1994. The Center is staffed by the Director, an Instructional Web Manager, and an Instructional Design Specialist in addition to a half-time Technical Support Specialist and 12-15 Student Technical Associates.

The center is designed as an open faculty development center with material and human resources available to faculty. The center is located in Kent Library where it is accessible to faculty during normal University business hours. Resources in CSTL are available to faculty on a walk-in basis or by appointment. The center carries out many of its functions through organized activities, including the Teaching Enhancement Workshop, Graduate Assistant Teaching Enhancement course and Teaching Serving Learning workshops (see exhibits).

In 1990, CSTL had an operating budget of $47,500. Currently, with a personnel line containing the salary for the Instructional Web Manager, the FY 2000 budget is a little over $240,000 (see exhibits).

The increased budget line reflects the increased role CSTL has on campus as well as the increased scope of the center's activities in relation to teaching/learning issues at Southeast Missouri State. Roughly one-half of the budget goes to the Instructional Technology related activities in the center, which reflects the importance placed on integrating instructional technology into the teaching/learning practices at Southeast Missouri State.

The Office of Instructional Technology (OIT) was established in the center in 1997. The operations of the OIT comprise the single largest function of the CSTL. OIT is overseen by the Director of the center. In addition, a group of faculty advisors representing the colleges advise the OIT on its operation. This group, referred to as the Technology Associates aids in the planning of the TSL institutes, advises on major hardware and software purchases, and aids the center in formulating a vision and direction for OIT. The office also houses three instructional technology servers that house the vast majority of instructionally-related web sites at Southeast Missouri State. The server provides listserv capabilities and online testing, conferencing and gradebook software as well as standard web serving tools.
The OIT provides a variety of services. Technology Serving Learning Institutes were first offered in the summer of 1997. They were well received and have been in high demand ever since. In the fall of 1999, Southeast Missouri State University began offering a small number of web-based distance learning courses through the school of Extended Learning. All faculty wanting to develop web-based or web-supported course materials or other instructionally technology related materials can do so in the center under the guidance of the Instructional Web Manager, Instructional Design Specialist and Student Technology Consultants.

The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning provides services to the University and faculty designed to enhance instructional effectiveness. Among these is the Teaching Enhancement Workshop conducted for new faculty every year that is based on a model emulated by many Colleges and Universities nationwide. This highly successful activity is well received by the incoming faculty with benefits both immediate and long range. The inter-departmental and inter-college connections faculty make in these workshops remain intact for years after the workshop is completed. Every year the workshop curriculum is reviewed and adjusted as needed to meet the changes in faculty and the University.

Teaching Serving Learning workshops have been a part of CSTL since its inception in 1985 (note that this specific name was coined only in recent years). Since 1990, over 1350 faculty have attended over 80 workshops related to teaching/learning issues at Southeast Missouri State. The topics have ranged from teaching techniques to student ratings to professional development to the teacher-scholar model. Faculty evaluations of the workshops have always been very good and faculty continue to sign up for the workshops. In a typical semester, over 10% of the faculty on campus attend at least one Teaching Serving Learning workshop conducted by CSTL. These workshops are an important mechanism for addressing the variety of teaching/learning issues on campus and are an important component of increasing the excellence of teaching at Southeast Missouri State.

One of the functions of the center from the outset has been to serve as a knowledge base for assessment techniques. CSTL works with faculty to develop or apply appropriate techniques to assess learning at Southeast Missouri State. One of the key components of this has been the application of a nationally normalized student rating of instruction instrument. Southeast Missouri State evaluated three nationally recognized instruments and in 1998 settled on one to be used in the spring semester of odd years (spring 1999 was the last campus-wide implementation). The IDEA student rating instrument is used in every section of every course on campus in those semesters. CSTL has been responsible for the administration of these instruments and currently has a budget for conducting the IDEA evaluations in the required semester as well as off semesters in which faculty can still choose to use IDEA as a student rating of instruction instrument. CSTL administers, and processes the IDEA rating system. Reports are distributed
to faculty and administrators by CSTL. The center keeps copies of all reports and assists faculty in interpreting the reports if necessary.

With the University offering on-line web-based courses it has recently become necessary to develop on-line rating of instruction instruments. The center has developed a system for use in on-line courses offered at Southeast Missouri State. The center is also currently working with the IDEA center to develop and pilot an on-line version of the IDEA system to be used by the IDEA center to evaluate on-line courses nation-wide.

The CSTL maintains an open-door policy and encourages faculty to walk in and utilize the resources in the center when needed. The center has not maintained consistent records on faculty use of the center by walk-in, appointment, phone or web page. However, sign-in sheets, phone records, and web page hits indicate that the center is utilized quite a lot with faculty coming into the center, phoning the center, or using the web page on a daily basis. If all of these methods of access are totaled up, the resources in the center are probably utilized by 50-100 different faculty per semester; a range of roughly 10-25% of the full-time and term faculty at Southeast Missouri State.

The Office of Instructional Technology was established in the center in 1997 to meet the increasing need for development and support of instructional technology-related tools at Southeast Missouri State. A well-equipped computer lab is available for faculty use. In addition, a variety of electronic equipment is available for checkout. These resources are well utilized by faculty and are a popular aspect of the center’s services. The center has offered instructional technology based workshops through the Teaching Serving Learning Institute series (See exhibits). The Institutes, hardware, software, and other instructional technology related resources, are funded by the Southeast Educational Network through Mission Enhancement Funding.

As demonstrated by the materials found in the exhibits, the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning is an integral part of the quality of teaching and learning at the university. The Center continues to strive for and support excellence in teaching and learning and to support and embrace the teacher-scholar model at Southeast Missouri State University.

**The Writing Center**

Located adjacent to the Computer Lab in Kent Library, the Writing Center has a staff of eleven, including six graduate-student teaching assistants from the Department of English, three Writing Associates, the Director, and a full-time secretary. The Center is open from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m., Monday through Thursday, and 9:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. on Friday. Staff confer with individual students on a walk-in basis and by weekly appointment. Students from all classes and all colleges of the University visit the Center; a small percentage of graduate
students and faculty utilize the service as well. The majority of students visit the Center on their own initiative, some are referred by their instructor, and others are required to visit the Center at some stage in the completion of a particular writing assignment. In addition to assisting students with their writing for courses, the permanent staff help students prepare for the junior-level writing proficiency exam or assist them in pursuing other options for satisfying the graduation requirement (e.g., the portfolio). Since the fall of 1997, the Writing Center has offered students the convenience of submitting questions and drafts for review via the Online Writing Center.

Statistics suggest that the Center is effectively meeting student writers' needs. The Writing Center consistently promotes writing across the curriculum. (See exhibits). A Funding for Results grant allowed the Writing Center to purchase eight Pentium-equipped PCs and the requisite LAN drops to establish the Online Writing Center. (See "Responding to Students' Drafts in the Writing Center via E-Mail" from Proceedings of the Midwest Writing Centers Association, 1998 & 1997.) The Writing Center has provided valuable experiential learning for the six teaching assistants on staff.

The Writing Center is tentatively scheduled for external review in 2002-03. In the meantime, student evaluation of tutors' performance has been obtained through informal surveys and interviews. In 1994, fifty students who had received assistance in the Center were randomly selected for interview by a graduate-student intern who was not a member of the Center staff. The results of the interviews were positive on the whole, with students voicing the perennial complaint that more tutors should be hired and/or additional hours added to the schedule. (See Questionnaire on the Writing). The Director has requested that Institutional Research provide data regarding the retention rate of students who have utilized Writing Center services as compared with the rate of students who have not, as evidence of the Center's impact. The Writing Center has managed to meet the steadily increasing demand over the past four years without additional staff. If the numbers continue to rise, however, current staffing will be inadequate. At stake is the very nature of the Writing Center itself as a service open to all, providing individualized, one-to-one instruction. Although a number of faculty actively support the mission of the Writing Center, requiring their students to bring a draft for review or inviting members of the staff to visit their classes, there is still much to be done in reminding the faculty in various disciplines about the role of writing as a way of learning and about the function of the Writing Center as a service whose goal is to produce better writers.

The Writing Center is faced with several challenges. Namely:

- Meeting the demands of increased utilization while remaining true to the best principles of writing center pedagogy
- Addressing the needs of Southeast PM students and others who are not able to visit the Writing Center during its current hours
- Effectively attending to the additional obligations of promoting writing across the curriculum and maintaining the Writing Center homepage and the Online Writing Center
- Assuring that the graduate-student tutors are motivated and well trained for the job

**Funding for Results**

The State of Missouri supports a campus-level Funding for Results program through a line-item allocation based on the institution having in place a mechanism by which funding is made available for innovation leading to improvements in teaching and learning. Southeast's approach merges Funding for Results (FFR) with strategic planning. The FFR program provides a mechanism to fund those strategic initiatives having to do with enhancements in teaching and learning. In the last few years four themes have emerged: to use technology to enhance active learning; to provide experiential learning opportunities; to improve students' communications and critical thinking skills; and to promote student success. A portion of the funds is set aside to promote student professional development. Proposals are requested from faculty and professional/administrative staff in a standard grant proposal format. Proposals must include the expected goals/outcomes of the project, a plan of activities designed to achieve the goals, a plan of evaluation and a timeline. Grant recipients must file a final report. Awards are managed as grant accounts (see exhibits for sample documents).

The standing FFR team, which evaluates all proposals, awards funds and continues to refine the approach, is composed of one student, one department chairperson, one representative each from each of the five academic colleges, the School of Polytechnic Studies, the administrative/professional staff, the library, the clerical/technical staff, and the Professional Staff and two at-large faculty members. Ex-officio members are the Provost, the Associate Provost, the Dean of Students, the Dean of University Studies and the Dean of the Graduate School.

In the first years of the program, the emphasis was on providing an opportunity for faculty and staff to develop innovative projects and implement them on a limited scale. Proposals were reviewed and scored according the following criteria: Is the proposal clearly stated and innovative? Is the proposal directly aimed at improvements in teaching and learning? Is the project related to the unit's strategic plan/priorities? Are expected outcomes clearly defined and are they assessable? Are baseline data available/accessible? Does the project demonstrate potential for achieving expected outcomes? What is the likelihood that the project will lead to enhanced learning? Is the budget reasonable and well justified?
Table 3-2. FFR Funding History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Submitted</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funded</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount</td>
<td>$72,223</td>
<td>$126,929</td>
<td>$152,638</td>
<td>$223,551</td>
<td>$208,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>$600-$10,000</td>
<td>$800-$19,175</td>
<td>$495-$21,268</td>
<td>$2,278-$28,756</td>
<td>$8,000-$52,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$6,566</td>
<td>$7,933</td>
<td>$10,176</td>
<td>$13,150</td>
<td>$13,875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As the program matured and the funding increased, issues arose that instigated a revision of the FFR format. While it was important to retain support for innovative projects, mechanisms were needed to: fund University-wide initiatives to enhance teaching and learning; move successful projects that merited continuation to other funding sources; move successful projects to a wider audience when appropriate; increase the assessment of the outcomes of each project; provide an opportunity to bring techniques that had proven successful in another institution to Southeast; and provide a reward for faculty preparing successful proposals. In response the FFR team developed the following modifications to the program:

- **Demonstration Grants** provide faculty and staff with the opportunity to try new ideas for which no significant background or information exists to predict the likelihood of success. Demonstration grant proposals may also be pilot projects. Demonstration projects will be funded for one year at a maximum of $10,000.

- **Implementation Grants** provide long-term support to projects that are based on preliminary evidence that the project will succeed. This evidence may come from the following sources: a previously successful FFR demonstration grant; published activities that have been demonstrated to have a positive impact on teaching and learning; and/or activities from other institutions that have been demonstrated to have a positive impact on teaching and learning. In addition, they seek to bring about institutionalization of various successful activities. To this end, the proposal’s sponsoring unit within the University must agree to provide some budgetary support for the project in its final two years. In addition, the proposal must present a plan for continuation of the project once FFR funding has ended. The proposals will typically be funded for up to three years at a level of $30,000 for the entire project. These grants are not renewable.

- **Core Continuing Grants** provide continuous funding for programs of demonstrated value to the entire University for five (5) or more years at up to $10,000/year.

- **University Initiative Funds** (up to 25% of the FFR Budget) support
University-wide initiatives related to enhancement of teaching and learning. The Provost has the responsibility for the distribution of these funds, but projects will be presented to the FFR committee to obtain input from the members.

Table 3-3. FFR Budget for FY2001²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$/project</th>
<th>projects/year</th>
<th>$/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Continuing</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Professional Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grantee Awards</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops/brochures etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committee Discretionary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Initiative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

² = Based on the Anticipated Level of Funding

Instructional Technology and Technology Supporting Teaching

The development of state-of-the-art technology is essential to Southeast's commitment to offer top quality professional and technical programs with a liberal arts core. In the revised strategic plan, technology will be incorporated as a goal under the mission priority. Optimal use of information technology for teaching and learning is the third of six institutional priorities set out in Southeast's 1996 strategic plan. It was stated as follows: "Enhance student learning by making optimal use of information technology and developing innovative applications of technology."

The Strategic Plan for Information Technology guides information technology planning at Southeast Missouri State University. Responsibility for institution-level planning and budgeting for information technology rests with the Information Technology Committee (ITC), including representatives from the colleges and schools, Kent Library, Extended Learning, Telecommunications, CSTL, Student Development, Administration and Enrollment Management, Institutional Research, Computer Services, Business Operations, Clerical and Technical Staff Council, Professional/Administrative Staff Council, Student Government, and the Provost's Office. It is advisory to the Provost and the Vice President for Finance. The first plan was approved in fall 1995. The plan consists of a background statement, a statement of relationship between IT development and institutional mission, a conceptual framework for IT development, and a plethora of goals and objectives. A final progress report on
completion of goals and objectives was approved by the ITC in December 1997 and reported to Administrative Council. In spring 1998, the ITC Steering Committee held open hearings for colleges, schools, and other units to gather information about current and anticipated information technology needs. A revised strategic plan was approved in spring 1999 (see exhibits for planning documents and detailed Information Technology report).

Information technology refers generally to any electronic technology used for the storage, delivery, and management of information in digital or analog form. This definition includes technologies such as desktop computers, network fileservers, telephones, fax machines, VCR's, projectors, satellite television, videocassettes, and interactive television. Operational responsibility for specific aspects of information technology is divided among various units:

- Computer Services: Mainframe operations, administrative applications, campus network, PC/LAN operations, Internet access, and open computer labs; training and support for community and productivity applications.

- Telecommunications: Installation and maintenance of phone lines, network drops, fiber optic runs, and cable. Cable television.

- Extended Learning: Oversight, planning, implementation and staffing of distance learning facilities; coordination and scheduling of satellite TV broadcasts.

- Kent Library: Planning, budgeting, and training for development and use of library technologies.

- Office of Instructional Technology (Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning): Operation of OIT instructional servers which house instructional web pages, including SEOnline, as well as course supporting pages; support for development of instructional applications; technical graphics support; faculty training in instructional technology. Faculty oversight of OIT operations is provided Faculty Technology Associates representing the colleges and schools.

- KRCU: Radio broadcasting.

- Department of Mass Communication: Satellite downlinks, and video production.

Planning for information technology is organized functionally under two major themes: community and productivity, and teaching and learning. The theme of campus community and productivity includes basic infrastructure and uses of information technology that are University-wide in scope and promote
community and productivity in the institution as a whole — for example, campus networking, human resource and student record systems, electronic communications, word-processing, database and spreadsheet software, e-mail, file transfer, calendaring, electronic conferencing, and the University web site. The theme of teaching and learning refers to infrastructure and uses of information technology that are targeted specifically at teaching, learning, and research — for example, instructional web sites, interactive television, disciplinary applications, such as statistical packages and geographical information systems, and pedagogical applications designed to support student learning.

Southeast's Information Technology planning philosophy consists of five general principles of planning, plus a set of basic questions that any plan for information technology should answer.

- **Planning Principles:**
  - To respond to rapid changes in technology, be extraordinarily flexible.
  - Link the planning process to the institution's mission and strategy, and design it to help achieve the institution's goals.
  - Keep the process ongoing and open-ended to facilitate quick adoption of new technologies.
  - Do not specify particular items or brands to purchase.
  - Be as specific as possible in listing reasons to adopt any new technology.

- **Planning Questions:**
  - How can information technology advance the institutional mission?
  - What is the conceptual framework for information technology planning?
  - Who is responsible for oversight, development, and maintenance of information technology?
  - How are information technology needs assessed and what are they?
  - What goals and objectives will guide the development of information technology?

Since the institution of the first plan in 1995, significant progress has been made on the goals for community and productivity. As illustrated in the following, the progress over five years has been remarkable.

**Results of Community and Productivity Planning**

- State-of-the-art operating systems and productivity applications.
- Reliable and convenient access, both on- and off-campus, to the University network and the Internet (faculty and staff PC's, open labs, dial-up service, residence hall access).
Table 3-4. Support for Access to the University Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Labs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence Hall Labs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Accounts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>7500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dial Up Lines</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>336(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet Connection (BITS/Sec)</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>10,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiber Optic Backbone</td>
<td>6 Buildings</td>
<td>Entire Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAN Drops</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty without a PC</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainframe CPU</td>
<td>40 MIPS</td>
<td>110 MIPS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) = 144 lines for on-campus access primarily in the residence halls and 192 off-campus lines

- Reliable and convenient administrative systems for human resource management, student records, payroll and other administrative functions.

- Use of the campus network, and particularly the web, to provide on and off campus access for students to information (such as academic records, accounts payable, and other personal information) and to facilitate processes such as registration.

- Use of the campus network, and particularly the web, to enhance public relations and support recruitment and retention. Moreover campus community is enhanced by the addition of the President's Web page that provides links to the President's interactive office.

- Training in the effective use of productivity software focused on enhancement of institutional processes.

Table 3-5. Computer Technology Training Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>N(^a)</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Microcomputer Overview</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Microsoft Excel(^b)</td>
<td>623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to MUSIC</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Lotus to Excel Conversion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Microcomputers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Create an Excel Gradebook</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windows(^b)</td>
<td>597</td>
<td>Microsoft Access(^b)</td>
<td>929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microcomputer &amp; Application So</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Microsoft PowerPoint(^b)</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to Scanners</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>E-Mail(^b)</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Directories, Backups, &amp; Viruses</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>Web Page Development(^b)</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virus Protection</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Internet(^b)</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File &amp; Hard Disk Management</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Novell(^b)</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microsoft Office Overview</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>SPSS(^b)</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What's New in Office 2K 67 Student Worker Payroll System 20
Microsoft Wordb 1200 Copy Center On-line Request 53
WordPerfect to Word Conversion 31 NET 3270 for Windows 18
WordPerfect 5.1 for DOS 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What's New in Office 2K</th>
<th>Microsoft Wordb</th>
<th>WordPerfect to Word Conversion</th>
<th>WordPerfect 5.1 for DOS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Number of participants  b = more than one level of training

- Adequate technical support for maintenance, trouble-shooting, and user-assistance. The number of technical support personnel has doubled since 1995.

- Quality delivery of data, voice, and video through cable, satellite, telephone service, and the campus network.

Since the institution of the first plan in 1995, significant progress has been made on the goals for teaching and learning. Other sections of the self-study such as the Office of Extended Learning and the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning contain additional details as to the enhancements that have benefited faculty and students in the teaching-learning process.

- Enhanced access to educational services in the region through effective use of ITV, cable TV, the web, videocassettes, video/voice/data technology generally [SEE-NET].

- Functional technology-enhanced classrooms supporting the effective delivery of instruction and other educational activities.

**Table 3-6. Information Technology Enriched Classrooms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty Labs/Classrooms (IBM)</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specialty Labs/Classrooms Macintosh</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technology Enhanced Classrooms</th>
<th>1995</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Pervasive and reflective use of instructional and discipline-specific applications to support student learning in University Studies and the major.

- The Office of Instructional Technology (OIT) was established in the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CSTL) in 1997. The Director of the center oversees OIT and a group of faculty advisors, Technology Associates, representing the colleges advise the OIT on its operation. The OIT provides a variety of services.
The OIT is also responsible for maintaining a variety of electronic equipment including lap top computers, portable projectors, video equipment, and digital cameras that faculty can check out.

A 10 station computer lab is open for faculty to use on a walk-in basis and includes Intranet/Internet-connected PC and Mac workstations, paper and 35 mm slide scanners, CD writeable drives, audio and video-dubbing equipment, and color inkjet and LaserJet printers. The workstations are equipped with a variety of instructional technology development software.

The office also houses three instructional technology servers that house the vast majority of instructionally-related web sites at Southeast Missouri State University. The servers are available to all faculty on campus. Faculty are given unlimited space (within reason) on the server for implementing instructional technology related tools. The server provides listserve capabilities and online testing, conferencing and grade book software as well as standard web serving tools. The web-based distance learning courses are housed on one of the OIT servers.

Support for faculty at all levels of expertise in the use and development of instructional applications.

Table 3-7. Technology Serving Learning Institutes and Workshops

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>CSTL Technology Associates Open House</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>An Introduction to Creating a Course Home Page</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating an Effective Presentation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating Home Pages with Navigator Gold</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using the World Web in Your Classes</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using Authorware to Create Course Learning Materials</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The High Tech Humanist: Adventures in Multimedia Teaching</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Teaching, Learning and Technology: Instructional Issues</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using PowerPoint to Enhance Your Classes</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>World Wide Web (8 day workshop)</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PowerPoint (8 day workshop)</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Authorware (8 day workshop)</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Digitizing Images for Classroom Presentations and the Web</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transferring PowerPoint Presentations to a Course Web Page</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating Interactive On-Line Forms for a Course Web Page</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles for Leading On-Line Discussion Groups</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using Netscape to Create Course Web Pages</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computer Fair</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Instructional Design Techniques for Classroom Presentations &amp; Course Web Pages</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Using FTP</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The numbers of faculty attending workshops provides but a piece of the success in incorporating instructional technology into the teaching-learning process. During the fall, 1999 semester alone, 60 faculty members consulted with either the CSTL Director or Instructional Design Specialist. The Web Manager reports over 1100 consultations with faculty and the student Technology Consultants report almost 2000 contacts with faculty. Two hundred and eighty faculty have active server accounts with over 350 courses supported by Web sites.

**Strengths:**

1. The development of Information Technology is guided by a continuously revised Strategic Plan for Information Technology.

2. Planning and budgeting are linked by a continually updated strategic planning process.

3. Planning and budgeting for Informational Technology is centralized to optimize the use of resources, foster integration, and avoid incompatible systems and duplication, but also decentralized to allow the units using the technology maximum reasonable flexibility.
4. Support for faculty involvement in employing instructional technology has generated activity by a large and diverse segment of the faculty including many senior faculty.

5. The focus on the needs of students has resulted in widespread use of technology to enhance learning and student support for fees to support computing resources for students.

6. Participation in MOBIUS, a consortium that links Missouri's academic libraries and which shares a common library platform to facilitate patron direct borrowing and use technology to increase access to state-wide library holdings.

Challenges:

1. As the campus community becomes accustomed to the use of information technology, the demand increases placing stress on budgets for training, hardware, software and faculty time.

2. The continuing changes in information technology require budget for training, hardware, and software.

3. With the conclusion of the Mission Enhancement program, funds for the information technology programs it funded, e.g. SEE-NET, must be found.

4. As faculty members continue to integrate technology into instruction, it is important that the focus remains on facilitating student learning and not be diverted to technology for technology's sake.

Opportunities For Improvement:

1. Participation in MOBIUS provides an opportunity to greatly enhance access to information.

2. Development of technology promises to increase access to higher education in the University's service area.

3. Development of technology promises to enhance learning experiences of students both in and out of the classroom.

Self Evaluation

Through the self-study, the University believes it has provided a sufficient pattern of evidence that it is appropriately governed and has organized its resources to gain maximum benefits. In the spirit of continuous improvement, the following Strengths, Challenges and Opportunities for Improvement were identified in the self-study process:
Strengths:

1. Through its committee structure and functions, faculty, staff, and students are provided the opportunity to impact the University’s decision-making processes.

2. The budget review process provides an opportunity for faculty, staff, and students to have a voice in these significant decisions.

3. The campus is well maintained and has been enhanced by recent expansions.

4. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning provides programs and assistance to faculty that is invaluable in promoting a high level of teaching effectiveness. The Office of Training and Development provides an effective means through which the skills of staff members are enhanced and extended.

5. The Funding for Results program provides the funding necessary to allow creative solutions to issues associated with teaching and learning.

6. Through planning and mission enhancement funding the development of instructional technology on the campus has been accelerated.

Challenges:

1. The adequacy of funding for faculty and staff development will need to be reviewed as travel costs continue to rise.

2. The development of strategies to increase minority and international enrollment will be a continuing need.

3. With the development of the River Campus, the ability of Facilities Management to continue its high level of service will be impacted.

4. Securing the resources to implement the recommendations of the Kent Library external reviews will be a continuing issue.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. The implementation of a state-wide system of sharing library collections will provide access for faculty and students to 14 million volumes.
2. The development of the River Campus has the potential to ameliorate space issues for several departments.

3. An enhanced focus on enrollment management should assist the University in meeting its enrollment goals.

4. Creation of a new position of Special Collections and Archives Librarian provides an opportunity to raise the profile of its world-class special collections.
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Criterion Three: Academic Services

Criterion three states that “the institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes.” Through this chapter and the two that follow, Southeast Missouri State University will validate that it meets and exceeds the expectations of criterion three.

Southeast Missouri State University, like other institutions of higher education offers educational programs and services which cross the boundaries of schools and colleges. Within this chapter, essential academic processes and organizational structures, which impact educational offerings across the institution, are discussed. The following discussion will clearly demonstrate that the University offers a program of general education that is clearly defined and coherent in its goals and structure. Furthermore, the assertion that the University is organized to support its mission by serving the greater community in its service region will be supported.

Academic Affairs Processes

The Division of Academic Affairs is under the direction of the Provost. The organizational chart found in the appendices details the units encompassed by the Division. This section of the self-study will address curriculum development and review and faculty roles and rewards.

Curriculum Review and Development

The number one priority in Southeast Missouri State University’s current Strategic Plan is to “Offer a top-quality curriculum.” One of the six goals associated with this priority is continuous curriculum improvement. The University’s commitment to this goal is strongly supported by the numerous curriculum improvements, which have taken place over the past ten years. Some of the major initiatives include: (a) the goal of integrating the objectives of the nationally recognized University Studies program into all academic majors; (b) the goal of integrating an experiential learning component into all academic programs; (c) the expectation that all academic programs are regularly and systematically subjected to internal and external review and assessment; and, the implementation of numerous new programs which are articulated in Chapter Five of the self-study. The University’s commitment to continuous curriculum improvement is also strongly supported by the expectation that all accreditable programs become accredited, and those having no accreditation framework develop processes for external reviews. Several new accreditations and reaccreditations have been completed while others are moving forward including AACSB accreditation of the undergraduate business program in 1996 (with accreditation of the graduate program expected in spring, 2001) and CACREP
accreditation in 1998. Reports of all new accreditations, reaccreditations, and external reviews since 1990 can be found in the exhibits.

All processes relevant to curriculum development and program review are systematic and maintain a high degree of rigor. Curriculum development originates at the department level and occasionally at the college level (e.g. the MBA program). All curriculum proposals must be subjected to a process of review and approval through various levels depending on the scope of the proposal. Course proposals must be reviewed and approved by the originating department and then by the corresponding College Council. Following these approvals, the proposal is disseminated to all academic colleges for reaction, and depending on the nature of the course to the Graduate Council or University Studies Council for approval. Proposals for new programs, in addition to the steps mentioned previously, must also be reviewed and approved by the Academic Council and Board of Regents. If the proposal is for a new major or option, the proposal must also be approved by the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education.

Faculty Roles and Rewards

The University believes that a critical requirement for developing and delivering a top-quality curriculum is to attract and retain a top-quality faculty. To this end, the University has adopted the “teacher-scholar” model for its faculty defined as follows:

The model of the teacher-scholar is that teaching is the faculty’s central activity, and scholarly work is viewed as not in competition with teaching, but as a significant means by which faculty develop as both teacher and scholar for the benefit of a broad community of learners. A faculty member’s participation in that community can take many forms, including the creation of new knowledge, application and dissemination of existing knowledge, the production and exhibition or performance of creative works, and pedagogical research and application. The University supports the teacher-scholar model through the activities of the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, which was described in Chapter Three and through its promotion, tenure and merit pay processes.

Promotion

The faculty promotion process is fairly decentralized, yet at the same time rigorous. It is decentralized in that each department is given the freedom to develop its own promotion criteria so that the department can best align the standards with its unique vision, mission and goals. At the same time, the departmental criteria must meet the University’s general promotion guidelines in the three areas of teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service. This is ensured by the review of all departmental criteria by a college committee, the college dean, the University Promotion Committee, and the Provost. The actual
promotion process requires approval of the application by a department committee, department chairperson, college committee, college dean, university committee, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Regents. A detailed description of the process can be found in the Faculty Handbook.

Tenure review is similarly decentralized. Each department utilizes its own criteria within the general guidelines of the University. Probationary faculty are systematically reviewed and advised as to their progress toward tenure, with a major review scheduled for the fourth year of service. The application for tenure is reviewed for approval by a department committee, department chairperson, college committee, college dean, the Provost, the President, and the Board of Regents. The full policy can be found in the Faculty Handbook.

**Merit Pay**

In 1994, the University implemented a Merit Pay process. Through this process faculty salary increases are awarded each year based on departmentally developed merit pay criteria. These criteria are designed to assess the faculty member’s performance in teaching effectiveness, professional growth, and service on an annual basis. All faculty, both tenured and probationary are evaluated. Since its implementation, the process has not been without controversy and has generated considerable debate among faculty and between faculty and administration. This has resulted in several revisions over the past six years with the latest sent forward from the Faculty Senate in the spring of 2000.

**Student Evaluation of Instruction**

The University has adopted a policy on student evaluation of instruction that requires that every course section be evaluated by students using a nationally normed instrument at least once every two years. Concurrently and in the interim, departments have the option of using departmentally approved instruments to assist them in continuous improvement of instruction. The Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning is responsible for managing the distribution and processing of the IDEA assessment tool. The selection of the specific instrument to be used was based on a three-year trial of various instruments with the IDEA being the preferred instrument of the faculty. The IDEA provides an analysis that compares results to similar courses at other institutions and provides information that faculty can use in improving their instruction.

The responsibility for development and review of policies related to Promotion, Tenure, Merit Pay, and Student Evaluation of Instruction rests with the Faculty Senate. Approval of such policies requires action by the Board of Regents.
School of University Studies

The School of University Studies is the administrative unit that is responsible for undergraduate academic programs and services that cut across all of the University's academic units. The general education program, University Studies; the First Year Experience program; the Interdisciplinary Studies major; the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning; the Honors Program; the Oral Communication Across the Curriculum Project; the Writing Center; the Writing Assessment Program; and the University Studies Academic Advising Center are the component operations within the School. Comments regarding the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, the Writing Center, and the University Studies Advising Center can be found elsewhere in this self-study report.

Through the University Studies program, Southeast Missouri State University meets General Institutional Requirement 16 and Criterion three. Coherence of the general education program is achieved through the focus of University Studies on nine intellectual skills objectives and curricular themes. All courses in the University Studies program must meet these objectives and serve these themes. Breadth of knowledge is achieved by the university's requirement that students complete courses in twelve lower division curricular categories. Students additionally are required to complete three upper division interdisciplinary courses designed to integrate knowledge from two or more disciplinary areas.

Criterion three is met through courses that require students to apply skills of information management, effective communication, and critical thinking as they practice valuing and integration of knowledge in the context of cultural, social, scientific, historical, and aesthetic issues and problems that are the content of University Studies courses. The intent of the program is that these learning experiences lead students to live responsible personal and public lives.

Through representative committees and the Faculty Senate, the university's faculty control the general education program and its curriculum. Course approval, assessment, and program review all are under the control of faculty committees. A faculty committee determines the allocation of funds for faculty development and teaching enhancement associated with University Studies as well.

The primary academic program that the School administers is University Studies, the institution's general education curriculum that all baccalaureate students are required to complete. Descriptions of the program, its centrality to the institution's mission and its requirements are included in the University Bulletin and in the University Studies Handbook. The program is publicized and explained to entering students and their parents during sessions of every First Step orientation. All entering students receive a copy of the University Studies Handbook. In addition, the handbook will be available online by the start of the
fall 2000 semester. The handbook begins with statements by the President of the University and the Dean of the School of University Studies regarding the importance of general and liberal education. The importance of the University Studies program is affirmed for faculty as well. Newly-hired faculty are introduced to the program and its purposes in a session of the Teaching Enhancement Workshop that all new faculty complete prior to their first fall semester on campus (see Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning materials).

The 48 credit-hour University Studies program is based on nine academic skills objectives and on curricular themes emphasizing interdisciplinary. A major strength of the program is that its design integrates coursework through objectives and themes that apply to all University Studies courses. All courses in the program must address these objectives and themes (see exhibits for the cover sheet of the Course Approval Document). The University Studies objectives represent Southeast Missouri State University’s concept of the intellectual skills that liberally educated persons hold in common and apply to the issues and problems citizens must resolve. The program’s interdisciplinary theme is an attempt to help students understand that examining and resolving the most significant issues and problems of the human life requires the integration of knowledge from various academic areas.

The curriculum consists of a first-year introductory seminar, 12 lower-division curricular categories of courses, and an upper-division interdisciplinary curriculum comprising 300-level courses and 400-level senior seminars. Students are required to complete the introductory seminar, one three-credit course in each lower-division curricular category, two 300-level interdisciplinary courses, and one 400-level interdisciplinary senior seminar (University Studies Handbook). The introductory seminar provides entering students with an introduction to the University Studies objectives and the concept of interdisciplinary. The lower-division curricular categories introduce students to broad disciplinary approaches to knowledge. The upper-division courses are designed to help students understand and practice the integration of knowledge from various disciplines. Throughout the curriculum students complete courses that must focus significantly on the first three University Studies objectives (information management, critical thinking, effective communication) and on other objectives as selected by the author of each course. In the upper division, interdisciplinary courses must significantly emphasize the first three objectives plus objective six (integration). The program, therefore, is designed to promote coherence of the curriculum and students’ learning experiences by requiring that the teaching strategies, assignments, and evaluation of students in all University Studies courses must address the University Studies objectives.

In 1990, the University Studies curriculum was still developing, particularly the program’s upper-division component. Over the last decade, the curriculum has matured and is now in place (Table 1). The most notable change is the significant
increase in interdisciplinary courses in the upper division curriculum. Although additional 400-level seminars would enhance the program, sufficient courses are available for students to complete the program without problems. The decrease in the number of sections of the First Year Seminar is attributable to fluctuations in the numbers of entering students, to improved enrollment management, and possibly to increases in the number of students entering with more than 24 credits completed.

Table 4-1. Change in number of University Studies courses and sections of First Year Seminar (FYS) from 1989-90 to 1999-2000.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Upper Division Interdisciplinary Courses</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Division Curricular Courses</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sections of First Year Seminar</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A new initiative for the University Studies program is the development of web-supported and web-based sections of courses. Through the efforts of the School’s Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning, many University Studies courses now have web pages that provide course information, instructor notes, study guides, instructional graphics, and asynchronous online discussion boards. Surveys of students in Southeast Missouri State University’s web-supported courses indicate very positive student reaction to the use of course web pages. The School is collaborating with the School of Extended Learning to deliver web-based University Studies courses and thus increase access to the general education program for individuals in the University’s service region. Within several semesters, the institution hopes to have a selected set of the University Studies courses online that will permit some students in the outlying service region to complete the general education program by means of the World Wide Web.

Administration of the University Studies Program

The Dean of the School, the Director of the Freshman Year Experience (FYE), the University Studies Curriculum Committee, and the University Studies Council are responsible for managing the University Studies program and curriculum. The Curriculum Committee is an appointed group of faculty from the council who represent the five academic colleges and the School of Polytechnic Studies. This committee is charged with rigorous evaluation of courses proposed for inclusion in the program (see exhibits for instructions for course proposals). Committee recommendations for addition or removal of courses from the curriculum are forwarded to the University Studies Council, which consists of faculty representatives from each academic college and the School of Polytechnic Studies. Once courses are approved by the Council, the School submits them to the provost’s office for 30-day review by the entire academic community. Faculty, therefore, control the content and quality of courses that compose the curriculum.
The Director of the FYE is responsible for maintaining and supporting high quality instruction in the introductory first year seminar (see GS101 Teaching Enhancement Workshop materials in the exhibits), managing the staffing of the course, and linking the course with appropriate co-curricular activities (see NCA Report-Freshman Year Experience, University Studies in the exhibits). The director recruits instructors for the courses from academic departments throughout the university (see GS101 Staffing Records in the exhibits), thus ensuring wide involvement of faculty in introducing students to University Studies and the value of liberal education. The director cooperates with New Student Programs regarding orientation of entering students and with Student Development regarding co-curricular Common Hour activities.

The dean is responsible for administrative management of the program's budget, program development, support of faculty development, ensuring effective assessment of the program, and advocacy of the program at the university level.

Program Review

In 1990, the School of University Studies had no internal procedures for continuing review of the program. The only review procedure that existed was the University’s regular program review process. The School of University Studies now has a continuing commitment to program review and improvement. During the last ten years, the review process has included the use of student evaluations of instruction, student surveys, and both internal and external reviews of the program’s components. Summary reports of aggregate student evaluation data from the IDEA system are produced to track teaching effectiveness and students’ perceptions of their progress on key learning objectives. A review of courses in the lower-division curricular categories was completed in 1991 to determine the degree to which program objectives were addressed in those courses (see exhibits, University Studies, Core Curriculum Category Review). The School distributed results of this review in a formal report. Evaluation of course portfolios for the first year seminar and upper-division courses has been conducted by the Student Outcomes Assessment Committee and results used to identify areas of strength and those in need of improvement.

During fall 1997 and spring 1998, the University Studies program was thoroughly reviewed by external and internal reviewers. Two teams of external evaluators were brought to campus to review the program. One team reviewed the whole program and its support system. A second team reviewed the first year seminar (see reports by Levy-Hinson team and Gardner-Barefoot team in exhibits). To complement the external review, an internal Review Task Force composed of faculty and students did a comprehensive review of the program as well (see Report of the Program Review of University Studies in exhibits). The external and internal reviewers’ work was excellent and resulted in recommendations.
regarding program structure, curriculum, course delivery and management, program review and assessment, and the first-year seminar. As of spring 2000, the School has responded by implementing approximately two-thirds of these recommendations. Others are in progress and will be implemented over the next several academic years.

In response to the recommendations from the review, the School has

- established an academic advising center for students who are undecided about a major,
- completely revised the first year seminar (UI100 First Year Seminar syllabus), focusing the course on interdisciplinary themes,
- strengthened the student outcomes assessment process,
- examined the Oral Expression category and discussed the role of foreign languages,
- implemented a moratorium on course proposals for the lower-division and 300-level curricula,
- reduced the number of program objectives that must be addressed by single courses and placed more focus on the first three foundation objectives,
- implemented a five-year sunset clause for all courses in the program,
- embarked on a study of double-dipping by academic majors,
- begun closer management of course enrollments,
- modified program objective number eight (demonstrate the ability to make informed, sensitive aesthetic responses).

Student Outcomes Assessment

Over the last decade, the School of University Studies has continued its effort to assess student outcomes related to the University Studies objectives. In 1994 the School added the administrative position of Director of Planning and Assessment to implement a more rigorous approach to assessment. The director has been responsible for administering assessment of the curriculum’s impact and accomplished this task with the assistance of a representative faculty Student Outcomes Assessment Committee charged with developing and implementing assessment activities for the University Studies program. During this time, an effective system of program assessment was put into operation and a plan for evaluating student outcomes was initiated. The process centered on evaluating course assignments, tests, and course content to determine whether the content matched approved course syllabi and met the liberal intent and desired academic rigor of the University Studies program. To assess the appropriateness of course content and academic rigor, much of this activity focused on examining graded student work included by instructors in course portfolios. The resulting evaluations of these portfolios were sent to instructors for the purpose of improving course effectiveness (see exhibits, University Studies Course Portfolio Assessment).
Assessment activities have been supported administratively with School of University Studies funds allocated for the assessment work and for faculty development related to assessment. Both new and continuing efforts to establish a cycle of assessment are supported with additional funds committed by the School and the Office of the Provost as well.

Assessment in University Studies focuses on the nine skills objectives, particularly the first three foundation objectives (information management, communication, critical thinking). Following the effort focused on the first three objectives, the School will initiate and support faculty efforts to develop means to assess objectives six (integration), seven (valuing), and nine (responsible living). The development of assessment tactics for objectives four, five and eight, which refer to broad disciplinary conversancy, will be taken up in future years.

The School has an effective assessment plan approved by the institutional Assessment Review Committee (University Studies Assessment Plan and Report). At this point, several components of this plan are well established, and others are at the beginning or mid-point of implementation. Current assessment activities include:

- a computer skills survey completed by all entering students,
- a three-stage writing assessment process consisting of placement, assessment at the end of the second composition course assessment (WP002), and a barrier exam (WP003) required of all students after they complete their 75th credit hour,
- the California Critical Thinking Skills Test completed by students when they enter the University and again when they are enrolled in 400-level interdisciplinary courses,
- a locally developed critical thinking rubric applied to large random samples of writing assessment essays produced by students in WP002 and WP003,
- an Oral Communication Across the Curriculum project,
- evaluation of student work in course portfolios submitted by instructors,
- a process that engages faculty teaching the 400-level interdisciplinary courses in defining rubrics and standards for University Studies objectives one, two, three and six and then applying these standards to student artifacts from University Studies courses,
- student self-reports of progress on learning objectives associated with the IDEA system of evaluating effectiveness of instruction in University Studies courses.

Data from each of these assessments are being used to improve the University Studies curriculum and instruction. Results from the California Critical Thinking Skills Test are being correlated with application of the locally developed critical thinking rubric to WP002 and WP003 essays with indications that the two
assessments are complementary ways to judge the thinking abilities of students. This use of multiple measures of student progress will be a continuing component of the assessment system. The Oral Communication Across the Curriculum project, supported with state-allocated Funding for Results funds, has established a rubric for speaking skills and is implementing a process for assessing these skills that is embedded within courses. This effort currently is focusing on assessing the speaking skills of students in the first-year seminar and selected 400-level interdisciplinary courses. The evaluation of course portfolios that include graded student work has been successful in providing information that is returned to instructors for course improvement (see School of University Studies, Course Review, Spring Semester, 1995 and Course Review Responses to Individual Instructors in exhibits).

During fall 1999, the student outcomes assessment functions were expanded and the new Associate Dean of University Studies worked with the School’s Director of Planning and Assessment, the Student Outcomes Committee, and the Office of the Provost to embark on assessing the first three University Studies objectives in the 400-level senior seminars. This activity is in progress and will culminate in the establishment of rubrics and assessment of student artifacts from these seminars. At the end of the fall 1999 semester, student papers from the senior seminars were collected and, during the winter interim, a faculty colloquium evaluated the papers to develop preliminary 400-level rubrics for the first three program objectives. This process will be repeated during the spring 2000 semester. Then, in summer 2000 instructors of the senior seminars will meet to establish final rubrics. These rubrics subsequently will be used to evaluate student work in the senior seminars and provide feedback for improvement of student learning experiences in these courses and those in the lower division curriculum.

Assessment information from the 400-level seminars will be used to drive a similar effort in the first-year seminar to establish academic expectations for the first three foundation objectives. Following this effort, comparison of the first-year seminar and senior seminar assessment results will be used to drive development of assessment in the lower-division categories of University Studies courses. The rationale for this approach to assessment is to first identify those skills that faculty expect in students who are exiting the program, to assess the status of students’ skills when they enter the University, and then to implement any changes in the lower-division curriculum that are necessary to prepare students for the upper-division courses.

The School is engaged in efforts to improve the means of informing faculty and students of these assessment tactics and to foster a faculty-driven process for ascertaining how assessment results are used to improve students’ learning experiences. These efforts will require several semesters to fully implement. At present, assessment data from WP003 and the Oral Communication Across the Curriculum project are given to students and faculty or departments. Beginning
in 1999, the aggregate critical thinking score data were distributed to deans. As of spring 2000, these data will be distributed to the rest of the academic division as well.

In addition to the assessment activities listed above, two other assessment instruments are being considered. The University is piloting the California Critical Dispositions Inventory as a tactic for measuring student attitudes that are fundamental for critical thinking. In addition, the School and the Provost’s office are considering use of the Defining Issues Test to assess students’ valuing skills.

Over the next few years, the School of University Studies faces several administrative, curricular, and programmatic challenges in continuing to improve the University Studies program:

- implementing the remaining recommendations of the external and internal reviews of the program.
- developing a more complementary relationship with the academic majors.
- integrating assessment of the University Studies objectives with all courses in the curriculum.
- fully implementing assessment of oral communication and investigating its relationship with assessment of written communication.
- implementing an effective system of informing faculty and students of assessment results and creating a faculty-owned means of using these results for improvement of teaching effectiveness and student learning.
- meeting the demands of a new state-level general education policy.

**Honors Program**

The Honors Program is supported by a one-half FTE director, Honors student volunteers, paid student workers, and a graduate assistant. The Honors Program serves students who enter the university with a high school GPA of at least 3.4 on a 4.0 scale and an ACT composite score of at least 25. To remain in the program students must maintain a GPA of 3.25 and complete Honors course credits at a prescribed rate (see Honors Program Summary in exhibits). The program serves these students through developmental advising, social activities, facilitation of an Honors Council, and recruitment of honors course sections. The program serves these students through developmental advising, social activities, facilitation of an Honors Council, and recruitment of Honors course sections.
The Honors Program at Southeast Missouri State affords its students a great deal of flexibility in determining how to best make use of the University's educational resources while fulfilling the requirements of the program. To complete the program Honors Students must accumulate 24 hours of Honors credit; 6 of those hours must be at the 300-level or above. Students select from a variety of Honors sections of courses in the University's nationally-recognized University Studies liberal education curriculum. In addition students can design their own projects to earn Honors credit by contract in non-Honors sections of courses. Finally, students must complete a Senior Honors Project, which can also be tailored to the individual interests and needs of each student. Given this freedom former Honors students have created such diverse projects as comparisons of American and Welsh educational practices based on a study abroad experience, musical and literary analyses based on a senior voice recital, preparation of a one-woman exhibition by an fine arts major and development of an elaborate program for educating junior high students about Shakespeare.

Service learning has been an integral part of the Honors Program for the past seven years. Freshman are encouraged to participate in modest service activities. Opportunities for much more extensive service involvement are available for all students in the program. All service activity is coordinated by the Learning in Volunteerism committee that is comprised entirely of Honors Students.

Since 1990 the number of students enrolled in the program has increased from 400 to approximately 700 (see Developments in the Honors Program 1990-1999 in exhibits). Since the 1989-1990 academic year, the number of students completing Honors contracts has increased fourfold (see Table 2). Fluctuation in the numbers of completed contracts is due to varying recruitment of high school students of honors caliber to cohorts of entering freshman. Since 1990 the number of students graduating as Honors Scholars has increased from one to approximately 24 per year.

Chart 1: Honors contracts completed by academic year.
In 1994, an internal task force composed of faculty and students reviewed the Honors Program. Their recommendations were submitted in a report submitted to the School of University Studies in January 1995 (*Honors Program-Report of the Honors Review Task Force*). The task force recommended changes for the following areas: admissions procedures and requirements, program structure, facilities, budget, administration and coordination, curriculum, program completion.

A successful addition to the program beginning in 1997 is a behavioral contract system with assertive advising for honors students whose academic performance jeopardizes their honors status and retention of scholarships. The Director of the Honors Program determines whether students whose academic performance has declined are eligible for the contract program. A graduate assistant supervised by the Director of Honors manages this intrusive advising system and counsels students who have signed behavioral contracts. This contract system has resulted in the retention of students who otherwise would have lost their scholarships (see *Honors Program-Behavioral Contracts* in exhibits).

Challenges that the Honors Program faces include increasing the number of students who complete honors contracts and graduate as Honors Scholars. To accomplish this will require recruiting more honors course sections and engaging more honors students in contracting for honors projects in regular course sections.
School of Graduate Studies

Graduate study at the University contributes directly to the mission of the institution by fulfilling the purpose of providing “multi-faced graduate education leading to the Master’s, Specialist, and collaborative Doctoral degrees in academic disciplines with resources of sufficient quality and quantity to support the needs of students.” For fall 1999, graduate education served the needs of 1,389 enrolled students, an increase from 888 in Fall 1997. The graduate faculty and students, through research, teaching, and service, work to both create and disseminate current and relevant knowledge in their respective academic disciplines. In order to accomplish this end, the School has set forth the following objectives for graduate studies:

1. To provide for intensive academic specialization in selected areas of interest.

2. To provide for breadth of understanding in selected fields of study.

3. To provide professional competencies in selected fields.

4. To provide opportunities for student research and acquaintance with current techniques and discoveries.

5. To require all graduate students to complete a culminating research experience.

The implementation of these objectives in response to the needs for graduate education is the responsibility of the School of Graduate Studies in collaboration with the academic units involved in graduate study. The School provides primary monitoring of policies and procedures affecting graduate admissions, advising, assistantships, retention, curricula, degrees, and faculty. The Dean of the School is responsible for providing overall leadership for graduate education. All policy matters affecting the graduate program and all proposals for new courses, new programs, and graduate faculty status are reviewed by the Graduate Council, which consists of an electoral body of faculty and graduate students. The Council also advises the Dean of The Graduate School concerning matters affecting the quality and development of the graduate program. The Council is chaired by the Dean of the School and has representatives from each College.

The School of Graduate Studies is administratively responsible for Sponsored Programs and International Programs in addition to the graduate school. The graduate programs are listed in the Graduate Bulletin.

Since the last NCA self study, a number of programmatic changes have occurred in response to regional needs including the addition of a middle level option in the major in Secondary Education, development of a Master’s degree in nursing,
establishment of a higher education option in the Guidance and Counseling program, and through cooperative agreements with the University of Missouri the offering of a Cooperative Doctoral program in Educational Leadership, as well as the Master’s in Social Work and Master’s in Industrial Management.

The Graduate School awards 125 graduate assistantships (including stipend and fee waivers). This total has increased via changes in allocation procedures, fee structure, and Mission Enhancement sources.

In addition to the above policy changes, the graduate assistant handbook has been revised and orientation for graduate assistants has been strengthened. Regarding graduate assistant orientation, at least three departments have full semester courses. Most other units do at least one day of orientation prior to the start of the fall term.

The graduate faculty of the University play an important role in fulfilling instructional responsibilities and providing leadership in the graduate program. They are expected to demonstrate high standards with respect to scholarly effort, research, and the practices associated with graduate study. In most cases, graduate and undergraduate faculty members are one and the same, with graduate faculty members assuming duties and responsibilities in both programs. Every five years, a review is completed to verify continuing status as a member of the graduate faculty (See Faculty Handbook).

Most graduate faculty members qualify for regular graduate faculty status. Regular graduate faculty members are expected to hold an earned doctorate or appropriate terminal degree; be full-time employees of the University and members of an instructional unit of their graduate appointment; and have a record of scholarship in the discipline of the appointment. Associate graduate faculty members meet the same requirements except that they have not completed the dissertation component of their doctoral program or have not completed all requirements in areas where the doctorate is not the terminal degree. Adjunct graduate faculty meet the requirements of regular graduate faculty status, but are not full-time employees of the University; they must be reappointed for each course they are employed to teach.

Data on the level of grant funding for the entire faculty and staff can be found in Chapter Ten. In addition to this data, there is further evidence of the growing significance of scholarly activity in graduate studies. Since 1990, a research fellowship has been sustained; released time for graduate faculty research has been allocated; a grant development fund has been sustained; and an excellence in research award for graduate students has been continued. In each of the aforementioned allocations, the level of awards has been increased since 1990.

The strength of the graduate program, in addition to the quality of instruction available throughout the program, is the existence of a clearly defined
organization for the development and maintenance of the program, strong leadership at all levels of the University, and improved financial support for graduate faculty and student scholarship.

Exit data gathered over the three-year period from 1995-1998 indicates that graduate students are very satisfied with the services offered them by the School and the University, and satisfied with the quality of their education. All exit data has been shared with the academic program units for their consideration in strengthening the various programs of study.

The self-study suggests that attention be afforded to several issues. First, to effectively continue serving the Bootheel region several additional degree programs are in progress to be developed/implemented (Social Work, Industrial Management and Criminal Justice). Second, as noted earlier, the recent increase in graduate student enrollments has placed a burden upon existing academic resources. For instance, the Division of Academic Affairs should consider approaches to continue to increase the number of needed graduate assistantships as well as faculty resources to meet the challenge of the expanded pressures of graduate education at Southeast. Third, given the recent increase of extramural funding and research activities, the university should consider additional mechanisms (e.g. faculty instructional loads/release time) to accommodate this growing aspect of graduate studies and research.

School of Extended Learning

The School of Extended Learning underwent reorganization during 1998. The School separated from the Graduate School and became an independent unit titled School of Extended Learning, headed by a dean, reporting through the Office of the Provost. The reorganization included the establishment of offices within the school and the realignment of various functions. This reorganization strengthened and emphasized the outreach mission of the university.

Since the 1990 NCA review, the School of Extended Learning has significantly expanded its offerings and responsibilities. In 1990, the School offered courses in multiple sites with faculty commuting from the campus to the sites. The Crisp Bootheel Education Center had just been opened in 1988 and consisted of support areas and eight classrooms. Over the last ten years the School has experienced:

- expansion of Continuing Education, Southeast PM and Advanced Placement Teacher Development
- a 104% increase in enrollment in off-campus classes and a 95% increase in the number of off-campus classes.
- expansion of the Crisp Bootheel Education Center to 13 classrooms and additional support space.
- construction of the Sikeston Area Higher Education Center.
- opening of the higher education centers in Perryville and Kennett.
• collaborative efforts through the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium.
• the delivery of classes through ITV and web-based technologies.
• increased ability of students to access degree programs at a distance.

The mission of the School of Extended Learning has always been to assist the University in serving the needs of the region. However, based on the University’s Strategic Plan, this primary outreach role is reinforced through Priority Four: Serve our region more completely and effectively (see Strategic Implementation Plan for specific goals). This connection to institutional priorities has provided Mission Enhancement funding to support new functions, new outreach centers, and enhancement to electronic delivery of instruction through the establishment of SEE-NET (see Mission Enhancement Plan and funding exhibits).

A brief summary of the units of the School of Extended Learning follows. The annual reports and self-studies from each unit can be found in the exhibits.

Southeast P.M. is the University’s evening college and coordinates the offerings of courses and degree programs during late afternoon, evening and weekends for residents within driving distance of Cape Girardeau. Established in 1996, this unit has developed an ongoing information campaign, served as a point of contact and assistance for students and worked with academic departments to add degree programs and courses.

Professional and Continuing Education is a resource for the Southeast Missouri region offering professional seminars and workshops, contract training and education, continuing education units and personal enrichment programs. The Office of Continuing Education was established in fall 1998. During the first year more than 2,000 individuals participated in non-credit programs. The first comprehensive continuing education catalog was published fall 1999.

Off-Campus Centers and Sites are available to students who live beyond a reasonable driving distance from Cape Girardeau or who face other life-style issues which preclude their commuting to the main campus. All the centers and other permanent sites offer coursework in collaboration with a two-year institution. The community college partner generally offers the bulk of the lower division coursework with the University providing upper division and graduate work. In most cases, the University administers the centers. The expansion of the center concept is supported by Mission Enhancement Funding, which projects the addition of another center in the near future. Free-standing centers, which include full-time administrative support include the Crisp Bootheel Education Center, the Sikeston Area Higher Education Center, the Kennett Area Higher Education Center and the Perry County Higher Education Center. The latter is administered by Mineral Area College. Off-campus sites are located at regional community colleges. These include St. Louis Community Colleges, Jefferson Community College, Mineral Area College, and Three Rivers Community
College. When needs are identified that cannot be met at one of the centers or permanent sites, instruction is delivered to students either electronically or through faculty commuting to a site usually hosted by a local high school.

Dual Credit offered through Extended Learning is a cooperative initiative with high schools throughout the Southeast region. Dual credit provides college level courses in the high schools for the benefit of advanced students who wish to earn college credits before entering the freshman year.

Southeast Online. The School of Extended Learning administers the technology-mediated courses for the University along with the Southeast Online web site. The purpose of Southeast Online is to provide educational access where people live and work. Two types of technology-mediated courses are offered through Southeast Online, courses delivered with minimal or no time on campus, called web-based courses and interactive television courses. Technology mediated courses at Southeast Missouri State University are supported in part through mission enhancement funds provided by the state of Missouri for the Southeast Educational Network (SEE-NET). The mission of SEE-NET is to enhance regional access to academic programs, courses and information through a reliable and convenient telecommunications network.

Advanced Placement Teacher Development, established in 1996 through special funding, provides summer institutes and training for high school teachers interested in teaching advanced placement courses. This statewide program operates in conjunction with Truman State University.

Each unit within the School of Extended Learning has identified the challenges it faces in the self-study report. A summary of Strengths, Challenges and Recommendations is presented below.

Strengths:
- full time faculty offer the majority of off-campus classes
- consistent enrollment growth at all venues
- high level of collaboration between academic departments and the School of Extended Learning
- community support for centers in Malden, Sikeston and Kennett
- increased access for high school students to Advanced Placement courses through the training of teachers prepared to teach AP courses
- increased access throughout the region
- administrative/university support for outreach activities
- collaboration with multiple institutions through the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium

Challenges:
- to maintain a spirit of cooperation rather than competition among centers and sites
courses, programs, educational activities and services are based on valid and reliable needs assessment

student support services as well as library services are accessible and relevant to the off-campus and distance student

continue meeting the educational needs of the place bound constituent

enrollment, admission and transfer procedures accommodate multiple institutional perspectives while meeting students need

increasing educational access with limited educational talent and resources

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

- expand consortium activities to include comprehensive needs assessment and joint planning for services
- develop systematic means of collecting student satisfaction data
- develop structures to allow for the identification and tracking of particular student cohort groups including Southeast PM student, students that attend centers and dual credit students
- expand regional contacts for continuing education needs assessment
- increase educational access through expanded use of technology and increasing the number of degree programs offered in the evening and off campus

**International Programs**

In the early 1990's, the University decentralized its international education function by placing responsibility for oversight in the School of Graduate Studies and Extended Learning. Each College was asked to form an international program committee and support was provided to the student service area to support student needs. The Colleges were provided with some modest resources that were to be used to provide released time for college international coordinators and support internationalization of curricula. While this reorganization led to increased efforts to provide international experiences to native students, issues such as recruitment of international students fell to no single entity. With the advent of strategic planning and the opportunity for Mission Enhancement funding, the Office of International Programs was reestablished in 1998 (see exhibits for complete report).

The mission of the Office of International Programs is to provide leadership, educational opportunities, and services to members of the international community on campus and in the region. To ensure quality and integrity in its offerings, the Office of International Programs adheres to the professional guidelines for the field of international education. Programs and services offered are comparable to those at similar institutions that offer a range of international programs and services and actively pursue international research and development. The Office of International Programs serves international undergraduate students from requests for information through the application and admissions process, orientation, English Language Training, and ongoing INS and
cultural advising. All undergraduate admissions, student and faculty exchange visas, and university wide study abroad programs are handled through the office. Study abroad programs such as ISEP and CCIS are coordinated through the office and general guidelines for exchange and study abroad programs are monitored. While several of the colleges have elected to maintain their own exchange and study abroad programs, they are able to also access the Office of International Programs for assistance and advice. The office is advised by the International Council consisting of representatives from each of the colleges, the Department of Foreign Languages, International and Scholar Services, and the Intensive English Program.

Major accomplishments the first year include remodeling of the facility in which the programs and services are housed, the presentation of week-long series of events which focused on international programs and services, and an increase in the fall, 1999 enrollment of international students. Challenges which remain include additional funding for recruiting (personnel and operations), development of a centralized set of guidelines for developing and monitoring exchanges and study abroad, and a higher level of engagement by the academic community in international programming.

Articulation with Community Colleges

The University’s program of articulation with community colleges is the model for other institutions in Missouri. The University has developed a set of ten articulation handbooks (which can be found in the exhibits), one for each of ten community colleges within the region, including schools in Missouri, Illinois, and Arkansas. An eleventh handbook is under development. Agreements have also been developed with community colleges in Kentucky and Tennessee, as well as with three institutions in Malaysia (all of these are listed on p.7 of the 1999-2000 University Bulletin). Copies of all articulation agreements are on file in the Provost’s Office. The agreements also cover blanket transfer of general education courses for students with an Associate’s degree from the community colleges; these courses are applied to the University Studies program.

One current concern is keeping the handbooks accurate and up to date; to that end, they are updated every two years. In the near future, a part-time position in the Registrar’s Office will be added with the responsibilities of updating the handbooks and putting the articulation materials on line. Also, a possible future concern may arise if the statewide Committee on General Education mandates changes that will affect the University’s system of granting transfer credit.

The Office of Admissions and the Office of the Registrar continually collect and assess information on the performance of transfer students. A computer program (TRACRS) enables transfer courses to be credited directly to a student’s University record by entering the course number from the student’s originating school (the program currently handles about 60 schools). Further, each year the
Office of Admissions produces a report comparing each transfer student’s University grade point average with the average he or she earned at the originating school. These figures are then used to measure the success of the institution’s articulation program. (Copies of the data are available in the Office of Admissions.)

Consortia

In 1982, Southeast Missouri State University along with Three Rivers Community College, the University of Missouri at Columbia, and the area Vocational-Technical schools formed the Bootheel Educational Consortium. The purpose of the consortium was to cooperatively meet the educational needs of the citizens of the “bootheel” region of the state of Missouri that traditionally exhibited low levels of education coupled with high levels of unemployment and poverty. For the past eighteen years, the consortium has fulfilled its mission with each institution providing those services and programs best suited to its mission.

In the mid 1990’s, Southeast Missouri State University through its planning process determined that the approach used in the “bootheel” to deliver services might well provide a model for extending educational opportunities to a larger portion of the region. The basic premise of the consortium is that partnerships between postsecondary institutions, the selective creation of cooperative off-campus sites, and the cooperative use of state-of-the-art telecommunications-based delivery of instruction can provide a cost effective means of bringing postsecondary education to those parts of Missouri which are presently not served at all, or which are underserved by the present system of universities, colleges, community colleges, and vocational-technical schools, without creating expensive new institutions. In the fall of 1996, the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium was formed. Members of the consortium are Southeast Missouri State University as the lead institution, Three Rivers Community College, Mineral Area College, the University of Missouri at Columbia, and Lincoln University. The consortium is served by a half-time director (see exhibits for consortium agreement and planning documents).

Self Evaluation

Through the self-study, the University has demonstrated that it meets Criterion Three by providing a program of general education which has clearly defined objectives, courses which “stimulate the examination and understanding of personal, social and civic values” and courses that ensure “proficiency in skills and competencies essential for all college-educated adults.” Moreover, the University through its graduate study and outreach efforts extends the University to the region it serves, the state, and the world. In meeting these challenges, the following Strengths, Challenges, and Opportunities for Improvement seem clear.
Strengths:

1. The University Studies program has received national recognition, was recognized in the last NCATE reaccreditation as exemplary and has been used as a model for other institutions.

2. The Honors Program continues to grow and mature.

3. Graduate enrollment has exceeded the goals expressed in the strategic plan and continues to grow.

4. Enrollment in off-campus offerings, reflective of service to the region, continues to grow.

5. The University is a leader in the State of Missouri with respect to the development of program-to-program articulation with community colleges.

Challenges:

1. The University Studies program will need to continue developing a culture of assessment among the various departments involved in course offerings.

2. As enrollments at the graduate level and in off-campus classes continue to grow, the employment of additional qualified faculty and budgeting for resources to provide additional academic support may be necessary.

3. The growth in off-campus classes and the use of electronic delivery of instruction requires the development of quality indicators to ensure student satisfaction and success.

4. Working in a consortial environment increases the need to communicate clearly between institutions.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. Consortium based programs provide an opportunity to serve the region in a more cost-effective manner.

2. The experience of developing articulation agreements with community colleges could be extended to international colleges/universities as a means of addressing enrollment management goals for increasing international student presence.
3. The University Studies program can benefit from its external reviews by continuing to implement recommendations from these reviews.
Chapter 5
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Criterion Three: Academic Programs

Criterion Three states that "The institution is accomplishing its educational and other purposes." This chapter will demonstrate that the centrality and quality of its academic programs clearly support the mission and purposes of the University.

Southeast Missouri State University takes pride in its academic programs. The University has as a goal, the attainment of all available professional accreditations and either holds or has a plan to reach all those which match the programs offered at Southeast Missouri State University. Professional accreditation is seen as a measure of program quality worthy of achieving. All programs not having a professional accreditation available to them are externally reviewed every five years. Copies of accreditation and external reviews can be found in the exhibits. Over the past ten years, the academic colleges and schools have been particularly responsive to the needs of the region in developing and revising curricula. Through Mission Enhancement funding, programs such as Physical Therapy Assisting and the Cooperative Doctoral program have been developed in direct response to regional needs articulated in the strategic planning process. The annual reports of the colleges and departments provide detail as to the progress of each academic unit. Complete college missions can be found in the Undergraduate Bulletin. Student enrollment data for each program is in the Appendices.

Donald L. Harrison College of Business

The Donald L. Harrison College of Business is accredited at the undergraduate level by AACSB - the International Association for Management Education, and is seeking initial AACSB accreditation at the graduate level. The College offers the Bachelor of Science in Business Administration (BSBA) degree in Business, the Bachelor Science (BS) degree in Economics, the Master of Business Administration (MBA) degree, and the College supports undergraduate and graduate degree programs in business education.

The College mission is summarized in the statement, ..."to provide business studies today for tomorrow's business successes.” While providing opportunities for advanced study (e.g., the MBA) and continuing education in business, the faculty have the vision of Southeast Missouri State University becoming the campus of choice among students wishing to pursue undergraduate business studies at a state university with a primary focus on student learning. In meeting this mission and striving toward this vision, the College subscribes to the University's values (learning, respect, access, service, and diversity). The College supports the teacher-scholar model, expects faculty to remain intellectually active, utilizes its resources in a manner that reflects the proper
stewardship of the public trust, and is committed to promoting a diverse learning environment.

Organization

The Harrison College of Business is comprised of five academic departments, including the Department of Accounting, Finance and Business Law, the Department of Administrative Services, the Department of Economics, the Department of Management, and the Department of Marketing. In addition, there is the Academic Advising Office, the Office of Graduate Studies in Business, the International Business Programs Office, the Small Business Development Center, the Center for Economic and Business Research, and the Center for Entrepreneurial Studies and Small Business Management.

The College’s administrative team is comprised of the five department chairpersons, the Associate Dean, the director of the Academic Advising Center, the Director of Graduate Studies in Business, the Director of International Business Programs, and the directors for the three outreach centers. The administrative team is responsible for matters affecting general operations, policies and programs as prescribed by university, college, department, and unit policies. The College Council, comprised of the five department chairpersons and an elected faculty member from each academic department, is advisory to the Dean. Additionally, faculty advisory committees assist the Director of International Business Programs and the Director of Graduate Studies in Business. College planning is integrated with University planning processes, taking advantage of faculty annual accomplishment reports, department/unit annual reports and a college annual report. A business advisory council and a student advisory council provide advice on program development and planning, and participate in the College’s processes designed to promote continuous improvement.

Curricula

The number of business majors has increased 14.4 percent since 1994 and numbered 1,319 in 1998. Under the BSBA degree, students may major in accounting, economics, finance, international business, management, marketing, office systems management and organizational administration. Details about the structure and content of these majors are published in the Undergraduate Bulletin. At the graduate level, students have available the MBA degree with a general track and an accounting track. Details about the MBA program are published in the Graduate Bulletin. The MBA program is designed for the nontraditional, working adult. As such, all course work is offered in the evening following a schedule that supports both part-time and full-time students.

The recently implemented “150 credit-hour rule” in Missouri that increases the education requirements to sit for the national CPA examination and the relatively low number of economics majors is of concern. These issues have been addressed
through recent revisions to the economics curriculum (implementing options in business economics and financial economics) and planned efforts by the economics faculty to recruit students. The major in international business was implemented in 1997 and the major in organizational administration was implemented in 1998. The latter is specifically designed to meet the needs of nontraditional evening students and distant students. The MBA program was implemented fall 1996 and has shown consistent growth since that time.

The number of degrees awarded and the number of majors reported reflect the impact of a generally declining trend in university enrollments that was not reversed until 1997. The trough in the number of business majors occurred in 1996 with 1,074 reported business majors. Since then, the number of majors has increased 18.4 percent. This growth in the number of business majors is expected to show up as an increase in the number of degrees awarded in the year 2001 and beyond.

As a professional school, placement data are an important indicator of success. Detailed placement information has been collected and analyzed since 1996 (see College Annual Report, 1998). Significant effort has been made to contact all graduates to determine their placement status. Currently, the College collects information on 65-70 percent of the individuals graduating during any year (e.g., 1996, 1997, and most recently, 1998). The placement rate for graduates has consistently been 99 percent. Given the tightness in labor markets, the increasing emphasis on experiential learning and student internships, and the increasing reputation for Harrison College of Business, this high placement rate is not surprising.

Experiential learning (internships, practica, study abroad, research presentations) is an important element to the business curriculum. Internships are available in every major and the MBA program. Practica are supported through courses taught in the areas of management, marketing, and economics. In 1998, 88 students participated in a student internship and approximately 200 students participated in a practica experience. Approximately 45-50 students participate in a study abroad program each year, and a few (5-10) students complete applied research projects that are presented at professional meetings or published in a peer reviewed outlet.

Planning

The planning/evaluation processes used by the Harrison College of Business are nested within the University's annual planning/budget process and five-year strategic planning cycle. These provide ample opportunity for self-examination and mission review. College planning processes not only address the development, execution, and assessment of new initiatives, but they also include reviews and assessments of ongoing operations and information on the internal and external environments. For example, information is collected through student
outcomes assessment, recent graduate surveys, student exit surveys, alumni surveys, faculty accomplishment reports, and from the Dean’s Student Advisory Council and the Dean’s Business Advisory Council. Information from these processes is used to scan the environment, measure accomplishments, revise goals and objectives, and develop priority action steps to improve on-going initiatives in the areas of student learning, scholarship, and service.

The College planning process is a decentralized process structured around three important reports built around assessment and improvement: a Faculty Annual Accomplishment Report, a Department Annual Report, and a College Annual Report. The College process provides faculty the opportunity to review and revise statements of mission, goals and objectives, and actions. The College process is coordinated with University processes including the University’s institutional assessment plan which is learning-centered and stresses the importance of evaluating programs, courses, and services in terms of their contributions to student outcomes. The Harrison College of Business subscribes to this approach and to the 15 assessment principles endorsed by the University faculty to guide assessment.

All faculty complete Faculty Accomplishment Reports based on the previous calendar year. The Faculty Accomplishment Report is a comprehensive summary of teaching, scholarship, and service activities and accomplishments. It is very similar to a comprehensive faculty portfolio, and the report provides each faculty member an opportunity to reflect on his/her activities. The completion of the annual accomplishment report provides a basis for reviewing and revising actions; i.e., planning, at the level of the faculty member.

The faculty annual reports provide information to guide department discussions concerning department activities and accomplishments (teaching, scholarship, service), department priorities, and department goals and objectives. On the basis of the Faculty Accomplishment Reports and department discussions, each department prepares a Department Annual Report. The Department Annual Report provides the opportunity for each academic department, as a community of teacher-scholars, to take a comprehensive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. ENROLLMENT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student/Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit Hours</td>
<td>22,892</td>
<td>23,498</td>
<td>24,127</td>
<td>11,649 (F)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Majors*</td>
<td>1,212</td>
<td>1,154</td>
<td>1,206</td>
<td>1,399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Degrees Awarded*</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Minority Students (AF)</td>
<td>53 (35)</td>
<td>46 (31)</td>
<td>59 (40)</td>
<td>80 (61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CC Transfer Students</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**B. STUDENT OUTCOMES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MFAT Percentile</th>
<th>Accounting</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Management</th>
<th>Quantitative Methods</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>Marketing</th>
<th>Legal Environment</th>
<th>International Business</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77**</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>76**</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79**</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>55**</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative Methods</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>73**</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>66**</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>70**</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Environment</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79**</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>79**</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Placement Rate</th>
<th>Gross Placement Rate</th>
<th>Net Placement Rate</th>
<th>Internship Survey</th>
<th>Average Score (Q1-Q12)</th>
<th>Overall Rating (Average)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**C. CURRICULUM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Internships</th>
<th>119</th>
<th>92</th>
<th>112</th>
<th>88</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Students w/ Practicums</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recent Graduate Survey</td>
<td>Average Overall Grade (12 point scale)</td>
<td>Communication Skills (10 point scale)</td>
<td>Teamwork Skills (10 point scale)</td>
<td>Leadership Skills (10 point scale)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.3=B</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.6=B+</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9.7=B+</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.2=B+</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes business education; **not comparable with previous year’s scores because MFAT was revised.

look at itself and its environment, reflect on department activities and accomplishments in the context of department and college goals and objectives, and identify areas of strength and areas for improvement. The Department Annual Report includes information on student enrollment, student outcomes, instructional activities, curriculum development/innovation and instructional resources, teaching effectiveness, internal and professional service, and faculty professional development and scholarship. The department annual report also identifies new
priorities and sets forth short term (one-year) and long-term (five-year) goals and objectives.

Information from the department annual reports is used to prepare a College Annual Report. The College Annual Report brings together a wide variety of information to assess accomplishments, re-examine the environment and the College’s mission, to review College priorities and establish short-term and long-term goals and objectives, and to measure improvement. This is summarized in a balanced score-card for the college (see Table 1, above). Because of its comprehensive nature and the integration of planning and improvement processes into the fabric of the College, the college annual reporting process is evolving toward a continuous professional accreditation review process.

Given the planning schedule that has been established, the college annual report is available for use in the University’s macro-level planning processes. The calendar for the College planning process is also advantageous because faculty begin each academic year with a clear picture of department and college goals and objectives and the actions that must be undertaken over the current academic year. Furthermore, this planning schedule provides faculty time during the summer to plan for their individual activities as they relate to College and University goals and objectives, as well as their own professional goals and objectives.

Teaching Effectiveness

The Harrison College of Business is comprised of 40 budgeted tenured and tenure track faculty and 3 budgeted term faculty positions. Part-time faculty are used sparingly. Typically, over an academic year the College will benefit from approximately 3.0 FTE in part-time assignments. Thirty percent of the business faculty are minority, 10 percent are African-American, 33 percent are female, and 15 percent are foreign-born. Women hold three of the five department chair positions and an African-American holds a fourth chairperson position. Seventy-two percent of the faculty hold the rank of Professor and 91 percent are tenured. Sixty-seven percent of the faculty has been awarded graduate faculty status. While University policy suggests a normal teaching load of 12 credit hours per term, over 90 percent of the faculty in Harrison College of Business have 9 credit hour teaching assignments in any term. Student-faculty ratios range from a low of 17.9 in the Department of Management to a high of 22.6 in the Department of Administrative Services. The College student-faculty ratio is 19.6, which is above the University average of 17.3, but very near the College’s target ratio of 20.0.

The College has established a comprehensive set of evaluation processes, including recent graduate surveys, alumni surveys, internship sponsor surveys and employer surveys. The College has adopted the IDEA teaching evaluation form for use each fall term to gather nationally normed information speaking to student perceptions on teaching effectiveness. Additionally, the College participates in a
national benchmarking study conducted by EBI under the sponsorship of AACSB. Graduating seniors take the Major Field Achievement Test in Business as an indicator of teaching effectiveness and student learning. Detailed results are summarized in the college’s annual report. IDEA results (a distribution of scores that matches the national data base) provide evidence of overall effective teaching and this conclusion is confirmed by results on the MFAT examination (generally, business graduates as a group score at the 75th percentile), and through responses by on-campus recruiters (Southeast business students are rated “very good” relative to students interviewed on other campuses in the areas of overall preparation, communication skills, and knowledge in major). Recent graduates and alumni speak highly of the teaching they received – the average grade assigned to teaching by these two groups is B+.

Scholarship

The College has established the goal of developing every faculty member as an active teacher-scholar under the University’s interpretation of the teacher-scholar model. Since 1994, the proportion of tenured and tenure-track faculty judged to be active teacher-scholar models has increased, reaching 97 percent (39 out of 40) in 1998. This level of performance is encouraged by a wide variety of faculty support programs (e.g., budgeted professional development funds, supplemental professional development funds, special AACSB professional development program, special teaching enhancement professional development program, team incentive program, undergraduate and graduate assistant programs, on-site visit program, Conference Board program, international faculty exchange program) that promote continuous improvement in teaching, scholarship and professional service. For 1998, 95 percent of the tenured and tenure-track faculty reported a peer reviewed regional or national presentation or publication. Eighty-five percent reported a peer reviewed publication in 1998 and 52 percent reported a national refereed journal publication in 1998. The intellectual contributions of faculty are balanced over basic research, applied research and instructional development. For example, in 1998, 56 percent of the intellectual contributions reported by faculty were in the areas of applied research and instructional development. Forty-six percent of the reported intellectual contributions were in the area of basic research. This composition is judged appropriate for a program that stresses undergraduate education while building and maintaining a highly regarded, albeit small, graduate program.

Service

Over the past five years, the service capabilities of the Harrison College of Business have increased significantly. The Small Business Development Center (SBDC) was assigned to the Harrison College of Business in 1996, with the completion of Robert A. Dempster Hall. The SBDC provides one vehicle for faculty to provide low cost consulting services to the regional small business community. The Center for Economic and Business Research (CEBR) was
established in 1997 to (a) develop and maintain data bases on the economic and business conditions in southeast Missouri, (b) analyze economic trends at the local, regional, state and national levels, (c) conduct special studies speaking to economic and business conditions in southeast Missouri. The CEBR has been especially effective in integrating service learning into its activities. Undergraduate students complete at least one major project each year for the Center that is subsequently presented at a professional meeting. The Center for Entrepreneurial Studies and Small Business Management was established in 1998 to promote and enhance the small business environment. The primary focus to date has been on (a) developing a series of programs on the family business and business succession and (b) developing internship opportunities in entrepreneurial settings for students. The latter initiative is being supported through a Kauffman Foundation grant and involves both undergraduate and graduate students. Additionally, service to the region has been enhanced through a wide variety of practica projects supported through the curriculum (especially in the Department of Marketing) and through the Management Assistance Program sponsored by the Department of Management.

Major Accomplishments

In reviewing the previous ten years it is possible to identify the following list of accomplishments for the Harrison College of Business, including:

- The complete revision of the business core curriculum to bring it in line with AACSB accreditation expectations (1991-1994).
- The achievement of AACSB accreditation at the undergraduate level (1996).
- The implementation of an undergraduate major in International Business in 1997.
- The implementation of an undergraduate major in Organizational Administration to meet the needs of evening, part-time students (1998).
- The implementation and growth of an MBA program (1996).
- The establishment of the Center for Economic and Business Research (1997).
- The establishment of the Center for Entrepreneurial Studies and Small Business Management (1998).
- The comprehensive revisions to the majors in accounting, economics, management and marketing (1996-1998)
- The integration of new technologies into teaching/student learning processes and the curriculum (1996 – present)
- The adoption of a distant learning strategy to meet the needs of southeast Missouri (1998)
• The development of a comprehensive faculty support strategy to improve teaching, scholarly work and professional service (1997-1998)

• The continued growth and expansion of international programming, including faculty and student exchange agreements, growth of semester-abroad programming, and significant expansion of the College’s international tour programs (1995-present)

• The establishment of minors in global logistics, business administration, and entrepreneurship (1996-1998).

Strengths. The College counts among its strengths a faculty comprised of active teacher-scholars committed to achieving and maintaining AACSB accreditation. Its facilities are state-of-the-art and support student learning. The College endowment provides a margin of excellence in supporting the development of students, faculty, and staff. The student body is increasing in both quality and diversity.

Challenges. In regard to the current environment, the Harrison College of Business has identified opportunities and challenges (see College Annual Report, 1998, p. 27). Nationally, the College is challenged by the continuing decline in interest in business among entering first-time, full-time freshman, the market for PhD’s in business, and the impact of emerging digital technologies. At the State level, the College must be cognizant of increasing expectations for accountability, a more active Coordinating Board of Higher Education, and the State’s A+ program that subsidizes attendance at community colleges. Regionally, there are a number of significant factors including increasing competition, increasing expectations for institutional cooperation, and increasing expectations to serve niche markets. Institutionally, the College is challenged by limited resources to support new programming, increasing demands associated with distant programming, and increasing emphasis on student retention. Within the College, there is the perpetual challenge to connect every faculty member with the processes promoting continuous improvement. Making these connections is important because we wish every faculty member to have an ownership in the future of the College.

Improvements in Progress. For the next few years the Harrison College of Business will be focusing attention on achieving re-accreditation at the undergraduate level and initial accreditation at the graduate level by AACSB. The College is currently in the candidacy phase and will be completing its accreditation self-evaluation report over the 1999-2000 academic year. It is expected that a site visit will take place in the February-March 2001 period, with a positive decision about accreditation announced April 2001. The College will be implementing a major in Management Information Systems during the 2000-2001 academic year, assuming the College’s proposal before the Coordinating Board of Higher Education is endorsed. At the same time, it is expected that the various majors will continue to improve their curriculum in response to changing
conditions and expectations of the business community. It is also expected that
the curriculum in the Office Systems Management major will be revised as
office/productivity technologies advance. The beginning phase of this is
underway with a proposal to establish a minor in applied networking.

College of Education

Teacher education has been the primary mission at the University since its
inception in 1873 as a Normal School. The commitment to teacher education has
remained a priority through the ensuing years.

Organization

The College of Education consists of four departments; Elementary, Early, and
Special Education, Educational Administration and Counseling, Physical
Education, and Middle and Secondary Education. Other components of the
College of Education include the Advising Center, Office of Field Experiences,
the Instructional Resources and Technology Laboratory, International Programs,
the Missouri Assessment Program and the Regional Professional Development
Center.

The College of Education and its programs are fully accredited by the National
Council for the Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and approved by
the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The Council
for Accreditation of Counseling and Related Educational Programs (CACREP)
granted accreditation for the Community Counseling programs.

The College of Education has primary responsibility for the administration,
development, maintenance, and evaluation of professional education programs at
the University. The College is administered by a Dean and a half-time Associate
Dean. Each Department is administered by a Chairperson. There is an Assistant
to the Dean for Technology who is also responsible for Certification, an Advisor
who oversees the Advising Center, a Director of the Office of Field Experiences,
a Director for the Instructional Resources and Technology Laboratory, a
Coordinator for International Programs, a Regional Facilitator for the Missouri
Assessment Center and a Director of the Regional Professional Development
Center. Several groups exist for the governance of the College; The
Chairperson’s Council, Expanded Chairpersons Council, College of Education
Council (which includes public school administrators and teachers), Committee
on Admission and Retention in Teacher Education and Student Advisory Council
to the Dean. Students are represented on all major committees.

Curricula

The College of Education offers programs at the baccalaureate and graduate
levels. The Doctorate in Educational Leadership is a degree awarded by the
University Missouri-Columbia and offered collaboratively with Southeast Missouri State University and other regional institutions. Descriptions of curricula may be found in the appropriate bulletin. Curricula in the College is assessed, evaluated, and revised according to the standards imposed by certification and accrediting agencies for specific programs. Each Department in the College is required to write an annual assessment plan and to report on progress toward implementing that plan. The College has a strong field-based component and feedback from students, teachers, and other educational personnel are included in all assessment related decisions. Evaluation and revision of all programs is ongoing and reflects changes required by certification and accrediting standards, but also by the needs of students. Student learning is a primary objective for all programs in the College. Courses and degree programs are continually reviewed and revised, accordingly.

Since implementation, in 1988, the College has twice won the Christa McAuliffe Showcase for Excellence Award conferred by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities (AASCU) for elements of its field-based program. In 1989, the Elementary Education Block program won the award and in 1994 it was given for the Kindergarten-Sixth Grade Science and Mathematics Education (KSAM) program. In 1993, the College received recognition from the White House Teach America program for its contribution to the advancement of the national educational priorities. In 1994, the College was invited to join the Renaissance Group, an organization of comprehensive university working to reform and improve teacher education throughout the nation by making it the responsibility of the entire university and the schools.

Annual undergraduate majors in the College of Education have increased from 1,212 in 1994 to 1,321 in 1998. Graduation rates tend to fluctuate in elementary, early and special education. Special education is an area of critical need in southeast Missouri schools and the number of graduates has doubled since 1997. Physical education and secondary education majors have remained stable and an increase is seen in the number of middle level education majors. There were 238 certificates issued in 1998.

Table 5-2. College of Education Summary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Enrollment Data Reported By Calendar Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Fte</td>
<td>39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student to Faculty Ratio</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Credit Hours</td>
<td>17342.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual graduate enrollment averaged 431 students from 1994 through 1996. In 1997 there were 51 more students and 21 more enrolled in 1998. There has been a 16% increase in graduate enrollment since 1994. In 1998 there were 503 students enrolled in College of Education graduate programs.

Planning

The initial strategic plan for the College of Education was developed in 1995. The College mission is to prepare teachers, administrators and counselors by developing the skills and competencies needed by its students to become educated persons and successful, competent professionals. The overall goal for the College is "Excellence and Distinction in all Programs and Services.” The theme for the College evolves around “The Competent Professional Educator, Administrator or Counselor.” The strategic plan was patterned after six priorities established at the University level, yet modified for the College into seven priorities with the addition of a priority to attain appropriate accreditation. Top objectives related to these priorities are reflected in the accomplishments of the college over the past several years and can be found in the annual report of the College of Education. As the self-study is being written, the faculty are completing new departmental strategic plans which will form the basis for the next iteration of the college plan.

Teaching Effectiveness

The College of Education has 41 full-time tenure track faculty members who teach courses in professional education, advise professional education students or administer portions of the professional education program(s). Of those 41, 98% hold the doctoral degree. All teach and/or supervise in areas in which they have both advanced preparation and experience.

Twenty percent of the faculty members hold professor rank, 36% hold associate professor rank, 42% hold assistant professor rank and 2% hold instructor rank. The data reflects gender distribution consisting of 25 females (61%) and 16 males (39%). Of the 41 full-time tenure track faculty members; two are African-American, one is Native American and two are of other minority origin for a total of 12% minority faculty. Of the 24 dual-appointed specialty area faculty, one is African-American, one is Hispanic, one is Native American, one is of other minority origin for a total of 17% minority faculty, and eight of the dual-appointed faculty members are female.
Regular faculty FTE has increased from 39.4 in 1994 to 46.48 in 1998. The student/faculty ratio has increased from 14.7 in 1994 to 16.47 in 1998 (Table 2). The average credit load for faculty members teaching only undergraduate courses is 12 credits per semester. Faculty members teaching a mixed load of undergraduate and graduate courses generally have an average ten-hour teaching load. Those faculty members teaching only graduate courses have a nine-hour teaching load. The College and other units, such as the School of Graduate Studies, award release time to faculty members for special projects, assignments, sabbaticals and research.

Reflective of teaching in the College is an increase in student GPA from 2.89 in 1994 to 3.12 in 1998. Student ACT scores tend to remain fairly stable as are scores on the 75-Hour Writing Test (Table 2). The College of Education systematically collects data for assessing the quality of its programs. It gathers information on the progress of current undergraduate students through reports on the competencies of the conceptual framework, results of the 75-hour writing examination, student teaching evaluations, and PRAXIS (formerly NTE) scores. The College also surveys recent graduates (teachers with 1-2 years experience) and service-area school principals. The Office of Field Experiences analyzes the data on graduates and distributes the results to each department. The School of Graduate Studies and Extended Learning completes an exit assessment on all graduates of advanced programs in the College of Education. Each department then uses all data on their current students as the sources of information for determining the effectiveness and delivery of its programs. Specific evaluative sources used by each department are written in an assessment plan that is linked to the University’s assessment plan to ensure institutional effectiveness. Some of these sources used by individual departments include progress on competency checklists (directly linked to certification competencies set forth by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education), course grades, GPA, the 75-hour writing examination, portfolios, evaluations by public school teachers during field experiences, PRAXIS scores, and student teaching formative and summative evaluations. In turn, students regularly evaluate individual professors as to the effectiveness of the delivery of courses. This procedure follows University guidelines for regular and systematic teacher evaluation. Results are shared with both Department chairpersons and individual faculty members for interpretation and decisions regarding the improvement of teaching.

Scholarship

Faculty professional development has been a College of Education priority. According to the NCATE Standards (Standard III.D), the College must "ensure that there are systematic and comprehensive activities to enhance the competence and intellectual vitality of the faculty." Resources to support scholarship by faculty must also be provided.
The level of faculty productivity is consistently high. In 1998 the number of faculty participating in scholarship was 40 (95%). Specific faculty and their involvement in particular scholarly activities can be found in the college annual report or in the annual report of specific departments.

Internal and external grant funding was also a college priority and has continued to increase each year. In 1998 the College was granted a total of $1,241,395 from external sources and $89,080 from internal sources.

Service

The College maintains the belief that education must be consistently renewed, that the preparation of teachers and professionals is only beginning after four years, that pre-service and in-service education must be seamless and consistent with current cutting edge reforms, the College has made a commitment to increase the already strong K-16 partnerships in our service region. There are 18 different partnership projects in place. These projects are designed to foster a seamless web of ongoing improvements of educational quality among pre-service students, graduate students, and in-service professionals.

The Southeast Regional Professional Development Center is one of nine state funded centers that were created in 1994 to improve public education in Missouri. The Center is located in the Mark F. Scully Education and Psychology Building.

In 1994, Southeast Missouri State University became a site for implementing the assessment component of Missouri Senate Bill 380 (1995), known as Missouri Assessment Project 2000 (MAP 2000). The project facilitates pre-service and in-service teacher education in performance-based assessment by training area teachers as senior leaders who are granted release time to assist other teachers.

Beginning in the fall of 1995, Southeast Missouri State University became a host site for the Select Teachers as Regional Resources program (STARR), which is designed to provide in-service education for teachers by teachers who are on sabbatical leave from their home schools for one year. After a year of preparation, STARR teachers serve as consultants for authentic instruction. They are available throughout the school year to conduct seminars for school districts in the University’s service region. In addition, STARR teachers serve as resources for pre-service teacher education.

There are two other collaborative programs housed within the Scully Building. Since 1992, the College of Education has provided office space to a satellite office for the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and in the fall of 1996, the College became a site for the regional coordinator of the Accelerated Schools program.
Another collaborative project is Reading Recovery, which is designed to help the lowest 15-20% of first-grade students read at or above the level of the average students in their class. The College also sponsors the Southeast Reading Clinic. The Clinic provides the culminating activity for reading certification, which consists of 24 graduate hours in reading, testing, and special education. The Clinic operates for an eight-week period in the summer and attracts children within an 80 mile radius of the University.

Additionally, the College is an active partner and/or supports partnerships with the following:

- School Counseling Transition Program (Grant)
- Early Literacy (Grant)
- Improving Mathematics in Missouri (IM) (Grant)
- Electronic Data Bank of Mathematics Performance Tasks (Grant)
- Project on Augmentative Learning in Special Education (Grant)
- Fine Arts Project with Cape Girardeau Public Schools (Grant)
- Professional Development School Projects
- Block Program
- A+ schools
- Gifted Education S.E.A.R.C.H. project (Grant)
- Literacy with New Methods and New Books (Grant)
- National Faculty Program

Faculty in the College continually provide workshops and professional development opportunities for public school teachers on topics such as performance assessment, student learning styles, use of the Show-Me-Standards, integration of technology in learning, and many other pedagogical approaches to increase student learning.

**Major Accomplishments since 1990**

During the course of the last ten years, the College of Education has accomplished the following:

- NCATE and CACREP Accreditation was achieved to ensure quality programs that will help increase student learning.
- Additional courses were developed to help support University Studies.
- In August 1996, the Department of Secondary Education submitted a new middle school program to the Coordinating Board for Higher Education. This was approved. Shortly thereafter, the Department of Secondary Education was changed to the Department of Middle and Secondary Education.
- The Department of Secondary Education has added emphases in Physical Education, Educational Studies and Social Studies to its master’s program.
A new area of concentration in (Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) has been added.
The number of off-campus sites for delivery of programs has increased.
An increased emphasis on information technology in the professional programs has resulted in the addition of a newly required course, EM 102 Technology and the Teacher’s Role

Self-Evaluations

Department of Education Administration and Counseling

Strengths. The Department began a major effort to increase both the outreach effort and to deliver courses to more places and in a variety of methods and to build enrollment. Both the Educational Administration and Counseling programs continue to grow in enrollment. One of the strengths of the programs also presents on of the biggest challenges, that is, of being “user-friendly.” Courses are offered on campus, via ITV, on weekends, “all Saturday” programs, and Web-based. Adjunct faculty are integrated into the programs by having several members teaching on campus each semester. This helps keep quality more consistent. Currently, spring 2000, a team is teaching a large ITV class with 58 students at a total of 5 sites. Three faculty members will rotate among the sites so each one will have a member of the team from 1-3 times. Students have responded positively to the alternate delivery of courses and programs. Graduates quickly secure jobs in the service areas in both counseling and school administration.

Challenges. Both programs face challenges in meeting changing standards imposed by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education as well as by accrediting agencies (ISSLC for Educational Administration and CACREP for school Counseling). Several courses need to be reconfigured to meet these standards. The counselors are discussing the possibility of seeking another program accreditation and perhaps a new degree via the state-wide co-op model. As enrollment continues to increase in both programs in the Department, it will be a continuing challenge to try to meet their needs with existing faculty.

Improvements in Progress. In an effort to continue to meet the needs of students through alternate scheduling, the use of ITV on weekends will be used for the first time. The first Specialist level Web-based course will also be implemented. Academic restructuring to separate the two programs into two-separate departments will continue to be discussed. Counseling faculty will continue to develop a Marriage and Family component of the program with a Marriage and Family Counseling Certificate.
Department of Elementary, Early and Special Education

**Strengths.** The Department has developed a long history of strong collaborative partnerships with school districts in the region. School administrators and classroom teachers had major input into the various instructional blocks in the program. The Department has implemented a carefully designed, comprehensive system for assessing the quality of student performance in the undergraduate program that includes student preparation of a Certification Portfolio. The Master's in Exceptional Child Degree can now be completed in four regular semesters and three summer sessions. It includes a new course in Assistive Technology. Practica in all the specialties have been combined into a single course. The course, Educational Assessment Techniques includes up-to-date content and state-of-the-specialty tests and assessment instruments.

International/Global Education is an important dimension of the Department. Strength in this area is evident in the following accomplishments: a. An annual student teaching exchange experience in Wales, b. Visiting scholars program., c. Southeast’s first year long Fulbright Scholar-in-Residence, 1999-2000, d. Department faculty effort led to the University being awarded the national AACTE award on Excellence in Global Education, Spring 1999.

**Challenges.** Justifying the need for new faculty is an issue. Adding credit to field experience courses and clarifying and realigning specific sources of data has helped to recognize improvement in faculty-student ratios. However, it remains a challenge to deliver a top quality program with existing vacancies for full-time, qualified faculty. Numbers in the graduate programs are beginning to stabilize and, in some cases, increase somewhat. Faculty members have looked to both ITV and the Internet in an effort to deliver courses to graduate students in more remote areas of the region.

**Improvements in Progress.** At the graduate level, a new area of emphasis in Cross Categorical Services has been approved by DESE. The graduate faculty in reading have totally redesigned the graduate Certification Program in Reading with seven new courses focusing on current trends and best practice, including an emphasis on leadership in reading. The early childhood education faculty have begun the process of developing a new Master’s in Early Childhood Education. At the undergraduate level, a new Area of Concentration, Educational Technology, was approved. Three Professional Development Schools have been established, two for elementary and one for early childhood. Changes are being made in assessing the skills of students according to new criteria from DESE. A result of this has been implementation of a required certification portfolio for education students.
**Department of Middle and Secondary Education**

**Strengths.** Well-qualified faculty committed to delivering top quality field-based program is the primary strength in the Department. The undergraduate programs derive their strength from the increasing depth of preparation delivered through a combination of pedagogical and professional courses and sequential field-based experiences integrated throughout all coursework. Graduate programs provide students with the opportunity to pursue individual interests with in-depth study and research. Strong partnerships with area schools and public school teachers provide the quality field-based experiences for all students in the program. Faculty representing content-specific disciplines on campus are dually appointed to the Department allowing for coordination of curricular issues and student experiences. The Alternative Certification and graduate programs meet the needs of those students seeking certification in critical needs areas and those students seeking advanced studies, respectively.

**Challenges.** Financial, facility and faculty resources impose limitations to the rate of growth in student enrollment.

**Improvements in progress.** Changes in DESE requirements and NCATE criteria have necessitated changes in assessment of student competencies. All courses in all programs are currently being reviewed, and revised, accordingly. The Department has added an additional option of “Educational Studies” to its graduate program to help individualize graduate work to meet specific needs and interests of students. Active recruitment efforts are being discussed to increase the number of students in the graduate program. The assessment plan is being reviewed. Changes are being discussed so that the data collected will provide relevant information for course and programmatic adjustments, which will help increase student learning.

**Department of Physical Education**

**Strengths.** The primary strength of the Department is the well-qualified faculty able to provide programs to meet the diverse needs and interests of students. The Department offers a variety of attractive, interesting and health promoting physical activity courses for the general student body as well as programs of two majors and four minors plus concentrations in one undergraduate area and in two graduate programs.

**Challenges.** The Department needs to continue to provide a quality program for all physical education students by meeting requirements for university studies and professional education while finding some opportunities for student electives in the fields of coaching and/or health. An additional challenge is delivering a top quality program with limited use of existing facilities.
Improvements in Progress. Curricular planning includes a certification for coaching as well as health education and new graduate courses for coaching, pedagogy and adapted physical education. A laboratory facility for physiology of conditioning, wellness, motor learning, first aid, kinesiology, and tests and measurements is in the planning stages.

College of Health and Human Services

The College of Health and Human Services is responsible for the administration of departments and programs in the health and human service fields. The College’s mission is to provide direction and support for the teaching, research, and scholarship, and service responsibilities of its units. The College is composed of academic professions that are committed to a multidisciplinary model of education and performance. It strives for an environment in which linkages with other programs and with other colleges and schools are desired and encouraged.

Organization

Seven academic Departments and three institutes report directly to the Dean of the College. The Departments are Aerospace Studies, Communication Disorders, Criminal Justice, Health and Leisure, Human Environmental Studies, Nursing, and Social Work. The Institutes include the Institute for Children and Families and the Institute for Gerontology.

A Dean and a half-time Associate Dean administer the College. A Chairperson administers each Department. A director administers each of the Institutes. The College Council supplies college governance. The Council is chaired by the Dean and is composed of the Associate Dean, Chairpersons and a faculty representative from each department. The Council also serves the function of a college-level curriculum committee. The College advisor also reports to the dean.

Curricula

The curriculum is based in the academic and professional disciplines of the departments and requires a mastery of knowledge and problem-solving ability that is basic to human growth, development and healthy functioning. The thrust of the curriculum is to prepare an ethical professional who is equipped to provide service to the individuals and/or families in a variety of settings, including business, home, school, and community, social, and justice agencies.

Assessment of the curriculum is achieved by a combination of outside accrediting agencies, external reviews for other degree programs, and established departmental assessment plans. Communication Disorders, Athletic Training, Physical Therapy Assistant, Recreation, Dietetics, Center for Child Studies, Nursing, and Social Work have all received national accreditation from their
respective professional accrediting bodies. The College has most recently developed multi-disciplinary courses: UI 427 – Service and the Community, and HS 551-Case Management which are taught collaboratively.

The College of Health and Human Services has the largest number of majors in the University with approximately 1500. Many of the academic professions represented are predicted to experience significant increases in the near future. College expansion is limited primarily by adequate numbers of faculty, staff, and facilities to meet anticipated student demand for new and expanded programs. The Physical Therapy Associate Program has graduated its first class, the Master of Science of Nursing is growing, and the Master of Social Work cooperatively offered with the University of Missouri-Columbia began in January 1998. The post-graduate dietetic internship had 85 applicants from 12 states for its first full class of six. Communication Disorders will address its applicant backlog of approximately 90 students with a newly authorized faculty position. A new joint M.S. degree in Nutrition and Exercise Science from the Departments of Health and Leisure and Human Environmental Studies has been approved by the Board of Regents. Child development, due to changing federal and state training requirements, has an applicant backlog of approximately 140 from only one (of three) head Start Centers in the Region.

Planning

College of Health and Human Services strategic planning efforts began in September of 1994 with the introduction of a “futures scanning” section into each department chairs meeting. At each meeting, chairs were encouraged to report on new developments related to their field and possible educational implications for the university and college mission. Each program and department additionally participated in writing a strategic plan to coordinate with the university strategic plan. The College’s strategic plan patterned after the fifteen priorities established at the university level.

Gaps in the region, identified through the Strategic Planning Process, led to the creation of the National Dietetics Internship Program, Cooperative M. S. W. with the University of Missouri – Columbia, and Physical Therapy Assistant Program, as well as the Nurse Practitioner Master of Science in Nursing track and closing of the Associate of Arts in Nursing program.

Teaching Effectiveness

The College has 63 full-time faculty members, of which 26 are tenured. The number of faculty, tenure to non-tenure ratios, use of part-time faculty, teaching loads, and faculty-student ratios are given for each department in the College. (Table 5-3)
Teaching effectiveness is assessed by a number of indicators: IDEA student evaluations, faculty peer and administrative classroom observation and through faculty merit reports. Faculty continually seeks to improve their performance in the classroom with an emphasis on the teacher-scholar service model. All programs incorporate practicum or internship experiences and have historically been leaders in experiential education. The College supports improvement in teaching effectiveness through support in faculty professional development and recognition of pedagogical research.

Table 5-3. College of Health and Human Services Summary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th># of Faculty 1998</th>
<th>Tenure:Non-Tenure Ratio 1998</th>
<th>Use of Part-time faculty (Mean 1994-98)</th>
<th>Student:Faculty Ratio (Mean 1994-98)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>24.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; Leisure</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>2:9.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Environmental Studies</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10:4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1:1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scholarship

Scholarship in the College includes formal publications, presentations; grant writing, involvement with student research, and professional consulting. The faculty of the college are active scholars as demonstrated by the data in the annual reports (see exhibits). In 1998, for example, faculty in the college produced 63 publications. Moreover, the faculty have been increasingly active in acquiring external funding to support a myriad of initiatives. An emerging focus of the College is not just the development of additional grants and contracts, but to fit college external funding into two conceptual categories: research and development, and service to the region. During the 1998-99 academic year, the College of Health and Human Services surpassed all other units on campus in external funding, with a total amount in excess of $3 million continuing dollars. Five million in new contracts are presently being added this fiscal year, in
addition to the last year's total due to efforts of the Dean through the Bootheel Initiative.

The mission of the Bootheel Initiative (BI) is to enhance the quality of life of people residing in the Bootheel region of Missouri by helping to develop programs to improve their economic, social, and physical environments. Initial efforts have been designed to help residents make the transition from being dependent on Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) benefits to being self-sufficient by becoming gainfully employed. The BI is attempting to accomplish this by connecting TANF recipients and other very low-income residents with the appropriate programs to help them overcome any barriers to their being gainfully employed.

Table 5-4. Grant Application and Awards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grant Applications</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant Awards</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award Totals in Dollars</td>
<td>$4,597,340</td>
<td>$3,707,778</td>
<td>$4,007,547</td>
<td>$5,447,316</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Management, evaluation, and program development assistance to the State of Missouri health and human service and community development agencies is highly desired. The College has developed relationships with the Missouri Department of Education, Division of Family Services, Economic Development, Public Safety, U.S. Department of Justice, HHS U.S. Department of Transportation, U.S. Department of Labor, Department of Health, and Bureau of Special Health Care Needs which has resulted in significant funding for numerous programs throughout the region. These include, in part, Bootheel Initiative, Educare, Weed and Seed, Workshop on Wheels, Child Care Resource and Referral, A.P.P.L.E., and the Parent Project.

Service

Service for the College of Health and Human Services is considered to be an essential component of its mission and has received a high priority in the strategic planning for the college. Service is accomplished through work for the university, for the students, and for the community and region. Examples of service are discussed in the following individual sections for each department within the college and in the annual reports.
Major Accomplishments Since 1990

- Graduate Program Development and revisions including the Cooperative MSW program with the University of Missouri, the Master of Science in Nursing, the Health and Fitness Administration option on the M.S.A., the development of masters programs in Nutrition and Exercise Science and Criminal Justice.
- The development of the Associate Degree in Physical Therapy Assisting.
- New Programs in Foodservice and Hospitality Management, Fashion Merchandising, and a National Dietetic Internship.
- The development of an Enrichment Center for full day care for children of faculty, staff, and students.
- The use of technology to develop web pages, on-line courses, and the integration of technology into all curricula.

Self-Evaluations

Department of Communication Disorders

**Strengths.** The Department of Communication Disorders maintains its national accreditation, and continues to strive to abide by the accreditation standards set forth by the Council on Academic Accreditation of the American Speech-Language-Hearing Association. The Department continues to recruit high-quality students for entrance into the graduate program. All graduate students are required to take the standardized Praxis Battery for Speech-Language Pathologists examination either upon completion of the Master's degree or toward the end of their program. Pass rates over the past three years have ranged from 83 to 91%.

**Challenges.** The department was granted a new tenure track faculty position for the fall of 1999 and retained the position associated with a faculty resignation. Despite extensive recruiting efforts, and due in part to the paucity of doctoral degrees being granted in the field, the positions have not been filled. The Department was fortunate to locate a master's level individual to fill one position on a temporary basis. It is hoped that the applicant pool for these positions will be larger than what was available last year and every effort will be made to recruit qualified individuals to fill these faculty vacancies.

**Improvements in Progress.** The goal to optimize and stabilize enrollment has been achieved through the revision of admission criteria for undergraduate and graduate students, formalizing the process for student advising, and delineating systematic scheduling of courses. The revised undergraduate and graduate
curriculums reflect trends in the field of communication disorders, and meet employment and accreditation needs. The changes in curriculum have resulted in above-average performance and passing rates on nationally standardized professional exams. The objective to recruit at least 60% of our graduate students from the region was achieved for the 1998 fall semester. The Department continues to show growth in scholarly activities. This year, four of the six faculty made a total of 16 presentations at national and state conferences; 15 were student-mentored presentations.

**Department of Criminal Justice**

**Strengths.** The teaching faculty continues to be the strength of the department. All faculty are motivated teachers and 70% of the students rate the quality of instruction as very good to excellent. The work ethic of major students is admirable and overall quality is improving.

**Challenges.** The immediate challenge is to implement the Master’s program and streamline the undergraduate program with existing resources. The department continues to request new positions and cannot meet committee and advising needs with adjunct faculty. The present workload is a detriment to scholarly activity, burnout and low morale are realistic outcomes.

**Improvements in Progress** In FY 99, the department recruited and hired a new minority tenure track faculty member. The department is now contemplating eliminating the degree options in lieu of a more generalized major. Continue to increase delivery via technology. The department currently maintains one electronic classroom and one mobile cart for PowerPoint and Internet presentations and plans to convert a second lecture style classroom to a technology-enhanced classroom.

**Department of Human Environmental Studies**

**Strengths.** The strengths of the Department are its faculty. Faculty members are excellent teachers and tireless service providers while still pursuing scholarly activities. In 1998, the Department wrote and received more than $500,000.00 in grants and contracts. These programs provide vital service to the region, serve as training opportunities for students within the Department, and serve as a basis for faculty research. Faculty also keeps curricula in line with the industry with which each is associated, providing necessary links for student’s professional growth. All faculty are members of professional organizations and several are active in leadership positions and elected offices at the state, national, and international level.

**Challenges.** Challenges lie within a department with numerous and varied programs. It is a constant challenge to meet the demand of resources and facilities to provide the regional service and research that is fundamental in such a
dynamic environment. Additionally, long-term challenges lie with developing pertinent and useful means of assessing eight different programs within one department. Individual programs within the Department are currently accredited through their respective professional bodies and this too poses additional challenges within one department to maintain these national standards. Finally, off-campus enrollment and demand for courses, due to changes in Head Start training requirements, now exceeds the department’s capacity without additional faculty.

**Improvements in Progress.** The Department continues to modify and improve recruitment of students. Departmental recruitment materials and program web pages have been developed. Additional articulation agreements have been completed with community colleges. Regional service projects continue to grow as funding has increased. Employees of these grant projects now exceed 40. Faculty continue to expand the number and type of experiential learning sites for student placement. Some of the newest include the institutional kitchen at Tamms Correctional Center, overseas sites in Japan and Turkey for Fashion Merchandising internships, and an Interior Design internship site at the Bauhaus in Germany.

**Department of Health and Leisure**

**Strengths.** Athletic training, recreation, and physical therapy assistant programs are all accredited. The national certification examination and workshop offered on-site, Health/Fitness Instructor™, sanctioned by the American College of Sports Medicine benefits students by making this professional opportunity so accessible. Each major has experiential components built throughout the undergraduate program, which culminates with a capstone internship experience. Students consistently appraise this to be one of the best elements of their degree programs. The department provides service to the University and regional communities. The Health Management faculty demonstrates strong institutional support through the Personal Training program offered through the campus-side Wellness Advantage Program. Students serve as personal trainers and staff the annual faculty and staff wellness screenings. Tourism faculty assists with tourism development initiatives in the region.

**Challenges.** Ongoing challenges include securing more space to make possible a student computer lab, student gathering space, conference room, technology equipped classrooms, and nearby priority-scheduled classroom space. The Health Management faculty carries a heavy teaching and advising load. Possibilities for additional course offerings are thwarted by lack of personnel and threat of overburdening existing personnel. Faculty professional development is another staffing challenge, as five faculty members are in their probationary years. Maintaining strong enrollments, especially in Recreation and Physical Therapy Assistant is a challenge. Tourism planning and development, based upon regional needs, is a key thrust for the department. An additional challenge is to attain
approval to initiate a Master of Science in Nutrition and Exercise Science, which will more effectively meet the demands of area professionals in health management fields who wish to raise their educational credentials.

Improvements in Progress. The department is working to secure accreditation in other areas where appropriate and further expand experiential learning opportunities. The department will refine its program assessment tools and procedures and develop curriculum areas in Tourism and Therapeutic Recreation. Promotional brochures are being revised and the Web site improved. The department will participate in long-term campus master planning to conceptualize an eventual move of the department to another building, involvement with Fitness Laboratory move. Participate in long-term campus master plan and conceptualize eventual move of Department to another building.

Department of Nursing

Strengths. The Department of Nursing strengths include the faculty and graduates. Faculty members participate in scholarly pursuits including research, presentations (national and international) and publications in both books and journals. All faculty are members of professional organizations and several are active in leadership positions and elected offices at the state, national, and international level.

Graduates of the programs consistently find employment and employer surveys indicate satisfactions with nursing skills and critical thinking abilities. Many graduates hold nursing leadership positions within the region. The Department’s graduates return for further education in the Bachelor of Science in Nursing (BSN) completion programs or the Master of Science in Nursing (MSN). The advanced degree programs are structured to meet the needs of the adult learner. All programs have strong experiential learning components and opportunities for learning through the use of technology.

Many scholarships as well as MSN traineeships and graduate assistant positions are available to students. Departmental endowments include support for nursing research for both faculty and students. A Health and Human Services grant for over $700,000.00 has facilitated establishment of an excellent Family Nurse Practitioner program whose graduates are meeting the primary health care needs of the rural underserved.

Challenges. The most significant challenge faced by the Department of Nursing has been resource limitations. Space for teaching and research is severely limited. Demand for nursing programs in other educational centers in the region is growing, but cannot be accomplished without increased faculty, staff, and budget.
Improvements in Progress. The faculty have recently revised the BSN curriculum to expand community based education, admit students as freshman, decrease the student-faculty ratio and provide specialized support for students in preparation for the national licensing examination for registered nurses (NCLEX-RN). The MSN curriculum is being revised to meet the demand for nursing educators and care management specialists. The nursing faculty has a goal to become an independent College of Nursing and Health Care and to integrate the health clinic and its student services within the newly established entity.

Department of Social Work

Strengths. The major strength of the Department of Social Work is its faculty. All members of the faculty are dedicated to social work education and are excellent teachers. Another strength is the students. Social work majors are committed to the profession, the people served and the quality of the majors, as measured by GPA and ACT scores, are improving each year.

Challenges. An immediate challenge is to provide a long-range plan for graduate social work education for the region. The current part-time cohort cooperative program with the University of Missouri is a temporary program and there are no immediate plans to continue this program. In addition, the department has not received a firm commitment from the University administration to proceed with the development of a MSW program at Southeast. Another challenge is to find a way to increase the amount of scholarly activity among the social work faculty.

Improvements in Progress. In AY 1998-99, the Department received permission to recruit and hire a new tenure track position. When this position is filled, there will be eight full-time faculty in the Department. At that point, the department will achieve the objective of one faculty to 25 students.

College of Liberal Arts

The College of Liberal Arts was formed in 1988, comprising 11 departments in the former Colleges of Humanities and Social Sciences.

Organization

The College is administered by a Dean and a half-time Associate Dean. A college Advisor conducts and coordinates academic advising and enrollment activities, and reports directly to the Dean. The main College governance body is the 22-member COLA College Council, made up of the Chairperson of each department and one additional faculty member selected by each department. Council meetings are chaired by the Dean. In addition, a variety of college-level committees deal with matters such as faculty promotion and tenure, sabbatical leaves, faculty development funding, computerization, etc. These committees typically report to the Dean.

The College also oversees the Center for Faulkner Studies and the Center for Regional History. Three additional units included in the COLA are

1. the University-owned public radio station (KRCU-FM), under the direction of a manager reporting to the Dean; the station is affiliated with National Public Radio (NPR)
2. the University Museum, whose director reports directly to the COLA Dean
3. the Missouri London Program, wherein the University’s participation in a consortium of Missouri public universities is coordinated by a faculty director.

Curricula

The College of Liberal Arts has undergraduate programs leading to Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Science in Education Degrees serving over 1200 undergraduate students. There are also graduate programs leading to the degrees of Master of Arts, Master of Music Education, and Master of Science in Administration. This M.S.A., offered in the Department of Political Science, the B.F.A. and an M.A. in TESOL have been added in the last ten years. A detailed list of programs can be found in the current undergraduate and graduate Bulletins.

To assess the curriculum, departments in the College use exit exams and interviews, portfolios of student work, awards and honors won by graduating students, surveys of recent graduates, placement information, and reviews by either external reviewers or, where appropriate, accrediting agencies. Departments continually revise their programs based upon assessment data. Information on assessment activities can be found in the College of Liberal Arts Annual Report, a copy of which is in the exhibits.

The College is heavily involved in the University Studies program, providing courses in nine of the twelve categories in the core curriculum. In addition, faculty in the College offer the majority of 300-level Interdisciplinary and 400-level Senior Seminar courses. Departmental annual reports describe in more detail contributions to the University Studies program (see exhibits).
All departments in the College offer their students opportunities for experiential learning, with nine departments offering internships and several providing other types of experiential learning. For instance, the Psychology Club and Psi Chi, student organizations in the Department of Psychology, organize a yearly Undergraduate Research Conference, which provides experiential learning both for the hosts and for the students from across the campus who participate. The Department of Philosophy and Religion encourages and enables its majors to give papers at regional and national meetings. Majors in the Department of Art display their works at regional and national juried exhibitions. And music students perform both on and off campus.

Planning

The Departments and the College participate in the periodic development of the University Strategic Plan. Flowing from their involvement in the University planning process, upon adoption of the University Strategic Plan, the COLA units develop unit-level plans for accomplishing the goals of the Plan. Progress toward achieving those goals is reported by every Department annually, and is included in each COLA annual report. The 1998 COLA Report, the most recent available, includes thirty pages of reported results addressing specific goals of the University Strategic Plan.

As might be expected, some of the six priorities of the University Strategic Plan require more financial resources than others. Because some financial allocation decisions are external to the College, some of the more heavily financially-dependent objectives of the Plan have been challenging for the College to attain. On the other hand, objectives which require the application of human effort more than financial resources have been areas where COLA has reported significant accomplishments, especially those dealing with curricular improvements, student learning enhancement, service to the region, and utilization of available technology. Some challenges remain, including more universal availability of classroom technology packages, and improvement of classroom, studio, and office facilities for some units of the College.

Teaching Effectiveness

The College has 123 full-time faculty members, of whom 94 are tenured. The number of faculty, percentage of tenured faculty, use of part-time faculty, teaching loads, and student-faculty ratios are listed in Table 5-5.
Table 5-5. College of Liberal Arts Summary Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Full-time Faculty</th>
<th>Percent Tenured</th>
<th>Part-time Faculty</th>
<th>Contact Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Student / Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10.95</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Languages</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.71</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.92%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Communication</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>64.71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.50</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy &amp; Religion</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.80</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.14</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.39</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology &amp; Anthropology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.66</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Communication &amp; Theatre</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>76.42%</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11.01</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quality of teaching in the College is reflected by a number of measures: some direct, such as student evaluations and exit interviews; and some indirect, such as student grade point averages, performance on exams, and exhibitions and performances.

The quality of teaching in the College is assessed regularly by the administration of student evaluations in all classes every semester, and response are on the whole positive, though not all departments report student evaluation data in their annual reports. One department that does is the Department of Psychology, where student responses for 1998 show that faculty overall scored 4.46 on a 5-point scale in response to a question about teaching effectiveness and 4.57 in response to a question about professional competence. Faculty use student evaluations in making needed changes in their teaching.

Also, faculty attendance at teaching effective workshops offered by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning indicate a desire to improve as classroom teachers (see CSTL report in exhibits for attendance figures).

Seven of the departments on the college conduct exit surveys or interviews with graduating seniors (with an eighth in the process of planning to implement such interviews). As reported in the 1998 annual reports, these tend to show high levels of satisfaction with teaching.
Other measures of quality teaching include MFAT results (for example, students taking the 1998 MFAT in sociology placed the department at the 83rd percentile) and work compiled in student portfolios.

Graduate students responses in surveys and interviews also indicate effective teaching. Of graduating M.A. students in English, for example, eight of the ten students agreed that “the quality of instruction has been high.” Exit interviews in the Departments of English and Political Science elicited very favorable responses about the quality of teaching.

One possible concern is the reliance on adjunct faculty, mainly in the Department of English, where many sections of the freshman composition courses are staffed by part-time faculty and Teaching Assistants. However, the Teaching Assistants undergo a thorough preparation for their teaching experience and participate in ongoing review, and part-time faculty are evaluated regularly (with the evaluations usually indicating a high level of faculty competence and commitment).

Scholarship

Given the diversity of departments within the College, the nature of professional activity varies widely, including artistic exhibitions, performances, publications, and presentations at professional meetings. Details can be found in the departmental annual reports.

In addition, many students in the College were involved in these activities. For undergraduates, these include exhibitions organized by the Departments of Art and History; performances arranged by the Departments of Music and Speech Communication and Theatre; publications in Journey, the student literary magazine produced by the Department of English; journalism in the Capaha Arrow, the student newspaper sponsored by the Department of Mass Communication; presentations at professional meetings by majors in the Department of Philosophy and Religion; and presentations of research at the Student Research Conference organized by students in the Department of Psychology. Departmental annual reports include more details about these and other activities (see exhibits).

Graduate students in the College are also active in professional activities. For instance, during 1998, graduate students in English gave ten presentations and published one article.

Service

The College provides professional service to the elementary and secondary education communities and to the region in general. Service to schools includes such activities as the regional speech contest hosted by the Department of Speech
Communication and Theatre, the Southeast Missouri Writing Achievement Awards program organized by the Department of English, the Model United Nations run by the Department of Political Science, the Foreign Language Festival hosted by the Department of Foreign Languages, and History Day hosted by the Department of History. Details on these and other programs providing service to the region can be found in the College’s annual report (see exhibits).

Of particular note is the TESOL program in the Department of English, which through a program funded by federal grants has assisted over 200 teachers in the region to secure an endorsement in the field of ESOL. Through the M.A. in TESOL program, it has also provided training in bilingual education for many area teachers.

Faculty in the College also serve the region as consultants and volunteers. For example, 11 faculty members in the Department of Psychology have served in various capacities for 17 public service and professional agencies. Students and faculty in the Historic Preservation program have consulted on a number of projects. And faculty in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology have responded to community and regional requests for their services.

A strong component of the service mission of the College is the fine arts programming provided by the Departments of Art, Music, English, and Speech Communication and Theatre. Each semester the College publishes a Cultural Arts Calendar listing art exhibitions, poetry readings, lectures, and musical and theatrical performances (see College annual report in exhibits). The work of faculty and students as well as that of visiting artists enriches the life of the community. Non-credit Art and Music Academies are offered to provide applied lessons to the community with an emphasis on youth.

The University Museum, KRCU-FM, the campus public radio affiliate, and the Center for Faulkner Studies, and the Center for Regional History and Cultural Heritage as units of the College, also play a vital role in community service. For example, the Museum provides a venue for the annual High School Art Exhibition. Also, because it includes historical materials as well as art, it also helps to further the public’s knowledge of the region. KRCU provides NPR news, PRI programming, and a variety of music, including classical, jazz, and folk; it also airs three shows hosted by faculty in the College, including a weekly public affairs show hosted by faculty in the Departments of History, Political Science, and Speech Communication and Theatre. The Center for Faulkner Studies perhaps has the broadest reach of any unit in the College, since it provides services to scholars worldwide; scholars have visited the center from Great Britain and Japan, and a local company has agreed to underwrite a visiting Japanese scholar on a yearly basis. The Center for Regional History presents endowed lectures on regional history, and publishes monographs about Southeast Missouri culture.
Major Accomplishments Since 1990

- The plan for universal computerization was accomplished.
- College faculty apply technology in the classroom setting and have developed innovative instructional techniques.
- Experiential learning components have been widely incorporated into students' courses of study.
- The departments of History and Political Science are now housed in the extensively re-constructed Carnahan Hall.
- The Bachelor of Fine Arts degree in Art was developed and approved.
- Additional study abroad opportunities for foreign language students were developed, including opportunities for international internships.
- Through various means including the expansion of KRCU, the College enhanced its role as a provider of a cultural center for the region.

Self-Evaluations

Department of Art

Strengths. The Department offers instruction in most of the areas of fine arts, and works closely with the College of Education and the Department of Secondary Education in the preparation of art teachers. The Department has an up-to-date Macintosh Computer Lab that is used to prepare students for graphic design job opportunities. The Department offers a varied curriculum, including a B.A. degree with either a 36 hour liberal arts major or a 56 hour major in studio and commercial arts, and 80 hour B.F.A., as well as a B.S. in Education degree which qualifies students to teach art K-12 in Missouri public schools. The initial round of student assessments in 1998 disclosed that graduating seniors have been overwhelmingly satisfied with their experience in the Department, and leave the institution confident and motivated, with clear-cut, realistic goals for their future education or employment.

Challenges. The Department has identified a need to further develop offerings in the 3-D Imaging/Animation field, and plans to do so in a new B.F.A. degree. Additionally, the Department faces both the challenge and the opportunity presented by the University's River Campus proposal, which envisions a new School for the Visual and Performing Arts as well as a new cultural center for the Cape Girardeau community.

Department of English

Strengths. The Department has a dedicated, professionally active faculty that provides courses not only in the traditional literature and writing areas, but in film studies, linguistics, women's studies, teacher preparation, and other areas. A 25-workstation computer lab classroom was completed in 1996 and is being
upgraded. The Department serves the University and the community through multiple publications covering professional activities, alumni news, creative writing, student work, and information for teachers throughout the region. Senior exit interviews have identified as strengths good student-faculty relations; effective instruction in written and oral communication skills, critical thinking skills, and research skills; and strong preparation in the area of emphasis.

**Challenges.** The Department is in the process of revising the curriculum at both the graduate and undergraduate levels, and hopes to complete this restructuring during the year 2000. A large majority of the Department members are senior faculty, the stability and experience of which has been a strength, but within just a few years the Department will face the probable challenge of a large number of retirements and a large percentage of faculty turnover.

**Department of Foreign Language**

**Strengths.** The Department has been very successful in its efforts to improve recruitment and retention of students. It continues to develop and promote multiple exchange programs, and especially in that context, to provide experiential learning opportunities. The faculty have been active in professional research and writing, in taking part in pedagogical workshops, and in service to the community. Though the Department's assessment plan is relatively new, all seniors but one passed the exit exam during the 1998 year.

**Challenges.** The Department has developed a prioritized listing of ten objectives which will require additional resources, including: adequate office space, an interactive media/foreign language laboratory, a Masters degree program for high school teachers, additional faculty development opportunities overseas, and the creation of more interdisciplinary courses to increase globalization on campus.

**Department of History**

**Strengths.** The faculty of the Department are experienced, professionally well-prepared, and dedicated. They are a mix of senior and junior faculty, and they are very active in the service to the region. The Department is housed in the newly-refurbished Carnahan Hall, and as a result, has first-rate offices and classrooms. Assessment of these programs in 1998 disclosed that over one-third of history majors graduated with honors that year. Over 70% of graduates were placed in employment or in graduate school, and two graduate students received research awards for their papers.

**Challenges.** The Department is faced with the challenges and opportunities presented by the impending retirement of several senior faculty. Curriculum review continues with the objective of continuous improvement. The Department continues to believe that budget allocations for discipline-related library holdings
must be increased. The Department has identified a need for improved methods of data collection for assessment activities.

Department of Mass Communications

Strengths. The Department serves a large number of majors with a relatively small faculty (322 students in 1998 with nine full-time and four part-time faculty). Assessment data show that the quality of department graduates continues to increase. In 1998, sixteen students graduated with honors, up 44% from the previous year. Internship experiences are rated of high quality by students, as are the satisfaction with Departmental academic programs, the course offerings, and the curricular/professional advising received. The Department’s consultants have found the Department to be in compliance with the national Accrediting Council for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (ACEJMC) standards in governance, curriculum, faculty, scholarship, service, and internships.

Challenges. The large number of students being served with a relatively small, relatively junior faculty means that the individual faculty workload is potentially heavier than it might be in other departments. Work continues to achieve compliance with six additional ACEJMC standards. The Department acknowledges a need to maintain recruitment efforts to generate a quality student population and move toward accreditation. The primary need to reach accreditation status is space for enhanced instructional facilities.

Department of Music

Strengths. The Department has increased enrollments of quality students, and more performances, and outreach activities than it has had in the past. These improvements can be credited to a strong and dedicated faculty. Faculty actively make presentations and performances throughout the region, and continue their activity in professional organizations. The Golden Eagles marching band and its director have increased their national and international visibility during recent years having performed in the Edinburgh Military Tattoo in August, 1999.

Challenges. The Department faces some of the same challenges and opportunities faced by related departments with regard to the development of the River Campus proposal. The Department hopes that the promise of that proposal and corresponding increase in financial support will yield improved outcomes, especially with regard to facilities, which the Department currently feels are inadequate and antiquated. The Department faces an impending reaccreditation process, and an acknowledged need to revisit certain curricular issues.
Department of Philosophy and Religion

Strengths. The Department’s programs are scholarly and pedagogically rigorous, and serve multiple campus constituencies, including the University Studies program as well as programs requiring specific student instruction in ethics. The faculty are scholars active in both the substantive disciplines of the field as well as in the scholarship of teaching and learning. The full-time regular faculty are mostly senior in rank, though not necessarily senior in years of service. With no foreseen retirements pending, the makeup of the Department should remain relatively stable in the near term. The rate of student placement in graduate school has been 100% over the past decade, though of a rather small population. Other measures of student success in the Department assessment plan demonstrate a high level of student performance.

Challenges. The Department feels that its physical facilities require improvement. The classrooms are deemed “not even barely adequate,” with inappropriate physical configuration and inadequate technology capability. Faculty offices all are inadequate. The Department feels that the library journal holdings in the discipline are inadequate. One additional challenge facing the Department is the upcoming revision and full implementation of the student research component of its assessment plan.

Department of Political Science

Strengths. The seven full-time faculty members all hold the Ph.D., and are all active teacher-scholars. The seniority of the faculty is widely distributed, with half the members having been at Southeast for twenty years or more, and half the faculty for ten years or less. The physical facilities are first rate, being located in the newly-refurbished Carnahan Hall. Each classroom has a high-quality technology package, and the faculty are active in their use of technology both inside and outside the classroom. Virtually all faculty members are advisors to co-curricular student organizations. Faculty have been active in supporting the University Studies program, the Honors program, and in participating in other curricular innovations. Students in exit interviews rate their overall experience highly.

Challenges. The Department continues to work on full development and implementation of its assessment plan, and on a more complete method of tracking graduates. The Department will complete its program review in the year 2000, and so will be incorporating its self study and student assessment results with its strategic plan to fine-tune its direction. With the 1999 hiring of a faculty member to replace a retiring one, it was anticipated that a certain amount of curricular revision would be both appropriate and likely.
Department of Psychology

Strengths. The Department faculty are qualified teacher-scholars with a broad diversity of expertise. The fifteen full-time faculty are all tenured, and all but one are at the Professor or Associate Professor rank. Despite this level of seniority, no large number of retirements are anticipated in the short term, so relative stability can be expected. The Department plays a very visible role on campus in the areas of technology and experiential learning. Annually, the Department and its two student organizations co-sponsor the Student Research Conference, which gives students the opportunity to experience first-hand presentation of their work at a professional conference. The Department’s B.S. degree attracted over two hundred majors during 1998, which made it the second-largest program in the College.

Challenges. The Department’s Strategic Plan identifies five areas where the faculty wished to strengthen performance. Two of those, assessment and experiential learning, have received much attention. The remaining three areas--distance learning, advising, and educational technology--will receive additional effort in the near term. Additionally, the Department plans to develop and implement an exit interview for graduating seniors, and plans to work to improve job and graduate school placement rates.

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Strengths. The Department serves a variety of constituencies, offering majors both in sociology and anthropology as well as four minors, and providing courses for the University Studies program in addition to several programs in other colleges. Faculty scholarship is sound and increasing, and faculty are active in state professional associations, developing grant proposals, presenting/publishing scholarly papers, and serving the community. Retention of students has been successful, and the overall number of majors has remained steady. Student performance is high, and recent results of the MFAT in Sociology place the program at the 83rd percentile. Though there is no corresponding exam for Anthropology, one measure of success is provided by the fact that approximately 80% of Anthropology graduates attend graduate school, and virtually all receive some type of scholarship or other financial assistance.

Challenges. Despite full computerization of the faculty and the establishment of computer instruction and assignments in a wide variety of classes, the Department is hampered by the lack of a departmental or building computer lab.

Department of Speech Communication and Theatre

Strengths. All full-time members of the Department hold the appropriate terminal degree. The permanent faculty are largely senior, with several recent retirements and others likely. The stability of the faculty as a group has been a strength, and
that will conceivably give way to the opportunity to add replacement faculty. Departmental student/faculty ratios have increased over the past five years, and are now at or above target ratios. The number of majors is holding steady, and preliminary indications are that graduating seniors are highly satisfied with the program and feel that the quality of the faculty is a major Departmental strength.

**Challenges.** The Department has only begun to implement its assessment plan, so the data are somewhat sketchy. To address this issue, the Department has identified a need to modify the assessment plan itself, including the substitution of a student satisfaction survey for exit interviews, the implementation of capstone course juries, etc. The Department has pointed to its progress toward achieving its strategic goals in areas where resources have been made available, but feels that progress in other identified areas has been hampered by the lack of sufficient resources to accomplish designated objectives. Finally, questions surrounding the proposed River Campus program present a challenge for the Department, especially for its theatre component.

**College of Science and Mathematics**

The designation of College of Science and Mathematics was completed in the spring of 2000. The change from the College of Science and Technology was necessitated by the formation of the School of Polytechnic Studies and the placement of the programs in industrial technology and agriculture in the school.

**Organization**

Seven academic Departments and three Centers report directly to the Dean of the College. The Departments are Agriculture (since relocated to the School of Polytechnic Studies), Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science, Geosciences, Physics and Mathematics. The other three units are the COST Advising Center, the Godwin Center for Science and Mathematics Education, and the Southeast Missouri Regional Crime Lab. Additionally, the University Demonstration Farm and the Horticultural Greenhouse report to the Chairperson of the Department of Agriculture; and the Center for Earthquake Studies reports to the Chairperson of the Department of Geosciences. A College-wide interdisciplinary, bachelor's program in Environmental Science reports to the Dean. Each Department or degree program in the College is involved in some form of external review. The Department of Chemistry program is certified by the American Chemical Society. The Department of Physics is in the process of obtaining accreditation for its engineering physics program from the Accrediting Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET). The Department of Computer Science is in the process of obtaining accreditation for its systems program from the Computer Science Accrediting Board. The University has established a five year rotation for the external review of all the Departments or Programs that do not have accrediting...
bodies. Three Departments in the College have been reviewed in the past three years and the remaining are scheduled in the next few years.

The College of Science and Mathematics is administered by a Dean and a half-time Associate Dean. Each Department is administered by a Chairperson. The Centers and the Environmental Science program are administered by a Director. College governance is supplied by the COST College Council. The Council is chaired by the Dean and is composed of the Associate Dean, the Chairpersons and a faculty representative from each Department. Several Directors sit on the Council in a non-voting capacity. The Council also serves the function of a college-level curriculum committee.

A variety of standing and ad-hoc committees report to the Council or, in a few cases, to the Dean. An executive committee consisting of the Associate Dean and the Chairpersons acts in an advisory role to the Dean. The College Professional Development Committee also reports directly to the Dean. This committee has the responsibility to distribute the college-wide professional development funds. This money is used primarily to support travel to present scholarly work.

Curricula

The College of Science and Mathematics, serving approximately 1200 students, has undergraduate programs leading to Bachelor of Arts, Bachelor of Science, and Bachelor of Science in Education (Secondary Education) degrees. There is also a graduate program leading to a Master of Natural Science (MNS) degree. In addition, the college supports several pre-professional programs in health-related fields and in engineering.

To review the curriculum, the College uses accrediting agencies for the programs that have them, and external reviews for the programs that do not. Each department is also establishing an assessment program that includes substantial feedback from graduating seniors. The College has an emphasis on experiential learning. This is accomplished by a combination of a strong undergraduate research program in several departments (Biology, Chemistry, Geosciences, Physics), and an internship program that is well-established in Agriculture and is being developed in Computer Science and Mathematics. All departments have established courses for either undergraduate research or internships, and all graduate programs have courses in research methods and in graduate research.

The newest degree program in the College of Science and Mathematics is the Environmental Science Program, leading to a major in Environmental Science (B.S.), or a minor in either Environmental Science (for non-science majors) or Environmental Studies (for science majors). The curriculum towards the B.S. in environmental science is a science intensive program that consists of core courses required of every major, and an area of emphasis (biology, business, chemistry, or geoscience). The curriculum is designed to provide majors with fundamental
knowledge of the scientific, social, ethical, legal, economic, and medical aspects of environmental issues.

Planning

In the spring 1998 semester, an Ad Hoc Committee was established to develop an updated Strategic Plan for the College of Science and Mathematics. This committee consisted of the Dean and one representative from each of the departments in the College. A plan was developed (approval still pending from College Council), patterned after the six priorities established at the University level. Major goals outlined in this plan include:

- Continue external and internal reviews of each department, and attain accreditation where applicable
- Improve the quality of faculty so that all will follow the teacher/scholar model as defined by the university
- Provide experiential learning opportunities for all students in the College
- Establish appropriate means of assessment of departmental programs, preferably through nationally normed instruments
- Develop and implement recruitment/retention plans
- Improve information technology to enhance student learning
- Improve student outlook on the College, and create a work environment that fosters cooperation
- Improve physical facilities of the College

Teaching Effectiveness

The College has 78 full-time faculty members, of which 61 are tenured. The number of faculty, tenure to non-tenure ratios, use of part-time faculty, teaching loads, and faculty-student ratios for 1998 are given for each department in the College in Table 6.

Table 5-6. Summary Data for the College of Science and Mathematics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of Faculty</th>
<th>Tenure: Non-tenure Ratio</th>
<th>Use of Part-time Faculty</th>
<th>Contact Hours Per Week</th>
<th>Student/Faculty Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6:1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>18.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14:6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9:2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7:0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5:2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13:5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The faculty in the College average 11.6 contact hours per week each semester, and teach an average of 18.7 students per class.

A number of indicators suggest that the quality of teaching in the College is excellent. Majors in the various disciplines within the College have a median grade point average of 2.96. Four disciplines (Biology, Chemistry, Mathematics and Physics) have available the Major Field Achievement Test for measuring the knowledge gained by graduating seniors. The departmental averages for Biology, Chemistry and Mathematics majors were each above the 50th percentile on the test in 1998. Of five Physics majors, three scored above the national mean on the 1998 test and two below the mean. Twenty-three of 35 (66%) of the pre-med students who have applied to medical schools in the past three years have been accepted. The national average is between 40 and 50%. Thirty-three of 33 medical technology majors who entered the clinical year program since 1990 have passed the National Registry Exam. The Institute for Certification of Computing Professionals (ICCP) certifies candidates as Associate Computing Professionals (ACP) through a national examination. During the 1998-99 academic year, thirty-three Computer Science majors took the exam and 14 were certified. Interviews of exiting seniors in Agriculture and Geoscience suggest that the small size of classes and the associated benefits of being able to access faculty and to be known by faculty contribute to the quality of the educational process.

Several initiatives developed in accord with strategic planning goals have resulted in Funding for Results support. These include using the University Studies objectives as a framework for the integration of HIV/AIDS issues into the curriculum, incorporation of Molecular Biology Investigations (BI450/650) into the curriculum, using calculator based labs to integrate physical science to students’ everyday experiences, and development of Project Starlab. In addition, a grant of $12,075 was received through Clemson University in conjunction with Casio Corporation for graphing calculators to be used in the math department, and the science and religion course received a $10,000 award from Templeton Foundation.

Five options in the College lead to the Master of Natural Science (MNS) degree. They are biology, chemistry, geosciences, mathematics and science education. Typically, 85 students are enrolled with 38% holding graduate assistantships. A number of the graduate students are secondary school teachers who are working on the degree part-time.

Scholarship

Scholarship in the College is measured broadly and includes formal publications, presentations, grant writing, and involvement with student research. Details can
be found in departmental annual reports. Many students have been involved in
publications and presentations. In 1998, undergraduates participated in 26
presentations and 12 publications, while graduate students participated in 12
presentations and 11 publications.

For the calendar year 1998, the College had 16 internal grants in effect worth
$56,300. The College received 179 external grants in the amount of $7,167,417
between 1990 and 1998 from funding agencies such as NSF, NIH, USDA and
USFWS. Since 1990, the faculty in the college have increased the dollar amount
of grants awarded by 100%.

Service

The College of Science and Mathematics provides professional public service to
the elementary and secondary education community and to the regional
community in general. To focus its efforts to support and enhance science and
mathematics education throughout Missouri, the College established the Linda H.
Godwin Center for Science and Mathematics Education. The KSAM Project for
promoting K-12 hands-on science and math activities in the Godwin Center is the
recipient of the prestigious Christa McAuliffe Award. Its other programs include:
Star Lab, a portable planetarium that local teachers may use; the Math and
Science Teachers Answerline, a free Missouri-wide phone-in help line; the Math
Resource Center and the NASA Educator Resource Center that offer teaching
materials, software and other resources in support of K-12 education, and a
variety of continuing education programs in math and science for regional
teachers. A new program is the Masters in Natural Science in Science Education,
which offers graduate degree options in secondary and elementary science
education. In addition to these activities, several departments within the College
and the Godwin Center sponsor regional science or mathematics contests, or other
annual programs. These include Chemistry Bowl, the District FFA Contests,
Math Field Day, Physics Olympics, Science Fair, and the Horizons Program.

Service to the regional community is provided though applied research,
demonstrations, and continuing education and extended learning courses and
programs. The Southeast Missouri Regional Crime Laboratory serves regional
law enforcement agencies. The Center for Earthquake Studies, administered by
the Department of Geosciences, offers public service through outreach programs
on earthquake education, awareness, and preparedness. It also develops and
participates in projects related to mitigating the effects of earthquakes. The
University Demonstration Farm, operated by the Department of Agriculture in
collaboration with four other federal, state, and local agencies, serves as a
teaching, demonstration, and research site for cow/calf production, management
intensive rotational grazing, and natural resource conservation. The Missouri
Rice Research Farm, also operated by the Department of Agriculture with two
partners, provides a site for applied research in support of Missouri’s rice
production industry. Both farms support undergraduate teaching and research and
offer opportunities for internships. A project currently being developed in cooperation with the Missouri Department of Conservation is the Nature Center at North County Park. When built, this Center will be one of six operated by the Department of Conservation and various collaborating organizations throughout Missouri. The College’s role will be to provide support staff, student interns, and programming on science, nature, conservation, and related topics for K-12 students and the general public.

The College operates three additional facilities that have a significant role in providing service to the local community. The Astronomical Observatory, operated by the Department of Physics, provides opportunities for the public to observe the heavens. The Kelso Wildlife Sanctuary, located in Cape Girardeau and operated by the Department of Biology, offers opportunities for hiking, birdwatching, and other activities within its forested landscape. The Department of Agriculture’s Horticultural Greenhouse and All-America Display Garden supports programs and demonstrations of interest to local gardeners.

The faculty is active in national and regional professional societies. The College occasionally hosts professional meetings; for example, the Missouri Academy of Sciences met on the Southeast campus during the spring 1999 semester.

**Major Accomplishments since 1990**

Over the last ten years, the accomplishments of the College of Science and Mathematics include the following:

- Two new graduate options under the Master of Natural Science, Applied Chemistry and Science Education, were established.
- An interdisciplinary program in Environmental Science was established.
- Involvement in experiential learning opportunities for research and internships increased.
- Physical facilities, computer technology and lab equipment improved.
- Grants and funded research grew dramatically.
- The Linda Godwin Center for Science and Mathematics was established. The center’s KSAM program serves large numbers of teachers and is nationally recognized.
- The Godwin Center was selected as a site for a NASA Educator Resource center.
- The University Farm moved to better facilities.

**Self Evaluations**

**Department of Agriculture**

**Strengths.** In exit interviews, graduating majors consistently declare satisfaction with their experience and praise the quality of the Department’s faculty and student/faculty relationships. Assessment results recently led the Department to
completely revise and update all of its curricula. The internship program is 14 years old, well established, and very successful. All majors are required to complete an internship or undergraduate research project. The Department is well supported by its nearly 1,000 alumni. Professional service to the community includes research projects aimed at helping local potato, rice, and vegetable producers solve production problems; research and demonstration projects at the University Farm to develop and demonstrate best practices in cow/calf production, management intensive rotational grazing, and natural resource management; projects at the Horticulture Greenhouse and All-America Display Garden to demonstrate new cultivars and horticultural techniques; landscape design and installation projects to beautify on- and off-campus sites; sponsorship of the annual District FFA Contests; and active participation on a variety of boards and councils, e.g., the Production Credit Association’s Board of Directors and the University of Missouri Extension Council. Relationships between the Department’s faculty and local agriculturists and horticulturists and between the Department and local agricultural institutions—e.g., the University of Missouri’s Delta Center, University Outreach and Extension, and the Missouri Department of Conservation—are strong and mutually supportive.

Challenges. The most significant challenge faced by the Department of Agriculture has been resource limitations. An inadequate number of faculty members, low equipment budget, and lack of research space has limited the Department’s growth and development. The lack of research space will become increasingly problematic as senior faculty members retire and are replaced. In the next few years the Horticultural Greenhouse needs to be replaced. A modern facility would better support the Department’s teaching, research, and service projects in the plant and soil sciences.

Improvements in Progress. The Department of Agriculture has proposals for the complete revision of its curricula pending with the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education. We have also proposed a two-plus-two program for the BS in Agribusiness/Horticulture Option in collaboration with St. Louis Community College and the University of Missouri at St. Louis. This program will allow students receiving an AA or AAS in Horticulture in the St. Louis metropolitan area to complete a BS without leaving the city. The Department has received an eighth faculty position and will use it to hire a small grains breeder to support the activities of the Missouri Rice Research and Merchandising Council. This faculty member will be located at the Bootheel Education Center in Malden, Missouri. The Department has moved to the School of Polytechnic Studies.

Department of Biology

Strengths. In 1998 there were 269 biology majors and 432 total majors with significant ties to the Department of Biology (e.g., education, pre-medical, and pre-dental majors). These numbers have been steadily increasing throughout the 1990’s, which indicates a continuing trend toward career options in biology, and presumably reflects positively on the programs offered by the department.
Although assessment of the Biology program continues to be a challenging issue (see comments below), recent results from the Major Field Achievement Test (MFAT) are very favorable, providing further support that the department programs appear to be serving the students well. In 1998, department faculty, often in association with students, made 25 platform or poster presentations at regional or national meetings; 53 papers were published, submitted, or in press; and 450,000+ dollars in grant monies were in force. The faculty applied for over 1.3 million dollars in new grant support. These numbers compare favorably with performance in recent years as the department strives to build and maintain their level of scholarly activity. The faculty is also very involved in service-oriented activities, both on and off campus, including judging at science fairs, presenting workshops to local schools and organizations, serving as advisors to student and community organizations, and governance in their professional organizations.

Challenges. The most significant challenge is finalizing and implementing changes to a revised curriculum that was developed in response to a recent external review. Another challenge is to implement assessment policies for the undergraduate and graduate programs. At present the MFAT is used to assess the undergraduate curriculum, and a portfolio system is used to monitor the progress of graduate students. Part of the problem will be to develop a system that creates strong incentives for undergraduate students to take the MFAT seriously so the results accurately reflect on departmental programs. Another problem will be to find an individual to oversee the undergraduate assessment process, including a yearly statistical analysis. Other challenges involve space, renovation, and equipment issues. Most of the classrooms in Magill Hall are in serious need of renovation, including the addition of current technology. The same is true for Johnson Hall 200 where significant numbers of non-science majors are taught. Other space issues will appear in the future as faculty become more involved in research, especially involving students as part of their experiential learning requirement. In an equipment-intensive discipline such as biology, funds to maintain or add to present equipment are a constant challenge. Basic operating costs increase each year, making it more difficult to meet the needs of the student. Finding additional funds to provide quality classroom instruction, as well as support for faculty/student research, will continue to be a challenge.

Improvements in progress. The proposed Biology curriculum will have three areas of specialization (Organismal, Ecological, and Evolutionary Biology; Microbiology, Cellular, and Molecular Biology; and Biomedical Sciences), all with the same set of required courses totaling 25 credit hours. The 100- and 200-level core will be significantly revised. Each track will have a different three-credit course required for that specialization, and 12 credits of biology electives. There will be an increase in non-biology science requirements for all majors. The assessment plan currently in use for the biology program is under review, with final decisions due by Fall 1999.
Department of Chemistry

Strengths. The Department has a quality program that prepares students for graduate schools, or careers in Chemistry or chemically related fields. An American Chemical Society Certified Degree is available. Small class sizes allow for better student-faculty interactions, and there are opportunities for experiential learning (either in research or internships). Fifteen of the 19 Chemistry graduates in 1998 (both B.S. and B.A.) participated in experiential learning. The Department obtained 3 grants during the year totaling $107,000 from the National Science Foundation and the Petroleum Research Foundation to help support research for Chemistry students. Five published papers were co-authored by Chemistry students, and nine papers were presented at professional meetings by Chemistry students this year. Of the 9 B.S. graduates, one was accepted to law school and five were accepted to graduate programs. The department has recently obtained a $180,000 nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) instrument through a grant from the National Science Foundation. An inductively coupled plasma (ICP) instrument valued at $125,000 was received as a gift from Perkin Elmer Corporation. A $20,000 fourier transform infrared (FT-IR) spectrometer was acquired through a NASA/JOVE grant along with money from the College and the Department of Chemistry. A used gas chromatograph coupled with a mass spectrometer valued at $25,000 was donated to the department by Golden Cat/Ralston Purina.

Challenges. One of the challenges facing the department is maintaining suitable physical facilities. Chemistry research facilities in Magill Hall are antiquated and research space is inadequate. An old building creates safety concerns that have had to be dealt with, and will continue to need attention. In order to keep the curriculum current, up-to-date instrumentation is needed, and it is very expensive. In spite of recent acquisitions, there is a need for additional instrumentation, especially an x-ray spectrometer valued at $400,000, and additional upgraded computers.

Improvements in Progress. The Chemistry faculty have incorporated information technology into their classes. Chemistry now has a computer server. However, the department is not where it needs to be with respect to computer hardware. The Department of Chemistry has recently implemented the Master of Natural Science (MNS) in Applied Chemistry degree program. The emphasis in Forensic Chemistry is popular in this degree program. An additional faculty member is needed to support the graduate program.

Department of Computer Science

Strengths. The Department is committed to student learning and to high quality education. The department offers a broad selection of degree options. The curricula are continually upgraded in accordance with national standards. The faculty of the Department is devoted to continuing professional development, by participating in national and regional meetings and workshops, and by engaging
in independent study. Experiential learning is an integral part of student learning in the Department, and the faculty provide one-on-one guidance in the laboratory experiences. All majors are required to take the capstone Software Engineering course, in which they work in teams to produce a complete software product. The greatest evidence of the strength of the Department is its successful students and graduates. This year at least ten students had internships with national and local companies and on-campus positions. Graduates of the Department are sought out by large corporations such as Boeing and Southwestern Bell, as well as by numerous smaller companies. Employers indicate their satisfaction with the preparation of new hires from the Department's graduates, and unsolicited reports from graduates indicate that the education they received at Southeast Missouri State University often places them at an advantage over fellow workers who graduated from other schools.

**Challenges.** The major challenge to the Department is maintaining its commitment to leading edge curricula and serving a growing number of majors despite limited resources. The Department currently has the equivalent of only six full-time faculty members and has over 200 majors. The rapid changes in computer technology often lead to out-of-date, inadequate lab computers. These changes extend to software, thus putting a heavy workload on the faculty. It has been difficult for the department to obtain a new faculty position, and in the current market it is difficult to hire a Ph.D. in Computer Science.

**Improvements in progress.** The Department's introductory courses are being changed to incorporate the object-oriented paradigm. Student lab assistants have begun providing help in the introductory level closed labs and in Student Learning Center sessions. The Department hopes to hire a Ph.D. in Computer Science this year. The Department is planning to have an outside review soon to offer suggestions for improvement.

**Department of Geosciences**

**Strengths.** Experiential learning is a strength of the Department’s undergraduate program. Experiential-based offerings include a summer field geology sequence, a required research-methods class, and a senior capstone course. Many students utilize electives for additional undergraduate research, including Graduation with Distinction in the Major that requires a senior thesis. Senior exit interviews cite small class size and student-faculty rapport as a departmental strength. The heavy laboratory component in all programs also fosters student-faculty interaction. The faculty has a long, consistent record of grantsmanship, publication, and presentation at national and international professional meetings. All calendar-year 1998 degree recipients received employment offers.

**Challenges.** Increasing the number of majors is the primary challenge facing the Department. Curricular changes, necessitated by the Missouri Geologist Registry Law, have increased the rigor of the program over the past few years; this may be a factor in the decline of declared majors. Senior exit interviews cite lack of
modern equipment as the major deficiency in the Department. The principal complaint is inadequacy of computing resources for image processing and Geographic Information System applications. The Department wants to develop undergraduate internship opportunities but needs faculty release time to organize and coordinate such a program. Recently, the Department acquired a 15-passenger van, meeting a long-standing need to transport small upper-division classes on local field trips. However, the current budget structure will not permit replacement when this vehicle wears out.

**Improvements in progress.** Internship and employment opportunities are now systematically posted in a prominent location outside the Department office and visits by State Parks representatives are arranged each spring. Faculty are identifying internship opportunities within their professional networks. Several professors are active in the Environmental Science major. This new program is expected to increase enrollments in courses taken by Geoscience majors. Equipment needs are partially met through external grants, most recently, a $102,000 X-ray diffractometer. University matching is a major incentive for submitting these equipment proposals. The Department now has exclusive use (permanent loan from a federal agency) of a truck, mounted with a soil probe, for faculty and graduate student research. Alumni relations developed significantly over the last decade due, largely, to periodic Department newsletters. Alumni and faculty donations to the Department are increasing.

**Department of Mathematics**

**Strengths.** The Department faculty shares a strong commitment to serving its students. This commitment is embodied in a three-fold mission: Preparing future teachers in mathematics; preparing future mathematicians for graduate work, business or industry; and teaching mathematics to non-mathematics majors. Class size for major courses is kept in the range of ten to 20 students. The profile of the Department has substantially changed recently due to retirements, with seven new faculty members (out of 18) added during the last five years. This has had a catalyzing effect, with the entire department becoming more innovative in the classroom and more active professionally.

**Challenges.** There are four main challenges before the Department of Mathematics: (1) Improving the support of College Algebra and Applied Calculus; (2) Expanding the use of technology in the classroom; (3) Recruiting mathematics education majors; and, (4) Improving facilities.

**Improvements in progress.** With support from the Provost, the Mathematics Learning Center was expanded to provide more tutorial support for courses such as College Algebra and Applied Calculus. A course in Statistical Reasoning will be offered for the first time in the Fall of 1999 to provide an alternative to College Algebra. New faculty members continue to help the entire faculty get involved with technology and mathematics education reforms. Math Field Day annually brings 700 of the best high school mathematics students to campus for an exciting
competition; modifications to it continue to better assist area teachers and to recruit more students to Southeast.

**Department of Physics**

**Strengths.** The major strengths of the Department include its dedicated faculty, its diverse curriculum, and its ability to make long term strategic plans to prepare for future needs and opportunities. The diverse curriculum is made up of distinct but complimentary areas of physics and engineering that adds breadth to the Department that is rare for its size. The Department continues to be a leader in integrating technology and newer pedagogical techniques into the curriculum. The Physics curriculum is in full compliance with national guidelines established by the American Physical Society. One of the greatest accomplishments of the Department was to realize the need for an ABET accredited Engineering Physics degree option and to begin replacing retired faculty with engineering faculty over the last ten years. The results of planning and executing this process will be the application for ABET accreditation in the Fall 2000.

**Challenges.** The greatest challenge of the department is surviving with a relatively small number of majors while maintaining a rather expensive inventory of equipment to maintain high quality experiences for majors and service courses. While the current number of majors, in the low 20s, is consistent with the national average for physics departments, it is still small compared to many other majors. Although the quality of the faculty, curriculum, and students is high, it remains a challenge to keep quality as an important factor when competing for institutional resources. The department has been very successful in maintaining lower level equipment and supplies for the introductory segment of the curriculum, and now needs to focus more on the upper level majors' laboratory courses.

**Improvements in Progress.** Over the last few years the Department has completed its investment in engineering faculty and curriculum modifications and is now waiting for those investments to post returns. In preparation for the ABET self-study, the Department has adopted a set of goals, outcomes, and assessment indicators that form a closed loop, quality control structure to insure continual, responsive, and productive growth.

**The School of Polytechnic Studies**

The Polytechnic Institute (PTI) was created in November of 1996 to put more emphasis and greater focus on advanced technical education on the Southeast campus and in the service region. The approval of the University’s Strategic Plan, an identified role in CBHE’s State Plan for Postsecondary Technical Education and a funded Mission Enhancement proposal, pointed to the need for the development of an organizational unit to allow Southeast to take a leadership role in enhancing the technical education opportunities in Southeast Missouri.
The Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology (IET) with programs accredited by the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT) was the first department in PTI. In November of 1999, the Department of Agriculture joined PTI and it was renamed the School of Polytechnic Studies. Because the Department of Agriculture’s data is included in the College of Science and Technology report, it will not be included in this report.

Organization

Until 1996, the Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology was part of the College of Science and Technology. Effective November 1, 1999, the School of Polytechnic Studies was established with the Dean reporting directly to the Provost. The School of Polytechnic Studies has two departments, the Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology, and the Department of Agriculture. The Chairperson of each Department reports to the Dean of the School of Polytechnic Studies. Along with the other Colleges and Schools on campus, the School of Polytechnic Studies is responsible for actions and recommendations concerning general operations, policies, and programs. Actions on curriculum, hiring, tenure, promotion, merit, budgets, and planning are shared between faculty committees, the Chairs, and the Dean. Both the Departments of Agriculture and Industrial and Engineering Technology have Advisory Committees made up of industrial leaders from the region. Outreach activities are coordinated through the Manufacturing Technology Resource Center with the Coordinator reporting to the Chairperson. The School of Polytechnic Studies also has an Advisor and Outreach Coordinator as well as a Technology Supervisor.

Curriculum

The Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology had 289 undergraduate majors in 1998 compared to 230 in 1994. Most of the growth has been from the associate of applied science degree and transfer students. Bachelor degree programs include Industrial Technology (with options in Electronics and Computer Technology, Industrial Management, Technology, and Technical Graphics), Manufacturing Engineering Technology, and Industrial Education. The Associate of Applied Science degree program is in Computer Technology (with options in Automated Manufacturing, Microcomputer Systems, and Technical Computer Graphics). Detailed information on these degrees appears in the University Bulletin. There were 45 undergraduate degrees granted in 1998 compared to 41 in 1994.

New campus initiatives have increased the program offerings at off-campus sites and in the evenings on campus. A cooperative 2+2 B.S. degree program is offered in St. Louis, a cooperative A.A.S. degree program in Sikeston, and both A.A.S. and 2+2 B.S. degree programs are offered on campus at night.
The Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology tracks the initial placement of graduates and in the last five years, has placed nearly 100% of the graduates into positions related to their field of study. The demand continues to increase as industries incorporate higher technologies to improve productivity. Beginning salaries for graduates continue to increase more rapidly than for most other campus graduates.

All Industrial and Engineering Technology graduates are required to complete an experiential learning experience. A capstone course, UI410, Manufacturing Research, provides students the opportunities to identify solutions to real-world industrial problems while working with others in team environments. Nearly one-half of the program’s students also choose to complete internship experiences as a part of their undergraduate education. These experiences can be completed any semester and include planning, supervision, and evaluation by a University and industrial supervisor.

Planning

The School of Polytechnic Studies present plan was developed during the University’s Strategic Planning process completed in 1995. An interim plan was completed in 1998 to serve the School of Polytechnic Studies until the University repeats the Strategic Planning process beginning in 2000. All of the faculty and staff were included in the 1995 planning process. The plan has served the School of Polytechnic Studies well and has helped form the basis for the increased equipment funding, new programs, new faculty positions, and a new facility.

Teaching Effectiveness

One of the continuing issues for technology and engineering programs is the shortage of qualified faculty. Over the past several years, the School has been fortunate to recruit and retain an excellent qualified faculty. The quality is verified through student and peer evaluations as well as yearly activity reports showing good progress toward promotion and tenure. The quality of the faculty is also verified by the feedback received from industries in which faculty consult and conduct training. The Department of Industrial and Engineering faculty is made up of 10 FTE with one being the Dean with one-quarter time for teaching responsibilities and the Chairperson with one-half time for teaching responsibilities. There are two Full Professors, three Associate Professors, and five Assistant Professors. Because of the number of recent new hires, only two faculty are tenured. Presently, part-time faculty teach only 4-6 course sections each semester. A recent increase in off-campus and night offerings continues to stretch our faculty, but we have new positions available in upcoming Mission Enhancement budgets.
Scholarship

The Department of Industrial and Engineering Technology faculty developed tenure, promotion, and merit documents to support the teacher/scholar model. The 1998 faculty year-end reports (eight full-time faculty) showed a total of nine published articles, six national and international presentations, and nineteen grant proposals. There are several University initiatives to assist with faculty scholarship. The Industrial and Engineering Technology faculty each have between $1000- $1500 for professional travel each year. The Funding For Results, Summer Grant Writing Award, and GRFC programs provide excellent opportunities for faculty to develop and procure funding for research and other scholarship activities. Interaction with area industry and the MTRC also provide excellent opportunities for faculty scholarship.

Service

The Industrial and Engineering Technology Department has both credit and non-credit based outreach/service initiatives. The Cooperative St. Louis 2+2 B.S. degree program and Southeast P.M. (both A.A.S. and B.S. degrees) are examples of credit initiatives. Our non-credit activities are the focus of the Manufacturing Technology Resource Center (MTRC). Faculty work through the Center for the delivery of seminars, workshops, and consulting for area industry. Recent MTRC seminars have included: MotorMaster+ Motor Management, Introduction to SolidWorks, Square D Motor Controls, Rebuilding Issues of Electric Motors, Energy Saving Opportunities with Variable Speed Drives, Rapid Prototyping Applications, Programmable Logic Control Fundamentals, Solid Edge 3D Modeling, and Network Cabling. Student involvement in UI410, Manufacturing Research, and internships are also considered to be a service to area industries. We also provide office space for the Mid-America Manufacturing Technology Center-Missouri (MAMTC), a non-profit organization that provides consulting services to area industries.

Major Accomplishments Since 1990:

- Department of Agriculture has joined the unit.
- Achieved School status.
- Full six-year reaccreditation by the National Association of Industrial Technology.
- New programs and/or options: Manufacturing Engineering Technology, and 2+2 Cooperative Program in St. Louis.
- State designation as a Center of Excellence in Advanced Manufacturing Technology.
- New base state funding totaling nearly $1 million.
- 1998 external funding totaling nearly $900,000.
- All new faculty members hired with doctorate degrees.
• Approval for a new $7.9 million, 60,000 square-foot facility.
• Formation of the Manufacturing Technology Resource Center (MTRC).
• Nearly 100% initial job placement each year.
• 37.5% increase in enrollment from fall of 1996, to fall of 1998.
• Hiring of an Advisor and Outreach Coordinator.

Self Evaluation

Strengths. The School has been fortunate to receive excellent university and industrial financial support. Its graduates are in high demand and it has developed good relationships with area industry. The high-tech laboratories to support student learning are a plus as is the excellent faculty. The outreach programs and Manufacturing Technology Resource Center assist the University in reaching its mission to serve the Southeast Missouri region.

Challenges. As it develops, the School needs to develop further cooperative efforts with consortium partners. Selected programs need to be positioned to achieve TAC-ABET accreditation. A comprehensive program of activities for the MTRC needs to be developed.

Improvements in Progress. The success of graduates is the best indicator of the School’s success. The placement rate and beginning salaries are among the best on campus. The School is fortunate to have budgets that allow purchase of the latest in high-tech equipment available for technical programs. The curricula were recently updated to reflect the changes in technologies taught in the classes. The Industrial and Engineering Technology Department is very pleased to have been granted full re-accreditation by the National Association of Industrial Technology (NAIT) for the maximum six years for its B.S. in Industrial Technology. In addition to an outstanding and dedicated faculty, a support staff is equally qualified and dedicated. The typical student is very pragmatic and expects relevance in course content. Most of the students also work part-time which requires many of them to be enrolled part-time. Therefore, it takes them longer than the traditional two or four years to complete their programs.

As mentioned earlier in this report, the Polytechnic Institute was renamed the School of Polytechnic Studies on November 1, 1999, and the Department of Agriculture was also moved into the unit. The school houses two departments and serves over 500 majors. A recruitment and retention plan has been developed and implemented to guide unit efforts to recruit and retain, through to graduation, more students in school programs. Consortium plans and activities continue to create examples of cooperative efforts at several off-campus sites. A faculty member has been designated to provide leadership and guide efforts to seek TAC-ABET accreditation of our new Manufacturing Engineering Technology program. To better serve increased off-campus programs, a new ITV site is included in the plans of the new Otto and Della Seabaugh Polytechnic Building and Mission
Enhancement funding has identified three new faculty for the Industrial and Engineering Technology Department.

**Self Evaluation**

Through their respective reflective processes, the academic units have demonstrated that they understand the value of self-analysis and continuous improvement as they seek to provide the highest quality educational experiences for the University’s students. Through the departments and majors, students are provided with the tools to reach their educational goals. Collectively, the academic units present a clear picture of a highly qualified faculty that offers a continuously improving curriculum to qualified students. The University demonstrates the seriousness with which it takes both external and internal assessment as a means of meeting its mission to provide an environment characterized by effective teaching and a high level of student accomplishment in learning. Following are those strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement that tend to be shared among the academic colleges and schools.

**Strengths:**

1. The faculty are well-prepared for their assignments. Clearly, the vast majority of classes are offered by full-time faculty who hold the terminal degree in their discipline.

2. Over the past decade, the student body, as evidenced by their ACT scores and completion of the high school core curriculum has increased in quality.

3. Curricula are regularly reviewed and revised as needed. New programs of need in the region are developed and supported.

4. Each college and school is engaged in significant service to the University’s service region. The service is often supported by external funding through grants awarded faculty and staff.

5. Faculty evince the teacher-scholar model through increasing creative and scholarly activity.

**Challenges:**

1. Several departments are challenged by space constraints.

2. Low enrollment programs will need to devise recruitment strategies to attract additional students or review the programs for possible deletion.
3. Programs designed to assess student learning will need to be further reviewed and refined.

**Opportunities for Improvement:**

1. The development of the River Campus has the potential of positively impacting both departmental space needs but may also serve as a recruitment tool.

2. As new strategies for recruitment of students are devised, departments with small enrollment programs have an opportunity for involvement in the process.

3. The self-study and team visit provides the campus community with an opportunity to focus upon and expand its assessment processes.
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The chapter is a continuation of Criterion Three as it relates to services to students. The chapter will demonstrate that the institution has effectively organized its student services and activities to assist students in reaching their educational goals. Southeast Missouri State University meets Criterion Three.

Programs designed to serve students can be found within three divisions of the University. The Vice President for Administration and Enrollment Management is responsible, with support of the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management, for Student Auxiliaries comprising the areas of the University Center, Residence Halls, Dining Services, and Recreational Sports, Admissions, New Student Programs, the St Louis Outreach Center, Registrar, and Testing Services. The Vice President for Business and Finance is responsible for the Office of Financial Services, Bursar, and Student Receivables. The Provost, with support of the Dean of Students/Associate Provost, is responsible for those programs normally found in student development. These are Student Development, the Learning Enrichment Center, Career Services, the Center for Health and Counseling, the Office of Minority Student Programs, Judicial Affairs, the Substance Abuse Prevention Program, and the TRIO Programs.

Admissions

At the time of the last NCA review, the Office of Admissions was just beginning to change its focus from a passive manager of applications to an entity responsible for recruiting students in sufficient quality and quantity to assist the University in meeting its enrollment goals. In 1992, the Office of Admissions was combined with the Office of New Student Relations, which was responsible for the University’s student recruitment and many outreach services. In that same year a new aggressive recruitment and scholarship program was initiated. In 1996, a new prospective student database and computer driven telecounseling program was brought on-line with an enhanced recruitment plan. Today the Office of Admissions consists of 12 professional staff members, four support staff members, two graduate assistants, eight student workers, one student webmaster, 24 student telecounselors, and 45 student ambassadors/tour guides. The Office actively works with all University units in order to maximize the enrollment management philosophy. The primary recruitment responsibilities of the Office, focus on traditional aged, domestic students. Other campus offices have been assigned the recruitment responsibilities for international, non-traditional, high school dual enrollment, and graduate students. The Office reports to the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management.
Over the past 10 years the Office of Admissions has focused on two key sets of goals:

I. The implementation of the state’s moderately selective admissions criteria with a 17-unit college preparation core curriculum of high school courses.

II. Implementing recruitment strategies to achieve the 1996 Strategic Plan goals 7, 8, and 9 for optimizing and stabilizing the enrollment in terms of the size, academic preparation, and the mix of the student body.

Admissions decisions at all Missouri public institutions reflect the statewide admission guidelines for standards appropriate to highly selective, selective, moderately selective, and open-enrollment institutions. In 1993, the Board of Regents elected to adopt the moderately selective admission standard. The standard applies to first-time, full-time degree seeking students and transfer students who have completed 23 or fewer credit hours. The following chart and curriculum outline defines the moderately selective requirements.

### Admissions Selectivity Categories Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>High School Percentile Plus ACT/SAT Percentile</th>
<th>Automatic Admission</th>
<th>Freshman Class 96 Allowable Exception</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highly Selective or under</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>ACT Composite of 27</td>
<td>10% 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective or under</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>ACT Composite of 24</td>
<td>10% 119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Selective or under</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>ACT Composite of 21</td>
<td>10% 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Enrollment</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Progress Toward Meeting Goals**

Both sets of goals were operationalized into the new student recruitment program. Specifically, the scholarship program was aligned to attract students within the academic quality goals and to build enrollment from the targeted populations in the immediate service region, the St. Louis metro area, and in southern Illinois. Using institutional enrollment data and geo-demographic research, the recruitment territories were realigned to increase the enrollment yield of accepted applicants. Enrollment has grown in the targeted regions and the academic quality indicators have come very close to the strategic plan goals.

The 1999 fall first-time beginning freshmen class had an average ACT score of 22.8, a 3.2 average high school GPA, and 98% had completed the required 16 unit high school core curriculum (the third unit of science will be implemented in the fall 2000).
The moderately selective exception rate based on the 100 point rank/exam scale continues to be about 16% to 18%. The decision to not enforce the 100 point minimum standard (a combination of high school class rank percentile and ACT/SAT percentile) is based on the Board of Regents not specifying the 100 point evaluation system in their decision to enact the moderately selective status in 1992.

The overall enrollment growth highlights in the Enrollment Management report demonstrate that significant progress has been made toward most of the strategic plan enrollment goals.

- Goal 7 was to increase the first-time student class to 1550. By the fall of 1999, the freshmen class had grown to 1509 and is just short of the goal for the year 2000.
- Transfer enrollment has always been hampered by the University’s geographic location. The campus is over 90 miles away from the state’s closest community college. Although some initial transfer student enrollment growth was experienced in 1997 & 1998 after completing extensive program to program articulation agreements, a very strong economy and smaller traditional student enrollments in the region’s four community colleges resulted in a smaller transfer class in the fall 1999. Growing freshmen enrollments at the four regional community colleges offer some promise to rejuvenate the transfer enrollment.
- While the ultimate goal for minority student enrollment has not been achieved, the number of new minority students has increased by 16% since 1995 for a total of 100 freshmen in 1999. Applications from qualified minority students have increased 176% from May, 1999 to May, 2000. The addition of a new Associate Director of Admissions for Minority Student Recruitment and over $200,000 in additional funding for minority scholarships and financial aid packaging should continue the steady growth rates.
- The goal of having 2,000 students living in the residence halls was exceeded by 82 in the fall 1999 semester.
- Through active enforcement of the required first-time student core curriculum and strategic recruitment with a tiered ACT merit scholarship program, the average ACT score goal of a 23 has almost been achieved. Since 1996, the first-time enrolled students have averaged over a 22.7 ACT score.

As the undergraduate enrollment has grown close to meeting the strategic plan’s quality and quantity enrollment goals, the data shows some interesting results have already shaped recruitment strategies. First, the assumption that the key to enrollment growth could come from a properly aligned scholarship plan and the larger student populations in St. Louis and southern Illinois was correct. Second, increasing the transfer enrollment through program articulation will be much more difficult than originally planned. Third, the minority enrollment can grow...
with constant and steady campus support systems, but without a dramatic shift in University resources, it will most likely take an additional five to ten years to meet the plan's goal of 9.5%. The data also shows the goal for non-traditional undergraduate student enrollment is not aligned with the goals for traditional, residential students and should likely be re-examined.

All enrollment and recruitment data will continue to be regularly reviewed to enhance recruitment and enrollment strategies. An increase in prospective student campus visits and programs to build positive name recognition in the immediate region, St. Louis and southern Illinois will be important for maintaining and increasing the undergraduate enrollment. It is also important to enhance the scholarship program to stay competitive and meet the strategic plan goals.

**New Student Programs**

In response to the University's Strategic Plan priority to serve students by increasing student success and optimizing and stabilizing enrollment, the Office of New Student Programs was established in 1996. The purpose of the Office of New Student Programs was to focus on the success and retention of first-year students via assessment, strategic planning, and open communication among the entire campus community. The Director of New Student Programs reports to the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management. The office staff consists of the Director of New Student Programs, the Coordinator of Orientation and First-Year Experience Programs, an Administrative Secretary, a Graduate Assistant, and eight student workers.

The Mission of the Office of New Student Programs focuses on the student's first-year experience at the University. Its purpose is to assist new students in their transition to college life by fostering academic and social integration to the University community and creating a staying environment. Student transition, i.e., connection, strategies include orientation programs; learning teams; faculty, staff, and student mentoring programs; family programs; and assessment relative to new students and student retention.

An initial goal of the Office of New Student Programs was to establish a comprehensive and integrated program to better meet transition, adjustment, advising and goal development needs of first-year students. To achieve that goal, the Director and staff enhanced existing orientation programs, i.e., First STEP, Transfer Orientation (formerly known as Step Ahead), Opening Week (formerly known as Next Step), and the Student Success Series (formerly known as Step Up to Success Series), and proposed new services based on campus level discussion about the needs of first-year students. With the guidance, assistance, and expertise of the First-Year Experience Team, a task force originated in 1996 comprised of representatives from eighteen academic, financial and student affairs areas across campus, New Student Programs collaborated with areas of Academic
Affairs and Student Affairs to develop a first-year residential program, integrate academic programs with students’ out of class experiences, and implement early alert interventions.

To achieve its goals, the Office of New Student Programs offers, implements, and evaluates the following programs:

*First STEP (Southeast Testing and Enrollment Program)* is a one-day program for entering students with fewer than 24 college hours. Activities include:
  - Writing & Math Placement Assessments
  - Pre-Advising for the enrollment process
  - Small groups with Faculty & Student Orientation Leaders
  - Information Sessions on Financial Aid, Billing, Housing, etc.
  - Academic Advising
  - Family Programs & Panel
  - Enrollment in first-semester classes
  - Campus tour (optional)

As a result of the restructured orientation programs effective in 1995 the average matriculation rate from fall 1996 to fall 1999 indicates that 94% of students who enrolled at the First STEP orientation actually attended Southeast Missouri State University.

From 1995 to 1999, students have consistently evaluated their experience at First STEP orientation as satisfactory (see exhibit). Prior to 1995, many students requested that the two-day orientation be changed to one day. In 1994, upon discussions with departments, faculty and staff, the University elected to shorten the orientation to one day (see exhibits for student comments).

*Transfer Orientation* is a one-day optional program for transfer students and their families. Activities are similar to those in First STEP excluding placement assessments. Students who participate have the option of having their advising appointments arranged for them. Student evaluations indicate general satisfaction with the transfer orientation (see exhibits).

*Opening Week* is a four-day program before fall classes begin for all first-year students. The week is designed to extend the orientation program by assisting students in understanding the University’s academic expectations, adapt to the college experience, connect with fellow students, interact with faculty, staff and peers, and focus on student life issues.

Since 1996, students have consistently ranked the overall Opening Week Program as satisfactory (see exhibits). Faculty and staff evaluation over the last three years has been positive with suggestions for a more “academic” emphasis during Opening Week Orientation as well as a focus on student development and socialization issues. In accordance with these recommendations, an “Academic
Day” where students meet with the dean of their college, department chairperson, and academic advisor and have opportunities to attend workshops in the departments has been implemented. Student development issues are addressed in a variety of formats but primarily through the New Student Convocation and small group meetings with faculty, staff, and upper class students.

Throughout the first semester of enrollment, new students are assisted by the *Student Success Workshops* that are designed to assist new students in their transition to college. Students may also take advantage of *GC110-Principles of Personal Adjustment* that addresses the development of academic and personal survival skills. Finally, the *Southeast Friends* mentoring program is designed to provide mentors for new students entering the University. Mentors are faculty and staff volunteers who are paired with students during the Opening Week and encouraged to remain in contact with their mentees throughout the academic year.

**Assessment of First Year Students**

First-year students are given various assessments that measure satisfaction with First-Year Experience Programs and the University in general. The assessments also measure the level of computer and technical competency of entering students. The following assessment tools have been and are being used. See exhibits for results.

- Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (spring 1997)
- On-line Student Satisfaction Survey (Pilot -- spring 1999)
- Entering Student Survey (1998 - present)
- College Concerns (1998-present)
- Computer Competency (1998 – present)

The 1997 *Student Satisfaction Inventory* revealed that students are satisfied with academic advising and instructional effectiveness; they identify academic advising, safety and security, instructional effectiveness, registration effectiveness and concern for the individual as areas of importance; and they are dissatisfied with parking, getting the “run-around,” food selection, class registration, and adequate financial aid. A pilot on-line Student Satisfaction Survey in spring 1999 revealed that students are satisfied with life at Southeast Missouri State University including campus grounds, staff, faculty fairness, and opportunities for intellectual growth on campus. Areas of dissatisfaction include parking, financial aid availability, and billing policies. Areas of concern influence campus decision-making. For example, recent changes in dining services were heavily based on student input.

The Entering Student Survey creates a profile of students regarding their anticipated plans at Southeast Missouri State University. In 1998, for example, it was reported on the Entering Student Survey that 75% of first-time students report that they plan to pursue a bachelor’s degree; 63% of first-time students plan to live on campus (of those living off campus, the majority will live in Cape
Girardeau); 69% of first-time students plan to hold a part-time job while in school; nearly half of all first-time students plan to join a student group/organization; 82% of first-time students reported their most important reason for attending college was to get a better job; and 60% of first-time students indicate that faculty should be very involved in student career development, indicating that they anticipate a moderate level of contact with faculty outside the classroom. This new-student profile is shared with administrators, faculty and staff for creation, continuation, and improvement of programs and services to meet the needs of entering students. As a result of the profile, the three greatest concerns students have were identified as:

1. Good grades/performing well academically
2. Meeting new people/fitting in
3. Getting lost/finding classrooms

These findings resulted in creation and expansion of transition and adjustment sessions during orientation, and discussions with Financial Aid Services, Residence Life, and the Registrar’s Office regarding how to address these concerns.

The survey also asks students to respond to questions based on their minimal computing competencies. These data reveal:
33% have access to a computer at home.
32% will have own computer at Southeast.
97.4% can demonstrate basic keyboard and mouse skills.
51% can format a diskette.
93% can manipulate files (e.g., open, close, save, rename, copy, delete).
91% can create a document using word processing software.
79% can open an e-mail file.
80% can compose and send an e-mail message.
89% can access the Internet using Netscape or Internet Explorer.

As a result of these findings, computer training sessions on the Kent Library access system, email, and the Internet are offered through the Learning Enrichment Center and Computer Services.

First-Year Learning Teams (FLightS)

The purposes of the First-year Learning Team (FLight) program are to improve the academic and social integration of first-year students, expand intellectual skills early on in the college experience, foster strong relationships among students and their instructors, and increase student persistence to graduation. FLightS respond to the University’s Strategic Plan priorities to offer a top-quality curriculum with co-curricular programs reflecting University Studies objectives, to increase student success, and to optimize and stabilize enrollment by serving students more effectively.
Southeast’s FLighT program has expanded from four FLighTs (66 students) in fall 1997 to ten FLighTs (188 students) in fall 1999. Twenty-five, self selected students enroll together in three cluster courses (including the first-year seminar), residential students live in the same hall, faculty collaborate to integrate courses, and veteran students serve as Peer Mentors. Nationally recognized, the FLighT program is featured in the 1999 Templeton Guide: Colleges that Encourage Character Development, and received the 1999 national CSRDE Effective Retention Award and the 1999 ACPA Model Residential Program Award.

Since its inception in fall 1997 under a Funding for Results award, the FLighT program has demonstrated success in terms of student involvement; student satisfaction; and student connection with faculty, peers, and the institution. Although the average ACT score for first-semester FLighT students is lower than the average first-semester Southeast student (22 and 23 respectively), longitudinal studies reveal that FLighT students who remain at Southeast for their second and third semesters have higher GPAs and display greater degrees of adjustment to college life and student involvement than students who were not in the FLighT program. (See exhibit, A Comprehensive Assessment of the First-year Learning Team Program, Birk, 1999). These results indicate that the positive impact of learning communities (e.g., FLighTs) may be delayed and more likely to surface in the student’s second or even third year at the institution. Because high-risk behaviors and judicial sanctions tend to have negative impacts on student success, focus on these areas may be useful predictors of persistence.

It has become apparent that assessment for this type of program needs to be longer than the project itself. Thus, FLighTs offered in fall 1999 will be evaluated not only at the end of the semester, but the fall 1999 FLighT cohort will be tracked for the next four years (just as the fall 1997 and fall 1998 FLighT cohorts are being tracked). Curricular and co-curricular components of FLighTs will be evaluated using baseline data for incoming first-year students matriculating fall 1999 (ACT, high school rank). GPA, first-semester completion rates, and fall-to-spring retention rates of FLighT members will be generated and compared with those of non-FLighT students. FLighT students’ progress relative to adjustment to college and involvement in classes (i.e., actual attendance, self-assessed level of involvement) will be monitored in respective courses and FLighTs at mid- and end-semesters. Assessments of student satisfaction, level of student involvement on campus, and level of familiarity with campus facilities, programs, services, faculty and staff will be administered to all FLighT members and to an equal number of non-FLighT students for comparison. Focus groups consisting of FLighT students, faculty and peer mentors will be conducted. Analysis reports will be distributed to the Administrative Council and others for consideration.

New program and assessment initiatives: The ten FLighTs offered in fall 2000 will consist of two courses based on a theme, instead of three, one of which will be the revised GS101 course, UI100. This change will allow for ease of
scheduling for academic departments and students. New assessment initiatives will include: 1) Longitudinal studies tracking FLighT cohorts over four, five, & six years to determine academic success, student involvement, and persistence to graduation; 2) Assessment of High-Risk Behaviors, anticipating lower levels of high-risk behaviors among FLighT students as compared to non-FLighT students due to degree of group friendship (i.e., looking out for one another) and exposure to information on prevention of high-risk behaviors; and 3) frequency of University judicial encounters.

Evaluation results of the programs offered by the Office of New Student Programs are included in the text and in exhibits. Feedback regarding specific programs is generated via written surveys, telephone surveys, focus groups, and email evaluations, and baseline data (e.g., demographics, ACT, High School rank, GPA, etc.) are obtained through the University data bases and the Office of Institutional Research. Results are disseminated to members of the campus community and stakeholders with vested interest in the projects including program coordinators, staff participants, university executives including administrators, deans, and chairs, students – anyone involved in the development, financing, and/or implementation of the programs. The Office of New Student Programs takes assessment seriously, through careful analysis of results and collaboration with other departments, programs are improved, altered and enhanced to continually achieve optimum success.

**Academic Advising**

The responsibility for undergraduate academic advising at Southeast Missouri State University is shared by faculty and professional academic advisors using a decentralized advising model. Each academic college/school offering major programs provides an advising center staffed by a full time professional advisor. Non-declared students with less than 24 hours are advised by the University Studies Advising Center. The centers were originally designed to advise only undeclared students. Over time it became clear that the academic departments, especially those with growing degree programs needed assistance in advising majors. All of the advising centers are now assigned and advise caseloads of up to 700 students with declared majors or an expressed interest. They also advise pre-admission programs, undeclared students, undecided students, probationary students, beginning freshmen, transfer students, evening students, and off-site students.

The University offers programs at a several satellite locations, and works to articulate transfers from community colleges. The Advising Centers also coordinate their efforts with the athletic advisors and advisors at off-campus locations including the Bootheel Education Center at Malden, Jefferson College, St. Louis Community College, and Sikeston Area Higher Education Center.
It is the ultimate goal of the Academic Advising Centers for students to be accurately informed of academic expectations from the time they are prospective students receiving information on a major until the day they successfully complete a degree and graduate.

The academic advising function serves the University achieving Goal #20 of the University's Strategic Plan: *Improve Student View of the University*. All students [will] *have a positive learning/personal growth experience at the University and view all University personnel as extraordinarily helpful to them in achieving their personal goals.*

Students receive personal assistance within their selected major by consulting the appropriate advising center or their faculty advisor. While the advising centers do have common goals and activities, in varying degrees, such as recruitment, orientation (First STEP and Transfer Orientation), and retention of students within their college, each center is uniquely organized around the specific population(s) they serve. This allows advising experiences to contribute to the specific careers and personal objectives of the students being advised.

Since the last self-study, the New Student Programs office has conducted several surveys that included advising-related questions. In addition to these studies, which encompassed more broad groups, some advising centers distributed their own surveys to their respective college advisees. Some studies administered by New Student Programs have spoken very highly of advising and others have suggested some areas for improvement. According to a Noel-Levitz (Student Satisfaction Inventory) administered during the spring 1997 semester to over one thousand Southeast students, academic advising was rated as the highest area of satisfaction (5.17 on 7-point scale, with 1 being "not satisfied at all" and 7 being "very satisfied"). In addition, the results of surveys administered to incoming freshmen who attended First STEP orientations during 1998 and 1999 show that the components of the advising process were consistently ranked around 3.5 on a scale of 1 to 4, with 4 being "excellent" and 1 being "poor." The most recent survey was sent in the spring of 1999 to first- and second-semester students. Several items emerged from this survey as needing some improvement: personal attention given to students, referral of students to appropriate resources/offices and consistency of services provided.

The Coordinators and Staff Advisors of the Academic Advising Centers have identified the following areas as needing improvement and recommended actions.

1. Advising transfer students.
   a. Develop shared advisors. Advisors would be hired jointly by Southeast and linked with two year institutions to advise transfer students.
b. Create traveling advisors. Advisors would be hired by Southeast and assigned to several two year institutions. They would hold office hours on designated days at each school.

c. Develop technological solutions to transfer and off-site advising. The use of eyeball cameras could allow on-campus advisors to see and talk to off-campus students through a computer interface about advising issues.

2. Improving the quality and consistency of academic advising campus wide.

   a. Requiring faculty and staff to attend workshops on academic advising.
   
   b. Making advising a high profile issue in merit pay and evaluations.
   
   c. Establishing an Advisors Forum on campus to encourage and recognize excellence in advising. The Advisors Forum could sponsor monthly meetings to present information on advising issues. The Advisors Forum could be the mechanism through which faculty/staff that have demonstrated excellence in advising could be recognized.
   
   d. Standardizing the documentation of advising appointments campus wide.
   
   e. Development of a 'referral sheet' for use by faculty/staff advisors.

3. Providing equitable staffing for all college advising centers.

Registration and Records

The Office of the Registrar at Southeast Missouri State University supports the educational purposes of the institution through the maintenance of the student database, Master Schedule, and Master Catalog. Additionally, this office produces and distributes the Undergraduate Bulletin, academic progress reports (degree audits), grade reports, and transcripts. Other functions of the Office of the Registrar include the evaluation of transfer credit; the coordination of student enrollment, withdrawal, and academic advising; and the determination of eligibility for graduation and participation in veterans, athletic, and financial aid programs.

In order to enhance the educational experience of students, the Office of the Registrar provides training for students during their initial orientation programs, First STEP and Transfer Orientation. Survey results following these programs indicate high student satisfaction with the training that is presented. Furthermore, the office supports faculty with multiple opportunities for training regarding the University's advising and enrollment system. The most recent contribution of the Office of the Registrar to the education support system is the facilitating of the
University's new attendance-taking procedures in compliance with Federal Title IV regulations.

During the last ten years, the Office of the Registrar has contributed to the University's Strategic Plan and enrollment management initiatives through the implementation of an exit interview process for students who are considering withdrawal from the University (see exhibit). Each student who visits the Office of the Registrar to withdraw is personally interviewed and counseled by a professional staff member. During the first semester of this process, one student decided to remain in school after the discussion. Additional success is expected in the future.

Perhaps the most significant improvement in the operations of the Office of Registrar during the last ten years has been the implementation of the telephone registration system (SAVRS). This will soon be enhanced with grade and grade point average reporting. Other technology-based developments have included the expansion of the online Master Schedule system, online participation in the National Student Loan Clearinghouse, construction of various service-oriented web pages, electronic certification for veterans' benefits, addition of online class rosters, and electronic imaging of student records.

Student satisfaction surveys were implemented in the fall 1996 semester and have reported consistently high ratings of service and staff. Strengths of the Office of the Registrar include the quick turn-around time of requests for such items as transcripts, degree audit reports, and verifications. Other strengths consist of the experience and competence of the individual staff members in this office as well as the willingness to assist students and faculty with the academic process. The Office of the Registrar has also demonstrated the ability to institute and utilize new technologies as resources are available.

A recent concern regarding weaknesses in communication from academic departments has been addressed with the membership of the Registrar on many key University committees. Staffing concerns are being attended to with the addition of a full-time professional to evaluate international student transfer credit and program-to-program articulation credit. The immediate primary challenge is the lack of diversity among the full-time staff in the office, currently comprising ten females and one male, all Caucasian.
First Step and Step Ahead/Transfer Orientation
Student Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First STEP</th>
<th>Helpfulness of Staff</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Class Schedule Satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>3.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Pre-Advising</th>
<th>Presenter Knowledge</th>
<th>Session Content Clarity</th>
<th>Usefulness of the Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>3.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum score = 4.0

Transfer Student Orientation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Pre-Advising</th>
<th>Presenter Knowledge</th>
<th>Session Content Clarity</th>
<th>Usefulness of the Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Residence Life

The residence halls are an integral part of the educational program available to students at Southeast Missouri State University. The Office of Residence Life believes that learning occurring in the residence halls is a vital complement to the classroom experience, facilitating growth and development of each student's academic, personal, and social success. To achieve these goals, the Office of Residence Life strives to provide well-maintained facilities, effective and timely services to the campus, and programs that challenge and support the education and development of residential students. Students are regularly and deliberately involved in the creation and review of policies and procedures, facility renovations, and programming.

The Office is a unit in the area of Student Auxiliary Services that reports to the Director for Student Auxiliary Services in the Division of Administration and Enrollment Management. The office is staffed by a Director; Associate Director; an Assistant Director/Facility Operations; a supervisor of Desk Operations; nine Hall Directors (four are graduate students); an Area Coordinator, two secretaries; and 60 Student Community Advisors.
The Office of Residence Life provides a wide variety of services to students including food services, through a contract with Chartwells Educational and Dining services, Mail and office services, support for Computer Labs, and the customary staff services.

The Office of Residence Life has completed a SWOT analysis that includes the assessment of student satisfaction. These documents can be found in the exhibits. Following is a list of the most significant changes that have occurred, the strengths and challenges of the unit:

Strengths:

- The central office has been reorganized and streamlined. The culture in the central office has improved and there is a sense of loyalty, ownership, and pride.
- Major renovations have been made to several buildings with one building partially eliminated; renovation to several ($19.1 million); and construction of new community and residential student organizational office space ($4.1 million). As a whole the current facilities are fairly well maintained and in average to above average condition.
- The creation of five specialty lifestyle floors; program requirements; and improvements in communications, have enhanced the central office and the satellite offices thereby improving customer service.
- The assignment of Residence Life to Student Auxiliary Services to strengthen financial and administrative management and support systems is a positive.
- The planned overhaul of the mainframe computing system will provide new technology and improved data collection.

Challenges: The office has good relationships with other units in Student Auxiliary Services and is developing relationships with other offices and faculty. In the central office, three of five positions are unfilled or filled with temporary or interim appointments. There is no written manual of internal policies and procedures, including planning for emergencies. Some of the facilities are aging, and may need major updates. The lack of weekend cleaning contributes to the problem. There is no board dining option on the south side of campus. One hall (Dearmont) is not a full-fledged residence hall, but remains a “shared use” facility with no clear “owner or operator.” The central office is difficult for parents and students to find, located on the South edge of campus. Other challenges include the following:

- The need for 12-month housing forces international students to make difficult choices (plan to offer in the Fall of 2000).
- The belief that Greek students are treated differently (which they are, in some cases) weakens the office.
- The University’s CICS mainframe housing module is out of date and slows service and efficiency.
- Administrative services, such as room move night, early arrival, and others need to be better coordinated.

**Career Services**

The role of the Office of Career Services in accomplishing the mission of Southeast Missouri State University is to provide developmental activities related to career orientation, exploration, assessment, development and placement. To accomplish this goal, the unit has undergone a variety of changes, both in philosophy and appearance, over the past few years. These changes have resulted in more attractive office space and interview rooms as well as a greater emphasis on career development and experiential learning rather than simply on placement.

A variety of services are provided to students, faculty, staff, alumni, and community members. Services include informational sessions/presentations for precollege students and their families, faculty, classes, and community groups. Routine listing and distribution of current job openings are also provided to the campus community. Computer based and paper career assessments are available with follow-up individual career counseling. A variety of career fairs, part-time job fairs, and internship fairs are provided. The themes of these events relate to academic discipline and location of employer. In addition, students have the opportunity to interview on site with a variety of employers from around the globe. They can get assistance in preparing for these interviews by participating in mock interviews, resume writing workshops, and setting up a credentials file. In addition, the Office of Career Services co-sponsors an annual experiential learning dinner and workshop for faculty. To address the needs of populations who have traditionally under-utilized career services, special events are targeted to minority, international, and undeclared students. The Office of Career Services has also been designated a Career One Stop Satellite Center by the state of Missouri.

Utilization statistics indicate that the Office of Career Services had a total of 5,007 contacts during the 1998-99 academic year. Total participation in job and internship fairs was 701 for this period while approximately 218 students interviewed with recruiters on site. Detailed statistical information can be found in the exhibits. In addition to these quantitative measures, the Office of Career Services is in the process of conducting qualitative research regarding the satisfaction of participants in the on site interviews. More general data regarding satisfaction with services is needed to guide the area's ongoing process of continuous improvement. Longitudinal data regarding utilization and detailed descriptions of services are available as part of the exhibits.
Financial Aid Services

Financial Aid Services reports directly to the Vice President for Finance and is a member of the Enrollment Management Team headed by the Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management. This organizational structure supports a commitment to recruitment and retention while ensuring the level of oversight to maintain fiscally sound practices related to regulatory requirements regarding disbursements and cash management.

Goals as they relate to the Financial Aid Services 1996 Strategic Plan are as follows:

- To provide the layering of information and support with student responsibility in order to circumvent problems before they happen and to avoid problems and misunderstandings through the use of properly targeted and presented information.
- To create a supportive environment that provides reliable services to students, parents, and the University community and opportunities for learning experiences by student employees, graduate assistants and interns.
- To implement viable and useful systems for both students and staff that provides both more effective and more efficient delivery of services through the use of technology.
- To provide services and information that allow easy transitions for incoming and transferring students and to promote the accessibility of post-secondary educational opportunities for under-represented groups and socio-economically disadvantaged prospects within our region.
- To provide better connections with other units and constituencies, and provide enhanced services for those departments utilizing financial aid services, specifically for departmental recruitment of student employees.

Financial Aid Services (FAS) assists students in filling the gap that exists between the cost of attendance (COA) and the funds the family is expected to contribute (EFC) from their resources. This is accomplished by providing consumer information to current and prospective students and parents; helping students apply for federal, state and institutional grant, scholarship, loan and work funds; and certifying aid eligibility based on the information provided. During the 1998-99 academic year a total of $29,262,315 was awarded to University students.

The largest source of grant and scholarship funds comes from state and federal government. The University provides funds for scholarship programs based primarily on merit but also include funds for talent and special interests including, but not limited to, band, theater, music. Additionally, the University has a renewable, need-based matching award program for minority students. This program is in its second year of existence. Currently the majority of institutionally awarded scholarships are based on academic merit or special
ability. However, within the past few years a concerted effort has been made to address the need factor, and the strategic enrollment mix at the University.

Students have opportunities for part-time employment both on and off-campus through Federal Workstudy, Regular Institutional Employment, and Job Location and Development. The annual payroll for these programs exceeded $2,546,000 for the 1998-99 academic year. The University enjoys a partnership with the Missouri Division of Employment Security through Job Service. Job Service is a branch office of Employment Security and is located within Financial Aid Services at Southeast. The purpose of this office is to assist students in finding employment, on and off campus, through a job referral process. During the 1998-99 academic year, 1677 students were employed on campus through the Federal Workstudy and Regular Institutional Employment Programs. Additionally, the University’s contracted food service provider employed students on campus. Employment opportunities are also available for students in internship and practicum programs both on and off campus.

The following tables indicate distribution of specific aid by multicultural status.

Table 6-1. Federal Perkins Loan Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Awards Amount</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>$63,034.00</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>$1,801.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>$7,068.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$1,767.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>$515,084.00</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>$1,814.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$504.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$504.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>$6,400.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$2,133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$592,090.00</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>$1,604.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6-2. Federal Workstudy (Dollars earned may be less than awarded)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>$48,725.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>$773.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>$3,399.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,133.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>$270,919.00</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>$828.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$2,273.00</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>$568.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>$4,148.00</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$1,383.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$329,424.00</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>$937.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
During the 1997 spring semester, 1,175 undergraduate students voluntarily completed the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory. The inventory measures student satisfaction with a wide range of college experiences. The rating scale is 1-7, one (1) being least satisfied/least important and seven (7) being most satisfied/most important. The inventory results in three different scores: importance, satisfaction, and performance gap.

A large performance gap score (e.g. 1.5) indicates that an institution is not meeting students’ expectations. A small gap score indicates students’ expectations are being met and a negative gap score indicates expectations are being exceeded.

Four items specifically pertained to the Financial Aid Office.

1. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.
   Importance 6.29  Satisfaction 4.36  Performance Gap 1.93

2. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.
   Importance 6.12  Satisfaction 4.46  Performance Gap 1.66

3. Financial Aid counselors are helpful.
   Importance 6.02  Satisfaction 4.39  Performance Gap 1.63

4. Financial aid as factor in decision to enroll.
   Importance 5.64
   This was an institutional item and was not rated in the same way. This item indicated that financial aid was the second highest reason next to cost for deciding to attend this University.

The results of the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory, indicate that ratings based on the responses of Southeast Missouri State University students are almost

---

Table 6-3. Federal, State, & Institutional Scholarships (Need/Non-Need Based)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Award Amount</th>
<th>Number of Students</th>
<th>Average Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>$469,164.00</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>$1,738.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian</td>
<td>$42,625.00</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>$1,639.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>$3,441,277.00</td>
<td>2434</td>
<td>$1,414.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>$37,171.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>$1,690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanics</td>
<td>$49,932.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>$2,080.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$4,040,169.00</td>
<td>2776</td>
<td>$1,455.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
identical to the ratings received by other four-year public institutions and indicated a need for some improvements. Given the results of these items, the University has addressed these issues over the last two years as follows:

- Reviewed and purchased software to provide early estimates of financial aid for prospects and admits.
- Cross-trained staff within Financial Aid Services.
- Convened a quality improvement group consisting of University staff and students to examine and implement ways in which the office of Financial Aid Services and Student Receivables and Collections can improve quality of service and clarity of information provided to students and parents.
- Convened a scholarship and fee waiver committee to review existing scholarship programs and make recommendations for changes in current programs and implementation of new programs to address strategic plan goals of increased student enrollment and student body mix.

Annually an independent audit firm, currently KPMG Peat Marwick L.L.P, audits the University’s major programs. A report on compliance with requirements applicable to each major program and internal control over compliance with OMB Circular A-133 is issued. KPMG issued an unqualified opinion for fiscal year July 1, 1997 to June 30, 1998. An unqualified opinion states that the University complied, in all material respects, with federal regulations.

Information regarding institutional compliance with the Higher Education Act of 1965 as amended, section I.A.5. of Chapter 14 is available in the Resource Room. This information includes default rates and summaries of the last three years’ audit reports.

Center for Health and Counseling

The purpose of the Center for Health and Counseling is to provide health and counseling services and programs designed to improve each student’s capability to function productively both in school and throughout life in the region, nation, and world. The health and counseling program strives to contribute to the general health of the faculty and staff at Southeast. The Center for Health and Counseling offers services to promote the educational mission of the University. Health and Counseling staff serve as consultants and resources to the campus community as they endeavor to promote and facilitate wellness. Through collaboration with other departments of the University, the Center for Health and Counseling serves as a teaching facility providing practicum and internship experiences for students in various health, education, human service, and social science programs.

The Center for Health and Counseling is a unit within the area of Student Development, which reports to the Dean of Students and Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The center is staffed by a full time Director, two full time Nurses, two part time Nurses, three part time Family Nurse Practitioners (total 40
hours per week), three full time Counselors, a part time Graduate Assistant (20 hours per week), one Senior Clerk, one Secretary, and six student employees.

Services include a walk-in acute health care clinic with Family Nurse Practitioner service on a fee for service basis, Counseling services (individual and group), Dietician services, and Peer Education services. Additional services include extensive educational outreach services, campus wide consultation, 24 hours a day, 7 days per week on call crisis intervention services, and experiential training opportunities for student nurses, student nurse practitioners, counseling practica and internships.

Approximately 34% of the student body utilizes the services at the Center with over 10,000 visits annually. This rate appears to be increasing as the range of services has also increased. A student health fee was implemented in fall 1999 which has enhanced services and provided additional staff. The staff provides educational outreach programs annually to over 1,500 students. Recent changes in the Center for Health Services include the employment of two part time nurses, the employment by Counseling Services of one full time licensed psychologist, an increase in student employee assistance, and new office space for staff and the Director. The renovation of the waiting room area is anticipated during the summer of 2000. The Center provides high quality health and counseling services and employs continual assessment of its effectiveness through client satisfaction surveys for all services including the front office staff and waiting room environment. Processes and systems are continually under review. Changes are implemented as the need is identified. Documentation related to the Center’s reviews and planning processes can be found among the exhibits.

Challenges faced by the unit are the provision of sufficient confidential space for students (renovation of the waiting room and additional exam rooms), adequate human resources (increased staff), and an improved computerized scheduling program (updated technology) that will accommodate the needs of both health and counseling services.

**Substance Abuse Prevention and Education**

The coordinator of Substance Abuse and Prevention and Education works to create an environment on campus in which students make responsible choices regarding alcohol and drug use. The coordinator works to accomplish these goals by engaging students, faculty, and staff in programs related to assessment, education, and positive social norming. Special programs for targeted groups including pre-collegiate, first year, athletes, and members of the Greek system. The results of both the 1996 and 1999 CORE, a national survey of college student alcohol and drug use and its effects, indicated that students at Southeast Missouri State University report experiencing more negative consequences as a result of binge drinking than is indicated by the national average. An executive summary of these results can be found in the exhibits. In acknowledgement of the role that
alcohol and drug abuse can play in both the attrition and quality of the educational experience at the University, the position was upgraded from half- to full-time in July 1998. One significant impact this and other programs targeting alcohol-related infractions of the Code of Student Conduct have is maintaining a relatively low recidivism rate. Referrals to community-based support groups as well as the University’s Center for Health and Counseling are frequently the results of evaluations and their follow-up consultations. The coordinator is also the advisor to the student organization Students Against Destructive Decisions and works with a peer education group.

**Learning Enrichment Center**

The Learning Enrichment Center (formerly the Campus Assistance Center) promotes learning, academic success and student retention through providing programs designed to create independent learners, support and assist at-risk populations in the accomplishment of educational goals, promote awareness of the importance and value of diversity, and ensure the accessibility of all University programs to students with disabilities.

The office is a unit in the area of Student Development that reports to the Dean of Students/Associate Provost in the Division of Academic Affairs. The office is staffed by a Director/Assistant Dean, two full-time Assistant Directors, two Secretaries, and two Graduate Assistants.

Reorganized in 1998, the two Assistant Directors assume responsibilities for general assistance with learning for all students as well as provide leadership for specific areas within the unit like Supplemental Instruction and Students with Disabilities. Student Support Services (a federally-funded TRIO program) began reporting to the Learning Enrichment Center in 1998. Additional functions include Tutorial Services, University Academy, the Pre-Admissions Education (PREP) Program, and the Academic Improvement Program for academically at-risk students. Students with Disabilities are offered services which include Faculty Notification Memos, Readers Services, Taped Textbooks, Interpreter Services, Priority Enrollment, and other services such as seating accommodations in classrooms, remote control door openers, Assistive Listening Devices, and supplying carbonless pads for note takers. Services for students with disabilities increased 33% for the 1998-99 academic year. (See exhibits for a comprehensive report) Accomplishments of the center since the last NCA review include establishment of the University Academy and University Tutorial Services, Implementation of the Minority Mentor Program, development of the PREP Program in collaboration with Three Rivers Community College, and adoption of an Academic Improvement Program for students at-risk. (see exhibits for details)

Organizational changes and streamlining the unit’s mission has increased the understanding of the services offered to the campus and the functions of the Learning Enrichment Center. The dedicated and committed staff of the center
demonstrates the delivery of high quality services. Approximately 70% of the students participating in tutoring or Supplemental Instruction reach their academic goals and are retained at Southeast. The university has experienced a growth in enrollment of students with disabilities at an average rate of increase of 33% between 1997-98 and 1998-99.

While the relocation of several offices successfully focused the LEC’s mission on academic success, it also resulted in the loss of a full-time position that affects the unit’s ability to adequately serve students. The Learning Enrichment Center faces several challenges including adequate facilities, additional computer lab space for students with disabilities, and the need for training and locating interpreters for the hearing impaired within the region to meet state requirements for interpreter certification.

**Office of Minority Student Programs**

As an office in the Student Development Unit of the University, the Office of Minority Student Programs fulfills the following mission:
- Provides advocacy for students and their rights;
- Provides leadership in the promotion of multiculturalism and diversity;
- Promotes student learning;
- Provides support for initiatives designed to recruit and retain students of color;
- Guides student personal growth and maturity;
- Enhances the quality of student and campus life;
- Helps students evaluate and effectively implement life plans;
- Assures equal access and opportunity for all students.

The Office reports to the Dean of Students and the Associate Provost for Academic Affairs. The Office was inaugurated on December 1, 1996 and is staffed by a Director, a Program Coordinator, a Secretary, and Student Assistants. There are three major programs administered by the Office of Minority Student Programs: the Minority Mentor Program; the Peer Mentor Program; and the Minority Student Matching Success Program. The Office coordinates and collaborates with several campus wide programs including: Black History Month, Martin Luther King Jr. Breakfast, the Minority Student Recognition Banquet, the Annual Minority Student Picnic, Minority Student Orientation Program, and assisting the Admissions Office with minority recruitment programs. (see exhibits for program documents)

The Office coordinates several comprehensive programs that contribute to the success of minority students at Southeast. Each year of operations, the campus response to the programs offered has continued to grow. The Office provided $8,000 of financial support and administrative guidance to seven different student organization events in 1998. The Minority Mentor Program has continued to grow each year. The fall 1999 program has 48 mentees enrolled with 38
Departments/Mentors compared to 15 mentees in 13 Departments/Mentors in fall 1995. Students have earned a higher overall grade point average each year since 1995 (1995 - 1.98 overall GPA / 1999 - 2.82 overall GPA). In the fall of 1999, the Fall-to-Fall retention rate for African-American students was 80%.

**Commuter and Non-traditional Student Services**

The Office of Student Life Studies provides support and advocacy to Commuter and Non-traditional students, while conducting research to elucidate student motivation, aspiration, persistence, and success.

The Office of Student Life Studies provides direct support for adult learners and provides administrative support to the Dean of Student/Associate Provost in the Office of Student Development, which is a unit in the Division of Academic Affairs. The office is staffed by one full time Coordinator. Secretarial support for this office is shared with the Dean of Students, Judicial Affairs, Substance Abuse Prevention and Education.

Services offered to commuter and non-traditional students include providing adult learner and commuter student orientation and family-oriented programs throughout the year, facilitation of car-pooling, listing of local landlords, advising of student organizations (the Non-Traditional Student Organization and Alpha Sigma Lambda), general counseling, and advising. This office collaborates closely with the offices of New Student Programs, the Office of Extended Learning, and other offices in the unit of Student Development.

Recent accomplishments include the opening of the Child Enrichment Center for use by staff and students, the allocation of funds from Student Government for a Commuter Student Lounge, and the establishment of a chapter of Alpha Sigma Lambda (academic honorary for adult students). Planning has begun to establish several new initiatives including the “Launching Pad”, a recognizable place on campus where adult students can conduct on campus business, tracking enrollment data to examine retention issues unique to the non-traditional cohort, and participation by returning students in a mentoring program for new incoming students. The office is scheduled for a five-year review process in the immediate future.

Challenges include the inconsistency of the programs/services/insufficient human resources/office space from 1986 to the present; unclear definition of “non-traditional” students; lack of verification that demographic data on the University mainframe is current and accurate; and commuter and adult learners have not been flagged or tracked by any office on campus. Additionally, while there have been internal reviews for commuter and adult learners (1984-85, 1988, 1995) there have been no external reviews of these services.
Student Government

Student self-governance is provided through participation in Student Government. The Student Senate is composed of 31 elected Senators, three elected Executive Officers, four appointed Committee Chairs, and two additional appointed members representing both resident and non-resident students. The basic goals of Student Government are to address and resolve issues relevant to students, and to represent students’ opinions, goals, and future aspirations for the university. At this writing, issues before Student Government include commuter parking, improving voter turnout, extended computer lab hours in the Towers Residence Hall, and improving public relations.

In addition to its legislative functions Student Government is also responsible for the allocation of funds to student organizations and special programming. The annual budget for Student Government is approximately $215,000 38% of which is designated for the Student Activities Council.

Student Government representatives take pride in their ability to represent their constituents through structured and informational debates. Student Government appoints student representatives to all university level committees to ensure that the student perspective is represented. The President of Student Government serves on the University’s Administrative Council and a student representative is appointed to the Board of Regents. Students also have opportunities to impact university governance by participation in the Student Senate and Residence Hall Council. The Student Government provides a central office location that allows all student access to their representatives.

Challenges that face Student Government include low voter turnout and a low level of interest among students in running for Senate positions. There is a perceived need to work more closely with the Faculty Senate and Board of Regents in order to develop an increased sensitivity to student concerns. The Student Government By-Laws can be found in the exhibits.

Student Organizations

The area of Student Involvement is a function of the University Center’s mission and provides support to the approximately 130 student organizations and their advisors at Southeast Missouri State University. The emphasis of the area is to help students become well-rounded individuals by participation in activities outside of class, which contribute, to their intellectual and emotional development. Organizations range from traditional Greek letter and academic groups to students organized to impact environmental and social causes. A list of registered student organizations for the 1998-1999 academic year can be found in the exhibits.
The area of Student Involvement at the University oversees campus activities including the Student Activities Council, Greek life, and Leadership Development Programs. Fourteen percent of the University's student body belongs to a Greek organization. Greek letter organizations engaged in 3,464 hours of community service during the 1998-1999 academic term. Leadership development and recognition activities for all students take place throughout the year in various forms but culminate in two events. These are the Emerging Leaders program and an annual leadership recognition banquet. In the Emerging Leaders program, students participate in a series of training activities to hone their leadership abilities. The annual recognition banquet allows administrators from across campus the opportunity to recognize outstanding student leadership.

Recreational Sports

The Department of Recreational Sports is part of Student Auxiliary Services. The current Student Recreation Center was opened in 1987 and expanded in 1999. Data found in the exhibits validates a rich program of activities for the university community and the community at large. Data from 1998/1999 indicate Recreational Sports served 142,053 individuals in all programs, services, and facilities (duplicated headcount). Seventy-five percent of Student Recreation Center usage was by students. The construction/renovation of intramural and athletic fields in 1998 led to a Fall 1999 increase in participation of 11% over Fall 1997.

Self-Evaluation

The following strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement have been identified as part of the self study process as it relates to effectively assisting students in meeting their educational goals through student services.

Strengths:

1. Data on student academic progress and satisfaction are used for continuous improvement in most student service areas.

2. In the past ten years, new programs have been developed to better serve students such as Supplemental Instruction, Family Nurse Practitioner services, and New Student Programs.

3. Services to students enrolled through outreach centers or distance learning have been significantly enhanced.

4. Specific programs for commuting and nontraditional students have been developed.
5. The partnership between the student services area and the faculty serves to enhance the educational experience of students.

Challenges:

1. As the student population increases, resources will be needed to meet the demands of serving the additional students and developing new programs to meet their needs.

2. Services to students in the current organization of the University are fragmented causing issues of communication and coordination to arise.

3. Retention data is difficult to obtain for certain student populations which have not been clearly defined. Examples are Southeast P.M. and off-campus students.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. The definition of various student populations can be addressed in the next iteration of the University’s Strategic Plan.

2. Continuing to develop a common university data set, maintained by a central source, can facilitate communication.

3. Additional resources will be sought through opportunities for grant acquisition and collaboration with the community.

4. While there has been progress in the use of technology to provide student services such as registration, assessment, and tutorials, work still remains and needs to be addressed in the next planning cycle.
Chapter 7

Criterion Four: Assessment
Chapter Seven

Criterion Four: Assessment

Southeast Missouri State University documents the academic achievement of its students through a multi-component assessment program. Analysis of the direct and indirect indicators gathered in assessment activities documents that students have mastery of the level of knowledge appropriate to the degree attained and efficiency in the skills and competencies essential for college educated adults.

The assessment program at Southeast Missouri State University significantly predates the mandate by NCA, growing out of commitments dating from 1967, when the University's Office of Institutional Research was founded. From the middle to late 1970's, the University collected information relating to student academic achievement and institutional effectiveness. Assessment activities gradually increased in the early to middle 1980's. In November 1984, the Board of Regents approved a graduation requirement that all students must pass a writing proficiency test after completing 75 credit hours. From 1985 on, the University's involvement in assessment grew rapidly. Assessment of student achievement received a formal focus in 1986, when an outcomes assessment task force, including representatives from the community, faculty, and students, was charged with developing an institutional outcomes assessment plan. The Board of Regents approved the plan in May 1987 (see exhibits).

From 1986 through 1990, the Office of the Provost initiated a variety of assessment activities. In spring 1990, the University Planning Committee published a document, Institutional Goals and Objectives for 1990-1995, which formally acknowledged an institutional planning goal of implementing a systematic plan of assessment for all University programs. In summer 1990, the position of Director of Assessment was created in the Office of the Provost. From 1990 through 1993, the Director of Assessment identified areas for improvement in assessment of the major and general education, offered workshops on assessment, assisted departmental assessment efforts, published a campus assessment newsletter (Accent on Assessment), and developed a statement of Student Assessment Principles (see exhibits). The University Assessment Review Committee was appointed in spring 1993 to evaluate and revise the University's assessment plan and develop a revised assessment plan for the North Central Association of Colleges and Schools (see exhibits). This plan was accepted by NCA in 1994 without stipulations. A review of departmental assessment activities was conducted in fall 1993. An Inventory of Departmental Assessment Activities, 1993-94 (see exhibits), was developed and reported, along with the results of the interviews, to the University Assessment Review Committee.
The University Assessment Review Committee’s recommendations acknowledged certain ongoing activities in departments and colleges as valid components of assessment and focused attention on the need for further development and refinement of procedures for assessing academic programs and the general learning environment. Between 1994-96 each department filed a revised assessment plan that was reviewed and approved by the University Assessment Review Committee (UARC) (see exhibits). Since 1994 departments have reported assessment information and activities in Annual Departmental Reports as part of the regular planning and departmental review process.

In 1999 the committee approved assessment plans for Student Services departments in the areas of Enrollment Management and Student Development.

**The Assessment Process**

Assessment, at the University, in University Studies and at department levels, currently employs a framework consisting of “Plan,” “Data,” “Analysis,” and “Response” sections (see exhibits, Assessment Evaluation Rubric). The “Plan” section contains the assessment objectives, methods and procedures. At the departmental level, lists of educational objectives for each of the department’s major programs, including knowledge, skills, and attitudes expressed in terms of student learning outcomes, measures of student achievement for each of the objectives, and procedures for collecting data are provided. The instruments chosen measure specific goals/objectives and each goal/objective is measured by at least one instrument. The “Data” portion presents the information gathered. The data presented, including trends (where available), provides adequate information for analysis of the unit’s status with respect to its goals/objectives. The “Analysis” section demonstrates that the unit has evaluated the data by describing general trends in the data and pointing out differences and similarities among data points. The data are qualified, amplified, and related to the objectives they are supposed to measure. The relationships between multiple measures of an educational objective are explored and inferences are drawn. Efforts to improve departmental programs, including the assessment mechanisms based on the results of the assessment process, are reported in the “Response” section.

Southeast Missouri State University’s assessment program is founded on fifteen principles. Together they constitute Southeast Missouri State University’s philosophy of assessment. This philosophy guides and will continue to guide evaluation and revision of the University’s assessment plan. The eight characteristics of an effective assessment program identified by NCA are included in the principles. Principles that elicit a common response are grouped, followed by the response. Since the use of assessment for continuous improvement is addressed in several principles, it is presented in a separate section.
Assessment should be a systematic, ongoing process that involves gathering, interpreting, and using information for continuous improvement.

Each academic department is expected to engage in assessment activities every year and to communicate the data obtained, an analysis of the meaning of the data relevant to the department's assessment objectives, and the responses generated as a result of the analysis of those activities in its annual report. The reports are evaluated by the UARC and each section scored according to the rubric. The 1996 and 1997 results were discussed with the deans and department chairs individually. The 1998 ratings were shared with the deans and department chairs. Members of the UARC met with individual deans, chairs and departments at their request to discuss the 1998 ratings and strategies for improvement.

Assessment reports for 1996 were informally scored using a present/absent scheme in the summer of 1997. The 1997 reports were given numerical scores based on the rubric when they were evaluated in the summer of 1998. Consistent with the evolution of the process, the committee was more exacting in the application of the criteria when it reviewed the 1998 reports in the summer of 1999. The "Plan," section of the rubric requires methods, procedures, and objectives. If a department did not include objectives, it was rated no higher than 2. For the "Data" section, if available trend data was not incorporated, the section was rated no higher than 2. In the "Plan," "Data," "Analysis," and, to some degree, "Response" sections, if a department did not include material from its graduate or teacher education programs, it was rated no higher than 2. For some departments the plan for the non-teacher education undergraduate program was complete and would have been rated at a 3 or 4, but since they did not report on all of their programs, the overall rating was a 2. Despite the more stringent application of the rubric, a number of departments received higher scores. This was most notable in the analysis and response categories where 10 and 12 departments respectively were rated higher while 21 and 13 retained their rating from the previous year.

Table 7-1. Number of Departments Achieving each Level in the Sections of the 1998 Assessment Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7  3</td>
<td>7  5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16 25</td>
<td>17 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10  5</td>
<td>5  13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1   2</td>
<td>5   3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the departmental assessment reports found exemplary assessment programs in some departments that linked the department's goals/objectives, the choice of instruments, the data presented, the analysis of the data, and the
responses to the analysis (see exhibits) and departments used assessment information for program improvement (see separate section). However, several areas requiring improvement were identified, some of which had been addressed.

1. There was significant variation in the quality of the reports and thus presumably the quality of the activities. In particular, the “Response” section in many departments needed to be strengthened. To facilitate improvement, the UARC developed a series of comments under the four headings including areas to be strengthened, as well as the positive aspects of the assessment and reporting in addition to a numeric score. These were shared with the deans and the department chairpersons through written reports and conversations with the committee chair or a senior committee member and the Provost. To accommodate strategic planning and emphasize assessment, departments will be required to submit only the assessment component of the Annual Report in Spring 2000. Administrators continue to stress the importance of assessment with an emphasis on the feedback component in appropriate forums and provide assistance and guidance to departments needing further development of assessment activities.

2. Some of the departments closely followed the outline from the Basic Format for Departmental Annual Reports Final Version December 17, 1998: section VII (see exhibits) and reported all of the requested information in an easy-to-follow manner. Other departments’ reports were disorganized to the point that it was difficult to locate and identify the information they presented, and/or they lacked requested information, and/or they included data that are not acceptable measures of student outcomes. A more consistent reporting format is needed to assure necessary information is included, to eliminate inappropriate data, to facilitate review, and to assure reporting of data should be more complete and standardized. Therefore the UARC developed a template and a Basic Format for the Assessment Report (see exhibits) that departments can use in conjunction with the Basic Format for Departmental Annual Reports Final Version December 17, 1998: section VII Assessment and the Busy Chairperson’s Guide to Assessment (see exhibits). In addition, Institutional Research is addressing data recording and reporting mechanisms.

3. For some programs, particularly B.S.Ed. majors, the locus of departmental responsibility was not clearly understood. Therefore, each department chairperson was sent a list of the degrees and programs currently listed for the department in the Program Inventory.

4. Assessment of graduate programs was weak or nonexistent for several departments.

5. As the review process matured and the UARC applied the assessment rubric more stringently, Department chairs requested a more detailed report of the
committee's findings. Thus a scoring sheet that provides information on the ratings of each component of the rubric as well as specific reviewer comments was developed (see exhibits).

Assessment should focus on specific programs and activities that contribute to the intellectual, professional, personal, and cultural needs of students.

Each academic department and the School of University Studies is charged with devising, implementing and monitoring an assessment program that addresses its contributions to the intellectual and professional growth and achievement of its students. Additional university-wide assessment activities focus on the effectiveness of the total university experience in meeting the personal, and cultural needs of students. The University is meeting its objective in this area.

Assessment should be shaped and guided by faculty, students, and staff, with administration and administrative processes providing essential support. (NCA 2, 3, 4, and 7)

The University assessment plan was developed by an institution-wide committee consisting of faculty representatives from each college and school, campus leaders in assessment, and representatives from the divisions of Student Affairs and Finance and Administration. The plan was shared with the Deans' Council, college councils, and Chairpersons' Forum for comment and suggestions. The Assessment Review Committee, Academic Council, and Administrative Council approved the plan.

Responsibilities for administration of assessment are decentralized (see exhibits). In general, the units closest to the delivery of programs have primary responsibility for design, implementation, and use of assessments. With the exception of institution-wide studies, such as the alumni survey, individual units within the Divisions of Academic Affairs, Administration and Enrollment Management, and Finance plan and conduct assessment activities tailored to their particular needs. Though decentralized, assessment is integrated into planning and program review and evaluated for effectiveness at the institutional level. The UARC, including faculty, student, and divisional representatives has become a standing committee for coordination and oversight of the assessment program. Chaired by a faculty member, the Committee reports to the Provost. The Committee is charged with annually evaluating the state of the assessment program at Southeast Missouri State University. This includes the evaluation of the yearly assessment reports prepared by the academic departments and the school of University Studies and communication of the results to the department chairpersons, the Council of Deans and Administrative Council, which is chaired by the President of the University.
To emphasize integration of program review and assessment, responsibility for the assessment program within the Provost’s Office has been assigned to the Associate Provost. Since its inception, the Office of Institutional Research has produced external and internal reports and provided support for data management. There is a brief statement in the University Bulletin informing students that they may be required to engage in assessment activities.

The University is meeting its objective with respect to providing administrative leadership. The Provost, President and the deans continue to emphasize the importance of assessment and encourage faculty involvement. The University is also meeting its objective with respect to providing opportunities for faculty involvement. However, while many faculty members have taken an active role at the department and/or university level and recognize the importance of assessment to continuously improving the academic experience of their students, others remain uninvolved and skeptical. Three areas of concern have been identified, which are being addressed.

1. There is a need for increased support from the Office of Institutional Research. The Office of Institutional Research has been expanded to include a Research Analyst and an Information Specialist.

2. More information on assessment should be provided to students to assist them in understanding the importance of the activities in which they are asked or required to participate. The UARC has developed a short explanation of the importance of assessment and the types of activities in which students are asked or required to participate (see exhibits). This information will be included in the student Day Planner, the Bulletin and in material presented to parents and students during First Step and Opening Week.

3. Chairpersons need to share information from the UARC with members of the faculty to achieve optimal benefit from the assessment program.

Assessment should flow from the institutional mission, and the institution’s mission should be shaped by the results of assessment when appropriate. (NCA I)

The University is meeting its objective in this area. The University’s Statement of Institutional Identity commits the institution to the creation of an intellectually challenging learning environment, which includes a forty-eight hour general education program based on nine measurable objectives, and undergraduate and graduate programs in business, education, liberal arts, health and human services, and the sciences and technologies. The assessment plan specifies methods for assessing student academic achievement in general education, the undergraduate
major, and graduate programs and for monitoring the quality of the learning environment.

Two actions in the Strategic Implementation Plan 1998-2000 under Priority 1, Goal 2, directly address assessment. The first, to “see to it that every department regularly assess its curriculum as part of its strategic planning process,” has been completed. The second, to “establish an assessment plan for every academic program including Kent Library and University Studies. Each department will systematically assess program outcomes and consider assessment data annually in improving its programs and report on its assessment and plans as part of its annual report,” is ongoing.

**Assessment outcomes should be used in planning, budgeting, and allocating resources (NCA 6).**

The University is meeting its objective in this area. There are several mechanisms for linking assessment outcomes to allocation of resources. Departments and colleges can reallocate existing resources in response to assessment driven initiatives. The University’s budget review process provides an opportunity to request additional funds for specific activities designed to enhance student learning.

The State of Missouri supports a campus-level Funding for Results program which provides a significant funding resource (FY1999 $250,000) for individuals and departments seeking to develop or implement new strategies to enhance student learning based on the analysis of assessment data. Proposals are requested in a standard grant proposal format and are reviewed by the Funding for Results Team.

**Flexibility in the choice of assessment procedures should be encouraged, permitting the exercise of professional judgment as to the appropriate methods of assessment (NCA 8). Assessment should be based on multiple measures both quantitative and qualitative, including, for example, locally developed instruments, surveys, nationally normed exams, external reviews, exit interviews, historical data, and evaluation of performances (NCA 5 and 8). The use of assessment results should determine the choice of assessment procedures.**

The University is meeting its objective in this area. Each department or school chooses the instruments it deems most appropriate to measure its stated objectives. Multiple measures are used within and among the departments. Table 7-2 summarizes the methods used, and a department-by-department list is found in the exhibits.
Table 7-2. Summary of Assessment Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessment method</th>
<th>Departments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MFAT</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTE/Praxis</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationally Normed Tests/Certification/Licensure Exams</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Writing Test</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Objective Tests</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance Based Assessments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolios</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Recognition and Honors</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exit interviews/surveys of graduating seniors</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student performance in internships/practica</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/professional school and/or job Placement Rates</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Surveys</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alumni Follow-Up</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Assessment should be cost-effective.*

The University is meeting its objective in this area. In FY2000 $23,000 was budgeted for assessment in the Office of the Provost, $5,000 in the School of University Studies and $29,000 for the Writing Assessment Program. Changes in the campus based FFR program will provide approximately $90,000 allocated by the Provost in consultation with the FFR team to be used for targeted assessment programs. Cost is balanced with effectiveness in the choice of assessment methods. The majority of assessment data is generated from educational activities with purposes in addition to assessment such as course materials, licensing examinations, performances and internships. A few activities, including WP003 (the DIT if adopted), CCTST, and CCTDI, have costs related to obtaining the instruments, scoring the results, and recording the data. These costs are offset in that the University is awarded $500 for each graduating student who performs above the 50th percentile on a nationally-normed general education test (CCTST), subject area test (MFAT) or Teacher Education examination (PRAXIS) through the state-level FFR performance based funding program. The other costs (student, faculty and administrative time) and the true benefits (enhanced student learning) do not fit easily into a cost-benefit analysis. The improvements described by the
departments and the changes made by individual faculty as a result of discussions raised by assessment activities have a positive impact on student learning. Thus, the outcomes justify the financial and personal costs.

Assessment procedures should be regularly evaluated as to their usefulness for fostering continuous program improvement. Assessment plans and activities should be continuously evaluated and improved through peer review and discussion.

The University is meeting its objective in this area. The UARC evaluates annual assessment reports prepared by the academic departments and the School of University Studies and communicates the results to the department chairpersons, the Council of Deans, and Administrative Council, which is chaired by the President of the University. The “Response” section of these reports may include the unit’s perception of the effectiveness of its current plan. See the separate section on the use of assessment for improvement for additional information.

There should be regular comprehensive reviews of the assessment plan.

The UARC is charged with annually evaluating the state of the assessment plan at Southeast Missouri State University. The self-study prepared for NCA provides an opportunity for an in-depth evaluation of assessment every ten years. The UARC has decided the 15 principles of assessment should be reviewed, with special attention paid to overlap and redundancy. An additional statement on information provided to students should be considered. A revised set of principles (see exhibits) was proposed by the UARC and accepted by the University.

While assessment for accountability may be necessary, it should be integrated as far as possible into assessment for improvement. (NCA 6)

The University is meeting its objective in this area. The University uses some assessment data for accountability, e.g., state performance indicators and this self-study. In the College of Education, assessment is partially guided by NCATE standards and state requirements including a portfolio and the Missouri Standards for Teacher Education Programs. Accrediting agencies, such as AACSB (Business), NAI (Industrial Technology), ABET (Physics-Engineering), and NLN (Nursing), include assessment data in the materials requested from departments or colleges. The “Response” section of the assessment report emphasizes the use of assessment for the improvement of student learning, and the evaluation of departmental assessment activities by the UARC focuses on this use of assessment. (See the separate section on the use of assessment for improvement for additional information.)
Assessment should be minimally intrusive on faculty, students, and staff.

The University is meeting its objective in this area. The majority of assessment data is generated from educational activities with purposes in addition to assessment such as course materials, licensing examinations, performances and internships.

Assessment and the use of assessment results should not unfairly restrict institutional goals of diversity and access.

The University is meeting its objective in this area. Assessment processes measure skills and the data are used to generate required reports for accountability and promote change to enhance student learning. External agencies require specific levels of performance for some programs, but results are not used to unfairly limit access or diversity.

Use of Assessment in the Major for Improvement

The assessment process has continued to evolve and mature since the inception of the University Assessment Plan. The development of department and unit based assessment plans and data collection were the primary activities in the early years. The focus then shifted to the thoughtful analysis of the data and refining the process. The current emphasis is on the use of the data for improvement. Colleges and departments have responded to assessment data in a variety of ways. Several examples are listed below.

1. For the academic year 1998, seven departments reported reviewing courses or their curriculum, including the Department of Agriculture, which instituted “sweeping curricular changes.” Three reported adding new courses to address needs identified in assessment activities. For example, the Department of Economics responded to students’ comments in exit interviews that they needed more “real world” applications of theory by introducing a course on economics modeling and designing a capstone course to give students practice in “doing economics.” In addition to adding a required course in Spanish to improve critical reading, writing and thinking skills of majors, the Department of Foreign Languages added an elective course which provides a virtual study abroad experience by pairing students with international students in living situations where the target language must be spoken 50% of the time. The department also added short-term study abroad options for students and additional scholarship assistance for students to study abroad.

2. In the last few years, the Department of Art has used assessment to improve both the assessment process and its curriculum. In its efforts to improve the assessment process and strengthen its program, the department has refined the core review form, as well as the form used by the external juror. The
department has also sought to enhance the senior exhibition, which acts as a capstone experience for its students, by improving the publicity and coordination with the museum. The department has also used information from assessment to improve its curriculum. From the foundation core review, it found that improvements were needed in light and shade logic. This will now be addressed earlier and more vigorously in foundation drawing courses, and also in the core reviews. As a result of observations from external jurors, the department has put 3-D design into the foundation core as a prerequisite to sculpture. This course is designed with a clear set of goals for accomplishing perceptual, technical, and design skills and awareness. This 3-D course will be a prerequisite for art majors for Ceramics I, Sculpture I, and Fibers I. In the senior exit interviews, students noted a lack of craft classes. The department has responded to this by proposing the addition of a small metals class at the Art Academy and by presenting workshops for the students by visiting artists in crafts.

3. In response to the significant number of criminal justice majors on academic probation and the substantial number of majors who failed the University's mandated 75-hour Writing Proficiency Exam, the Department of Criminal Justice developed a program for at-risk criminal justice students. The goals were to increase both the GPAs of program participants and the number of criminal justice students who pass the Writing Proficiency Exam. Specific interventions included participation in a Field Essay Assignment after visiting a criminal justice-related agency and observing a professional utilizing written communication skills; a Writing Proficiency Exam Workshop; and an in-depth interview and regular meetings with the program coordinator. In Phase I, 85% of participants completed a writing apprehension questionnaire and 35 students participated in in-depth interviews regarding their perception of factors influencing academic performance and writing skills. Results of the program indicate improvements in the group members' GPAs, writing skills and retention rates. Thirty-six students were included because they had GPAs of 2.0 or less. Academic success was measured by comparing means for beginning and ending GPAs. The baseline cumulative GPA mean was 1.667. Following intervention, the cumulative ending GPA mean had increased 14.6% to 1.842. The paired difference was statistically significant with a probability for the two-tailed test of p<.009 (t-value = -2.751; df = 35). Over three-fourths (79.4%) of the group showed improvement in GPAs, with another 13.9% experiencing no change in their GPAs. Nearly half (47.2%) of the participants were in academic good standing at the conclusion of the program. Twelve (33.3%) students avoided academic suspension by elevating their GPAs, but were continued on academic probation until their GPAs reach a level of 2.0 or greater. Only five students (13.9%) failed to increase their GPAs sufficiently to avoid academic dismissal or suspension.
4. College algebra was identified as a high-risk course with student D, F and withdrawal rates of 50%. The Supplemental Instruction in College Algebra project was initiated to increase student performance and retention of students in college algebra by assisting students in mastering course concepts and increasing their competency within the discipline. Student self-assessment indicated over 70% of students felt they received a higher grade as a result of SI. Regression analysis with SI participation and ACT score as the independent variables revealed that the coefficient for SI participation was significantly different from zero.

5. In response to information from both graduating student and alumni surveys indicating a desire for increased information on computer technology, the Harrison College of Business has developed a proposal for an MIS (Management Information Systems) major; increased use of personal computers in MG257, MG352 and MG358; and revised the Office Systems Management major.

6. In response to a call in the graduating student surveys for experiential learning and business world practices, the Harrison College of Business was provided mission enhancement funding for internships and the implementation of CEBR (Center for Economic and Business Research); and sponsored a faculty round-table discussion on bringing business world experience into courses.

7. In 1996, it became evident that business students were not performing to the level desired in the management sub-area of the MFAT in business. In other areas, testing groups consistently tested above the median. However, in the management area, students (as a group) were consistently scoring below the median. In response, the faculty in the Department of Management requested a copy of the MFAT examination from ETS so that they could determine the nature of the examination and judge how it compared with the content presented in the basic management class, MG301. As a result of this evaluation, the faculty decided to alter the content (change in relative emphasis assigned to topics) and the text, recognizing that the course had slowly evolved so that it was placing significant emphasis on organizational behavior and too little emphasis on other areas of management, e.g., production and operations management. As a result of the faculty's evaluation and revision of MG301, student performance on the management portion of the MFAT examination improved.

8. Concern over students' performance on the Cell Biology and Molecular Biology and Genetics sections of the MFAT was the major impetus behind the Department of Biology's participation in an external review. As a result, the department's undergraduate curriculum was totally revised, including the addition of a new core course in cell biology.
9. Unsatisfactory performance on the NCLEX Licensing Examination resulted in a series of actions by the Department of Nursing, in addition to previously instituted faculty taught review sessions, including:
   a. Faculty conducted a curriculum review to insure that all items on the NCLEX test plan are included in the curriculum.
   b. A new NCLEX diagnostic exam was administered to the 1999 graduates in fall 1998. It is computerized, as is the NCLEX, and gave the students immediate results and feedback.
   c. Students who scored in the “at risk” range on that exam were paired with faculty mentors for one-on-one attention.
   d. All seniors are required to complete 1500 additional computerized NCLEX-like questions, under the direction and monitoring of a graduate assistant. Students are required to achieve a score on those questions that predict NCLEX passage.
   e. Faculty increased the use of case studies and clinical decision-making as critical thinking activities in both theory and clinical experiences.

Student Mastery of the Level of Knowledge Appropriate to the Degree Attained

Southeast Missouri State University has a well-developed departmentally-based mechanism for evaluating student achievement in the major. Data documenting student accomplishment can be found in the departmental annual reports.

Assessment in University Studies

Assessment in University Studies (see exhibits) employs multiple methods, including nationally normed tests, nationally recognized instruments, locally developed tests and rubrics, locally developed surveys, evaluations of student activities, and evaluation of student performance in University Studies courses. The Writing Assessment Program, which uses a locally derived rubric to evaluate student work for placement in composition courses (WP001), after completion of the required composition sequence (WP002), and as a requirement for graduation (WP003), is well established. The assessment of students’ critical thinking skills using the nationally normed California Critical Thinking Skills Test and evaluation of students’ WP002 and WP003 essays using a locally developed critical thinking rubric is evolving and providing useful data. The California Critical Thinking Dispositions Inventory and the Defining Issues Test are being evaluated. A project to evaluate students’ performances on the University Studies objectives based on the review of artifacts of student work in University Studies courses was initiated in F1999. UI400 faculty established acceptable characteristics of student work regarding the skills that constitute University
Studies Objectives One, Two, and Three to determine desired levels of performance on those skills. These performance descriptors were woven into rubrics (see exhibits) designed to provide specific information on the strengths and weaknesses exhibited in the student work to provide a basis for targeted efforts to improve student learning. As the project develops, rubrics will be created for the other objectives. Initially artifacts from UI100 and UI400-level classes were evaluated. Eventually, artifacts from core courses will be included as appropriate to the course. University Studies faculty use the rubrics to evaluate student work and inform conversations focused on methods to maintain the demonstrated strengths and address the weaknesses.

**Written Communication**

For a more complete description of the processes, see the Writing Assessment Section of this self-study. In brief, two independent evaluators utilize a 6-point scale using the criteria of focus, organization, development, style, correctness, and use of references holistically assess students’ writing abilities. Students at the completion of EN140 take a common final exam (WP002). From 1990 to 1999, the percentage of students passing the exam increased from 89% to slightly less than 94%. (see exhibits for details).

*The 75-hour Writing Proficiency Examination (WP003):*

Prior to graduation, all students seeking a four-year degree are required to sit for the writing proficiency examination (WP003). The percentage of students failing the exam, which peaked at 18% in 1993, has decreased to 6.2% during 1999 (Table 7-3).

**Table 7-3. Pass Rate for WP003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number Who Took Exam</th>
<th>Number Passed</th>
<th>Percentage Passed</th>
<th>Number Failed</th>
<th>Percentage Failed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1101</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1031</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>85.8%</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1173</td>
<td>1024</td>
<td>87.3%</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1036</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1187</td>
<td>1030</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1263</td>
<td>1134</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>1091</td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1215</td>
<td>1115</td>
<td>91.8%</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1271</td>
<td>1193</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oral Communication

The fall 1999 semester marked the implementation of the first phase of the Oral Communication Across the Curriculum program. The objective of this program is to provide and support students’ incremental acquisition of oral communication knowledge and skills. The first phase involves establishing baseline oral communication skills. To that end, a total of 176 first-year student presentations were evaluated using a holistic scoring rubric with a range of 0-6. The mean score was 3.02; according to the rubric, this means that students are at a developing level. During the Spring 2000 semester, oral communication skills will be evaluated in senior-level classes in order to set a baseline for upper-class students as well as validate the scoring instrument.

Critical Thinking

Critical thinking skills and dispositions provide the basic foundation for all of the University Studies objectives. Therefore, measurement of student learning outcomes in critical thinking skills and dispositions is critical to assessment of the University Studies program. The California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST) has been administered to incoming students in GS 101 and to students in UI 400 courses. The 35 item, 45 minute, multiple-choice normed test provides a total score and subscores for analysis, evaluation, inference, deduction and induction. The results from the CCTST are reported to the state as the nationally normed general education test.

Southeast Missouri State University upperclass students’ scores compare well with the norming group on the total score based on mean and percentiles (Table 7-4). Based on percentiles, Southeast Missouri State University upperclass students’ scores correspond with the norming group for analysis and induction, but not for inference. Southeast Missouri State University’s students’ deduction scores are slightly below the norming group, with the greatest deficit seen in 1999S. Performance in the area of Evaluation varies, with 1998 being below and 1997 above the norm. Students show growth in their critical thinking skills during their tenure at Southeast Missouri State University. Statistically significant differences can be detected between the performances of first year and upperclass students on the Total Critical Thinking Score and all subscores using a Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test (P = <0.001, except 1998 Inference = 0.055 and Analysis = 0.002; and 1999 Deduction = 0.002) for all comparisons except 1997 Deduction (Table 10)
Table 7-4. Comparison of the Performance of Southeast Students and the Norming Group for CCTST - Total Critical Thinking Score by Percentiles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year NS</th>
<th>ACT</th>
<th>Number Correct</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentile Norming Group</td>
<td>90 781 NA</td>
<td>31b 40 48 57 65 73</td>
<td>15.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile SE Upperclass</td>
<td>97 223 23.17c</td>
<td>36 40 48 58 69 73</td>
<td>16.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile SE Upperclass</td>
<td>98 242 22.98d</td>
<td>36 40 48 58 69 74</td>
<td>15.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile SE Upperclass</td>
<td>99S 406 22.64e</td>
<td>35 42 53 59 66 75</td>
<td>15.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentile SE Upperclass</td>
<td>99F 389 22.81f</td>
<td>33 40 49 58 66 72</td>
<td>15.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a NS = number of students  
b = percentile 31% of the students scored 13 or lower  
c = 169 ACT scores  
d = 197 ACT scores  
e = 315 ACT scores  
f = 286 ACT scores

Table 7-5. Comparison of Performances of Upperclass and Beginning Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Inference</th>
<th>Deduction</th>
<th>Induction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
<td>mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97 Upp 16.17</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>7.64</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First year 13.76</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>5.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98 Upp 15.87</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>7.48</td>
<td>6.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firs a 14.28</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99S Upp 15.57</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>6.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99F Upp 15.77</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7.49</td>
<td>6.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Year c 14.15</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Mean ACT = 22.87  N = 479  
b Mean ACT = 22.42  N = 1128  
c Mean ACT = 22.68  N = 1305

California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory

The CCTDI is designed to measure an individual's disposition toward critical thinking. The scales of the CCTDI include: truth seeking, open-mindedness, analyticity, systematicity, critical thinking self-confidence, inquisitiveness, and...
cognitive maturity. In the fall of 1999, approximately ½ of the students in GS101 took the test at the beginning of the semester, while the remaining GS101 students completed the test at the end of the semester. A statistically significant difference was not found. This could be a function of the level of student achievement or the ability of the instrument to measure the amount change likely to occur in one semester. The instrument will be administered to upper class students to determine if differences can be detected between beginning and upperclass students.

Assessment of Critical Thinking Using WP002 and WP003 Papers

Trained faculty members using a 4-point critical thinking rubric developed by Facione and Facione and revised at Southeast Missouri State University holistically scored WP002 and WP003 papers. Significant correlations (Pearson Correlations) were found between students’ Critical Thinking Rubric and CCTST scores. Beginning students who participated in sample 1 either volunteered or were volunteered by faculty members. All other papers evaluated were selected randomly. When the performances of upperclass students on WP003 were compared with those of students on WP002 using Mann-Whitney Rank Sum Test, there was a significant difference in samples 1 (P = <0.001) and 3 (P = 0.006), but not sample 2 (P = 0.113).

Use of Assessment in University Studies for Improvement

Aggregate and section data from the CCTST is given to each GS101 instructor and the Director of the First Year Experience at the beginning of the semester. This provides individual faculty with the opportunity to modify class exercises to address weaknesses detected in the critical thinking skills of the students in each section.

A Funding for Results funded project has been initiated to determine if selected University Studies assessment activities can be used in conjunction with specific faculty development activities and interventions with students to improve student learning. In one segment of the project, data from the CCTST taken in UI4XX and the WP003 examinations have been evaluated for selected departments whose students have scored below the University average on the instruments. Two study departments have been selected, and the chairpersons of the departments have agreed to participate in the project. Each study department has been paired with a control department from the same college with similar performances on the CCTST and WP003. Two or three faculty members from each study department will be provided with help in teaching writing across the curriculum and critical thinking skills. In the other segment of the project, data from the CCTST given to incoming students has been evaluated to identify individuals needing additional enrichment in the area of critical thinking and a set of matched pairs has been established. One member of each pair is offered the opportunity to participate in a
seven-session intervention provided by personnel from the Learning Enrichment Center and faculty/staff volunteers.

Department-based data for WP003 is provided to department chairs and college deans to facilitate college and department based responses. College based data for the CCTST is provided to college deans to facilitate college based responses.

Self Evaluation

The study of the assessment process has resulted in the identification of the following strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement that can be used to further enhance the overall program of assessment.

Strengths:

1. Assessment is founded on a set of principles, guided by a university plan, implemented in unit based assessment plans, and evaluated based upon an established rubric.

2. Responsibility for the administration of assessment is decentralized with the units closest to the delivery of programs having primary responsibility for design, implementation, and the use of assessments.

3. Oversight of the process rests with the Provost and the University Assessment Review Committee consisting of a faculty representative from each college and school, students, representatives from Student Development and the divisions of Finance and Administration and Enrollment Management.

4. Many faculty members take an active role at the department and/or university level and recognize the importance of assessment to continuously improve the academic experience for their students.

5. Assessment is integrated into planning and program review with a clear focus on improving student learning.

6. Multiple examples of the use of assessment for improvement are evident.

7. Assessment is based on multiple measures both quantitative and qualitative including locally developed instruments, nationally normed exams, surveys, external reviews, and evaluation of student performance.

8. University Studies assessment employs universally administered nationally normed tests and locally developed assessments but is centered in a
systematic review of student work that targets specific strengths and concerns in the achievement of the University Studies objectives.

9. The data indicate that the performance by students on assessments of student learning is strong.

Challenges:

1. As departments further develop their assessment processes there will be an increased demand on the Office of Institutional Research to provide data in a manner that facilitates its inclusion into assessment reports and analysis.

2. There is significant variation in the quality of assessment reports that in some cases may not reflect the quality of the activities.

3. Assessment in graduate programs is generally weak or unreported in several departments.

4. Some faculty members remain uninvolved and skeptical about the utility of the process.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. The restructuring of the Funding for Results program provides opportunities for units to explore novel methods of assessment through supporting projects that aim to develop initiatives to enhance student learning.

2. The University assessment process is ready to move to a new level with respect to using assessment as a tool to enhance student learning. These initiatives might be enhanced by supporting professional development activities for the faculty to further develop their knowledge base in the use of assessment tools.

3. The University Studies assessment project involving a systematic review of student work may serve as a model for other units who seek to incorporate the evaluation of artifacts into their assessment programs.

4. Chairpersons need to make a conscientious effort to share assessment review results with the entire faculty of the department in order to foster greater faculty involvement.
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The chapter is a continuation of Criterion Four as it relates to planning as a means to accomplish the University’s purposes and strengthen its educational effectiveness. The text will provide evidence that the University supports a planning process which is collegial, takes into account internal and external circumstances, and results in an annually updated document and inventory of accomplishments which can then be used to focus the next year’s efforts.

Strategic planning is a critical element in the continuous improvement of any organization. University strategic planning amounts to an ongoing consideration of the interaction of environmental trends, institutional mission, institutional values, and institutional strengths and challenges. The purpose of strategic planning is to identify and refine priorities that become the basis for the wisest use of institutional resources.

The process of strategic planning, in its most practical form, amounts to an assessment of how well an organization and each of its component parts are doing versus how well the organization should do in light of its mission and current and anticipated trends in its external and internal environments. This, in turn, leads to the identification of priorities, plans, goals, and objectives for the short- and long-term future. Plans, goals, and objectives must be specified in terms of measurable outcomes, both qualitative and quantitative. Strategic planning must be seen as a continuous process, as a critical element in the “plan, do, check, act” cycle of continuous, quality improvement.

An ancient Chinese curse reads, “May you live in interesting times.” The times indeed are “interesting,” full of hopes and fears, opportunities and challenges. Above all, they are times which call for strength and clarity of purpose.

Through strategic planning, Southeast Missouri State University is forging ahead, boldly, into the 21st Century. The priorities, the activities, and the indicators of success identified in the Strategic Plan will serve as Southeast’s blueprint for continuous improvement in serving students. (A University for the New Millennium)

History of Strategic Planning at the University

The University strategic planning process began in March 1994 when the President charged the Provost, who chairs the University Planning Committee (UPC), with the task to develop a strategic plan for the University. During the spring semester, National Higher Education Management Systems (NCHEMS) was chosen to serve as the consulting firm to help in the development of the
It was chosen to serve as the consulting firm to help in the development of the strategic plan. Dr. Dennis Jones, President of NCHEMS met with the UPC and spent the summer reviewing and compiling demographic and other data from the University, the Coordinating Board of Higher Education, and other sources.

During the fall of 1994, Dr. Jones visited the campus to make presentations to the Board of Regents and to the UPC. Planning forums were held in nine locations, six of these in regional communities, to allow constituents to give input to the Board of Regents about interests and concerns with the University. Individuals were also encouraged to send their thoughts in writing to the Board. Five on-campus forums were held with approximately 200 people attending. A survey on core values, major world trends, and university priorities was sent to all faculty and staff. The UPC compiled the results. A joint meeting of the Board of Regents and the University Planning Committee was held to consider a summary of the input from the nine public forums, the campus forums and the campus survey. Robert Zemsky, Pew Charitable Trust, gave a presentation and conducted a workshop with approximately 50 people participating.

By February 1995, a draft working document was sent out to persons on campus, along with a charge to units to develop unit strategic plans based on the six institutional priorities identified by the UPC from the results of forums and surveys. These priorities were: 1. A Top Quality Curriculum, 2. Increased and Stabilized Enrollment, 3. Utilization of Innovative Technology, 4. Better Service to the Region, 5. Enhanced Campus Community, 6. Excellent Physical Facilities.

By October 1995, Fifty-four campus organizational units had developed unit-level strategic plans. Every member of the organization had an opportunity to be involved. During the spring 1995, twenty presentations were made across campus by a group of ten presenters, working in pairs, to discuss linking strategic planning with continuous improvement. Approximately 300 persons participated. A team of ten persons was sent to attend a workshop on advanced strategic planning in St. Louis. During fall 1995, three campus workshops on strategic planning were held, with approximately 100 participants. An additional three on-campus forums were held on the question of a strategic planning theme. Approximately 90 persons participated. By December 1995, a draft of the strategic plan was presented to the Board of Regents for review.

In January 1996, two on-campus forums were held to discuss implications of the strategic plan. On February 1, 1996, The Strategic Plan was submitted to the Board of Regents and approved.

**Strategic Planning Document**

The University has adopted a dynamic form of strategic planning in which there is ongoing consideration of the nature of the University and its priorities in light of environmental trends against the backdrop of the institution’s basic mission, its
core values, and its strengths. The University has continued to involve students, faculty, staff, and citizens of the region in the strategic planning process. This inclusive, participatory, grass-roots process utilized in developing its strategic plan has allowed the University to continue its tradition of educational excellence.

The six priorities at the core of the strategic plan were:

- Offer a top-quality curriculum with a solid liberal education as a foundation for preparing graduates for leadership positions in society
- Optimize and stabilize enrollment by serving our students more effectively
- Enhance student learning by making optimal use of information technology and developing innovative applications of technology
- Serve our region more completely and more effectively
- Enhance campus community
- Build, maintain, and operate first-rate physical facilities

Twenty-eight related goals were written for each of these priorities that identified institutional aspirations. Indicators of success were then developed that would serve as the basis for assessing progress the University achieved toward reaching its goals. The compelling link between the two was action. Each campus unit, both academic and support, had the responsibility for a specific action plan, by which it would help address each University priority. In addition to these plans was the detailed, University-level action plan. The priorities, indicators of success and action items compiled by the UPC were distributed campus-wide and to all interested constituents in the document *A University for the New Millennium*.

A Strategic Implementation Plan (May 2, 1996) was written by the UPC detailing the priorities, goals, and actions to be taken, identifying who would be responsible for each action and a projected completion date. This was distributed campus-wide and to all interested constituents.

Year 1: 1996-1997. The 28 major goals for the original six priorities in the strategic plan were more clearly written. Southeast Missouri State University not only implemented a strategic plan, but also developed a campus master plan and a mission enhancement plan intended as a long-range guide for the University. The Mission Enhancement plan was directly connected to the strategic plan and demonstrated the University was making budgetary decisions, accordingly. This mission enhancement plan approved by the Coordinating Board of Higher Education, presented to the State Legislature and approved by the General Assembly, contained more than $3 million of "new" money to be used to enhance the University's overall mission. Significant achievements during this year were made in each of the six priority areas in the strategic plan. The Donald L. Harrison College of Business was accredited. Restructuring of the enrollment
management effort and creation of programs to help minority students and all new students in making a successful adjustment to the University was accomplished. A new emphasis was given to the use of technology to enhance teaching and learning. Working through decisions in a collegial fashion and building pride in the institution through an Inauguration Week, highlighting all elements of the University took place. The Robert A. Dempster Hall was completed and dedicated. Results: Strategic Plan Progress Report was written and distributed to all University stakeholders – students, legislators, colleagues in Missouri public higher education, the community at large and the University community itself.

Year 2: 1997-1998. The Strategic Plan for the University became a sound blueprint for construction of the Southeast Missouri State University of the 21st Century. It became the template against which all strategic and budgetary decisions were measured prior to implementation, and against which success was gauged. The Board of Regents recognized that all the original goals would not be achieved immediately, or even in the first five years. But the value of the plan was that actions taken piecemeal, over a long period of time, would contribute to realizing the priorities of the 1996 plan. The Board also made it clear that the plan would be revised from time to time in order to take account of new challenges and new opportunities.

Significant progress was made in each of the six Strategic Plan priority areas. New degree programs were added, ranging from a cooperative doctorate in education to an associate degree in physical therapy assisting and national accreditation was achieved in community counseling. New enrollment management leadership was secured and a comprehensive enrollment plan was developed with attention devoted to recruitment and retention. The campus fiber optic network was completed, and internet access was improved. A new higher education center to serve the Sikeston areas was opened, and a Polytechnic Institute to meet the advanced technical education needs of the region was established. The Social Science Building was renovated and funding was secured for additional facilities. Additional progress toward achieving the goals of the strategic plan were reported in Results I: Strategic Plan Progress Report Year 2: 1997-98 which was printed and distributed campus-wide and to all interested constituents.

In addition, a segment reporting on “Resource Development” was included in this report. Financial resources to carry out the six priorities and related goals were necessary. Resource development included the University’s efforts to persuade state and federal governments to increase their investment in the work of the institution, as well as the efforts of the Southeast Missouri University Foundation to attract private support.

A new “implementation plan,” listing specific steps to be taken during years three and four of the plan, was completed during the Fall Semester of 1998. Among the more significant efforts planned for the 1998-99 period were the development of a
new River Campus to house a School of Visual and Performing Arts, the University Museum, and a performing arts complex to serve both the University and the region; the start of construction on a new Polytechnic Institute building and on the new Sikeston Area Higher Education Center; continued development of new degree programs; intensified enrollment and retention efforts; a major upgrade of computer applications used throughout the campus; and a year-long celebration of the University’s 125th anniversary.

Year 3: 1998-1999. *Strategic Implementation Plan 1998-2000* was distributed campus-wide and to the University’s constituents in September 1998. This implementation plan superseded the one dated May 2, 1996. Significant progress was made in each of the six strategic plan priority areas and most concerns expressed in the public forums in 1994 have been addressed. New degree programs have been added, new program accreditations received and re-accreditation was achieved in two existing programs. A comprehensive strategic enrollment management plan as developed. All buildings on campus were linked via a fiber optic network, upgraded software was installed, internet access improved, redesigned World Wide Web pages created and the number of courses available over the internet to increased each semester. The Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium, a partnership among five higher education institutions serving Southeast Missouri was organized. A Regional Public Service Institute was established to coordinate the University’s outreach efforts. A Kennett Area Higher Education Center was in development. A Polytechnic Institute to meet the advanced technical education needs of the region was established, along with a Center of Excellence in Advanced Manufacturing Technology.

Efforts were made to improve the campus climate for minority students, international students, and students with disabilities. Major new construction projects made significant improvements in the University’s infrastructure. Additional renovation projects were also being planned. More specific achievements are reported in *Results III: Strategic Plan Progress Report*.

Financial resources also increased. In fiscal year 2000, Mission Enhancement funding reached the $4.575 million level, and an additional installment projected for fiscal year 2001 would raise that level to $6.1 million in annual appropriations. The state was able to fund several major capital projects and the University took advantage of favorable bond markets to finance others. The Southeast Missouri University Foundation and the hundreds of members of the Copper Dome Society made significant private gifts to enhance the University’s margin of excellence.

The New Strategic Plan

In the 1998-99 academic year, the University Planning Committee was charged with developing a timeline for use in preparing a revised version of the University’s Strategic Plan. The timeline, in general, projected a review of
Mission and Purposes in the spring of 1999, completion of an external scan, including Board of Regents sponsored forums both on and off campus and UPC forums on campus, and the development of new or reaffirmation of current institutional priorities in the spring of 2000. Over 400 persons attended the planning forums (see exhibits for summary). In addition, faculty and staff were asked to provide their thoughts on the University’s future direction. A summary of the Strategic Planning Survey can be found in the exhibits. In January 2000, the Board of Regents approved four strategic planning priorities that will be used to guide the planning efforts of all departments/units of the University. These priorities are:

**Priority 1:** To provide top-quality academic programs with a liberal arts education core.

**Priority 2:** To enhance access to a wide range of educational programs throughout our service region.

**Priority 3:** To provide service to the region.

**Priority 4:** To enhance the University community.

A copy of the priorities and their explanatory statements is available in the exhibits. With the approval of the priorities, the time line projects that departments and units will begin revising their plans in the spring semester, 2000, and complete the work in the fall semester, 2000.

**Self Evaluation**

Through its planning process, the University has strengthened its educational effectiveness. The process has led to enhanced funding which undergirded the development of a range of initiatives including new academic programs and significant infrastructure improvements. The planning process has led the University toward a culture of continuous improvement that is used to focus and assess its ongoing efforts. From these efforts the following strengths, challenges, and opportunities for improvement seem clear.

**Strengths:**

1. The University has adopted a dynamic form of strategic planning in which there is ongoing consideration of the nature of the University and its priorities in light of environmental trends against the backdrop of the institution’s basic mission, its core values, and its strengths.

2. The initial round of planning in 1994 was conducted with an unprecedented series of open forums in nine locations throughout the University’s service area to get direct input from the public about the post-
secondary needs of the region. Continued input from the University’s constituents is not only welcomed but also encouraged.

3. The Board of Regents made it clear that the Strategic Plan is a long-range guide for the University community. The plan acknowledges that all the goals would not be achieved in the first year, or even in the first five years. Its value lies in providing a mirror in which all decisions may be viewed. By measuring future decisions against this vision, it is expected that actions taken separately, over a long period of time, nevertheless will contribute to realizing the priorities of the 1996 plan. There is a clear expectation that the plan will be revised occasionally in order to consider new challenges and new opportunities that were not clear during the 1994-96 period of its development. The members of the Board of Regents provide leadership, constructive advice, and give firm support for implementation of all aspects of the Strategic Plan.

4. The University uses the planning process to focus its collective energies on the six priorities of the strategic plan and make budgetary decisions, accordingly. Connections are made between the Strategic Plan and the Mission Enhancement plan. The planning process will continue to tie budgetary decisions to departmental/unit goals set by faculty and staff in departments/units as those goals identify with the Institutional priorities in the strategic plan.

5. The planning process is designed to include input from all departments and the students, faculty and staff of the University as well as external input from the region. This input has been sought through forums and surveys as well as the opportunity for further involvement through a website designed for that purpose. During the 1999-2000 process for reviewing and revising the strategic plan, forums were held at 11 different regional sites. The strength here is the sense of ownership of this process of strategic planning by the faculty, staff, students, and constituents in the University’s service region.

6. The dissemination of the priorities and goals of the strategic plan helps communicate an institutional identity.

7. The planning process has been particularly focused on student-centeredness/student learning through the proposed revision of the Mission, Role, and Scope of the University as well as the Value "Learn" Statement. Three out of four of the new priorities (1999-2000) focus on student learning with respect to curriculum and experiential learning.
Challenges:

1. A challenge with regard to planning and the institutional process is the apparent "apathy" on the part of members of the University community or, in other words, overcoming the feeling that some individual's input has no value or that one's voice will not be heard. Encouragement of commitment and cooperation from all persons in the University community needs to be ongoing. The challenge is to foster maximum involvement and ownership from all constituents.

2. Challenges that impact student learning include implementation of non-traditional delivery systems such as web-based and off-site learning with regard to economic, technological, and human resources. Implementing new non-traditional delivery systems will impact both colleges and departments with regard to training of faculty and support personnel, travel and extended hours for personnel in both areas of instruction and services.

3. The University strategic plan provides a road map for planning at the departmental/unit level. A continuing challenge is reviewing, updating and implementing strategic plans at the departmental/unit level and the coordination of those plans into college/division level strategic plans, goals and action statements.

4. An additional challenge is continuing to deliver a top quality curriculum given continuing rising costs of education and student indebtedness. Budgetary constraints will continue to be an issue, particularly if federal grants to state and local governments decline.

5. Continued acquisition of financial resources to carry out the action plans and reach the goals for priorities in the strategic plan will always be a challenge.

6. An additional challenge, which is also considered to be a strength, is maintaining a flexible strategic plan that allows for changes and creativity as the need arises.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. The strategic planning process must allow for continually refining the needs of faculty, staff, students, and constituents in the service region. There is an increased need for support services for a growing number of students as enrollment demographics continue to change. While race, gender and ethnic issues also come to the forefront, the planning process must be flexible to accommodate changing demographics and remain
student-centered or constituency-driven in order for the Institution to continue to be competitive and successful. Retaining the strategic planning web site as a permanent fixture and allowing for suggestions and ideas from University constituents on a continuing basis will provide for updating the plan in a timely fashion.

2. The University Planning Committee (UPC) has revised the original six priorities from the 1996 strategic plan to four priorities based on results from the fall 1999 series of public forums sponsored by the Board of Regents and the UPC. The Board of Regents approved these four priorities in January 2000. A concerted effort was made by the UPC to have greater involvement of all University constituents in this current revision of the strategic plan than the number of participants in the process for the 1996 plan.

3. The University’s current efforts toward developing a comprehensive institutional research reporting data base will enhance the ability to systematically collect reliable and timely data. This, in turn, will enhance the ability to develop and utilize a comprehensive measurement system aligned to track progress toward meeting goals and objectives and increase the effectiveness of the “plan, do, check, act” cycle of continuous improvement.
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Criterion Five states that "the institution demonstrates integrity in its practices and relationships." This chapter will demonstrate that the institution, through its policies and activities, practices integrity in its internal and external environments. Operational procedures are clearly defined, public, and open for review.

Southeast Missouri State University’s self study validates its contention that it not only has in place policies which reflect its ethical values but that its practices reflect integrity in its dealings with all constituencies. Since the development of the University Web site, policies and procedures are available on line to both internal and external constituents.

Faculty, Staff, and Student Rights

Rights of appeal on matters such as retention, tenure, promotion, merit, and other grievances are found in the Faculty Handbook. These policies emanate from and are periodically reviewed by the Faculty Senate. Also in the Handbook is the statement of Academic Freedom adopted by the Board of Regents that guarantees faculty full academic freedom in the classroom, in research, and in public venues. The Personnel Handbook describes the due process and grievance procedures for staff. The Student Calendar/Handbook enumerates those policies and procedures affecting the behavior of students (see section on retention for suspension, probation policies). Violations of the Code of Student Conduct are referred to the Judicial Process.

The Office of Judicial Affairs is responsible for enforcing, interpreting, continuously improving and educating members of the campus community regarding the Code of Student Conduct. The latest revision of the Code took place in 1998. It emphasized expansion of sections related to hazing and alcohol related behaviors. The Coordinator and graduate assistant, under the auspices of the Dean of Students, administer the Code in a fair and timely manner. They also train and supervise a group of twenty student justices and 10 peer mediators. The office is currently developing a draft sexual assault policy and a resource area for issues related to sexual assault, bias related offenses and other forms of harassment. The office adjudicated the following number of cases over the past 3 years: FY 97 - 119, FY 98 - 227, FY 99 - 238. Most cases are alcohol-related involving first year, male students. The office also provides educational programs and consultation with faculty, staff and students.
Diversity and Equity

The University is committed to a written policy of equal opportunity for all employees and students in its employment and academic programs. This commitment applies to all persons without regard to age, ancestry, color, creed, gender, national origin, physical disability, race, religion, or veteran status. Equal employment opportunity includes both nondiscrimination and affirmative action. Nondiscrimination assures equal employment opportunities for all qualified persons, and encourages all to recognize their full employment potential. Affirmative action creates positive programs to more fully utilize minorities and women.

This policy governs all practices relating to all employees and students, and includes, but is not limited to, recruitment, hiring, compensation, advancement, promotion, reassignment, retention, non-renewal, termination, transfer, lay-off, leave, training, support and tenure (the Personnel and Faculty Handbooks are available online). Faculty members, administrators and other supervisory staff are responsible for availing themselves fully of the talents of minorities and women to rectify any past inequities. Particular attention is given to their increased opportunity for upward mobility. Through implementation of this policy the University participates in the fulfillment of its goals to achieve excellence in all phases of university life.

The Assistant to the President for Equity Issues is charged with implementing the affirmative action policy. An Affirmative Action Committee, appointed by the President, serves as an advisory committee. The committee reviews the policies affecting equal employment opportunity and affirmative action, and assists individuals who allege discrimination.

Efforts to recruit and retain minorities, women and the disabled have met with mixed results. The following tables show the numbers and percentages of African-Americans, all minorities and women faculty, staff and students for the years 1993 and 1998. In general, the data suggest that minority student enrollment increased in real numbers while staying constant as a percentage of all enrollments. The number of minority staff has also increased while the number of minority faculty has remained constant.
Table 9-1. Minority Faculty, Staff, and Students, 1993

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers and (Percentages) of African-Americans</th>
<th>Numbers and (Percentages) of All Minorities</th>
<th>Numbers and (Percentages) of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>9 (1.9%)</td>
<td>24 (5.2%)</td>
<td>171 (36.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>51 (8.2%)</td>
<td>58 (9.3%)</td>
<td>363 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>421 (5.2%)</td>
<td>532 (6.6%)</td>
<td>4711 (58.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Minority Faculty, Staff, and Students, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Numbers and (Percentages) of African-Americans</th>
<th>Numbers and (Percentages) of All Minorities</th>
<th>Numbers and (Percentages) of Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>6 (1.6%)</td>
<td>24 (6.2%)</td>
<td>144 (37.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
<td>54 (7.7%)</td>
<td>62 (8.9%)</td>
<td>414 (59.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>404 (4.8%)</td>
<td>562 (6.6%)</td>
<td>5225 (61.6%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Strategic Plan of the University commits the institution to increases in recruitment, retention and graduation rates of minority students and in the employment of minority faculty and staff with the ultimate goal of an increased presence and understanding of all people. (See the reports of the Office of Minority Programs, Admissions, and Enrollment Management as they relate to the recruitment, enrollment, and progress of minority students) The Admissions Office developed a Minority Recruitment Plan that outlines the goals for recruiting minority students. The plan was to recruit and enroll at least 120 minority students in 1998-99 as a step toward the strategic planning goal of raising the minority student population to 9.5% by the year 2000. Recruiting efforts include strengthening the visibility of the University within the target populations of St. Louis City/County, the Bootheel and the metropolitan St. Louis area in Illinois, all of which have large minority student populations. There will be a concerted effort to develop a cohesive working relationship with the St. Louis Outreach Coordinator to promote the University within the St. Louis market. The Associate Director of Admissions for Minority Recruiting has the responsibility for implementing this plan. The University has had little success in meeting its goal of employing representative numbers of minority faculty, despite a strong affirmative action effort.

The President’s Commission on Minority Affairs was established in 1997 to help the University develop new approaches to the recruitment and retention of minority students, faculty and staff, and to the creation of a friendly, supportive
environment that can help individuals reach their full potential. The Commission includes members of the University community as well as minority citizens throughout the state. These Commission members are creative and influential, and will serve as role models for Southeast students.

The role of the Affirmative Action Officer has been expanded with the recent filling of the position of Assistant to the President for Equity Issues. This administrator is responsible for development of practices designed to enhance the University community’s appreciation for cultural diversity. The Assistant to the President provides leadership, pro-active support and assistance to units at all stages of the employment process with special attention to developing pools of qualified individuals of diverse backgrounds from which a final selection can be made. This officer is the University’s administrator responsible for implementing, as appropriate, suggestions of the President’s Commission on Minority Affairs, and revising the Affirmative Action Plan.

Publications

The Department of Publications and the University Web Page Committee are part of University Relations, which is composed of the Assistant to the President for University Relations, News Bureau, Special Events, Photo Services, and Video Services. The mission of the Department of Publications and University Web Page Committee is to support the University by providing very high quality, accurate, ethical, and effective publications. Great effort is taken to ensure that material in the publications/web pages is an accurate representation of institutional practices, policies and procedures. When NCA accreditation is mentioned in a publication, the address and phone number of the commission office is given. Each year the Department of Publications submits materials to two national organizations that review higher education marketing and publication efforts. As a result, many awards have been received for the quality of the work submitted (see exhibits for details).

Since the last NCA review, the department has become more research oriented with respect to its recruitment pieces. Focus groups, national data, and information gathered on campus as well as a system of follow-up surveys have become invaluable in the day-to-day work. The department assumed a leadership role in the development of a student centered web page. The site was implemented in 1997 concurrent with adoption of a World Wide Web policy statement and procedures for web publishing. In 1999, the site was redesigned utilizing concepts developed by students. To provide support to units and foster consistency among web sites, Computer Services hired a student employee to assist departments with content updates and design at no cost to the unit. The remaining challenge is to assist departments in updating their web pages and providing in-depth information.
University Foundation

The Southeast Missouri State University Division of University Advancement has responsibility, through the Southeast Missouri University Foundation, for fund raising and development to advance the mission of the University. In addition, the Division incorporates the Office of Alumni Services. Institutional integrity in fund raising and development is exemplified in many ways including (1) the policies and activities of the Foundation’s independent Board of Directors and committees, (2) internal and external reporting of funds contributed and donors, (3) meticulous internal accounting procedures and an annual external audit, (4) effective fund investing/management, (5) qualitative production by professional staff and (6) personalization of donor acknowledgments and ongoing contributor stewardship, insuring compliance with donor designations.

Materials that document the integrity demonstrated by the Division of University Advancement include the Foundation’s operations manual and minutes of the Southeast Missouri University Foundation Board of Directors and its committees; monthly, annual and campaign internal reporting and external gift reports submitted to the Council on Aid to Education; written Divisional Policies and Procedures; annual Financial Statements including Auditor’s opinion letters; and samples of formal scholarship endowment agreements, deferred gift acknowledgment forms, gift receipts and acknowledgments, and donor stewardship programs and monitoring systems.

In addition, the Division of University Advancement measures favorably based on quantitative comparisons with peer institutions with regard to funds raised and professional staffing levels. Through a fiscal 1997-98 survey of eight regional peer institutions, the Southeast Missouri University Foundation’s gift receipts were higher than for peer institutions (Southeast raising $5.1 million compared to the peer average of $5 million). A review of professional staffing levels for our peers also indicates the Southeast Foundation received this level of support with a smaller professional staff on average than its peers.

Based on the self study sub-committee’s comprehensive review of the Southeast Missouri State University Strategic Implementation Plan 1998-2000, the Division of University Advancement and Southeast Missouri University Foundation have direct and positive effects on 18 of the University’s 29 goals in five of the six plan priorities as demonstrated throughout the patterns of evidence. The Division’s role in enhancing the effectiveness of Southeast Missouri State University is primarily through the acquisition of and effective and efficient management of private financial resources. These resources are then used for student scholarships, faculty development, program underwriting, capital equipment, library acquisitions and in many other areas. During FY99, support contributed to the University exceeded $1.57 million. Additionally, the Division provides support through the positive influence of Division staff members, board members and other volunteers who are constantly engaged with external constituents,
whose interests and concerns are identified and shared internally through appropriate administrative channels.

The Southeast Alumni Association contributes to the institutional mission through its chapters in 17 Missouri counties, as well as seven out-of-state chapters, two international chapters, and eight organizational and professional chapters throughout the country. These chapters provide opportunities for alumni to continue to promote the advancement and prestige of Southeast Missouri State University. The Alumni Association offers an organized structure for fund raising, and many alumni assist with the recruitment of new students.

Improvements made since the last North Central Association re-accreditation visit include the creation of the Division and elevation of its lead administrator to the rank of Vice President and Executive Staff member of the University, substantial enhancements in the Foundation’s investment policies and procedures, and growth in total assets and endowments from $19.6 million and $5.2 million respectively as of June 30, 1991 compared to $37.1 million and $24.7 million respectively as of June 30, 1999. Support and revenues received during FY99 alone totaled $6.9 million.

The Division of University Advancement is currently working in the quiet phase of the 125 Years – Prologue to the 21st Century Campaign. This campaign provides an opportunity to secure significant funding for two of the University’s major capital projects: the Otto and Della Seabaugh Polytechnic Building and the School of Visual and Performing Arts to be located at the University’s recently acquired River Campus. The Southeast Missouri University Foundation has already received pledges for more than half of the $25 million “quiet phase” goal.

Division strengths include a relatively experienced staff, expansion of the donor base in terms of number of givers and average gift size, a greater focus on major gifts fund raising and new leadership in the Office of Alumni Services. Concerns include relatively limited operating funds and increasing reliance on unrestricted Foundation contributions to support operating and salary expenses, as well as relatively limited support for Division computing services and internal and external communications needs.

Intercollegiate Athletics

The Director of Athletics reports to the President of the University. Intercollegiate Athletics is governed by university policies and procedures. There is a University Athletic Committee that advises the department. This committee is charged with recommending policies governing University programs in Athletics and reviewing guidelines established by external organizations as well as state and federal agencies insofar as they affect university programs in athletics. In addition, the Department of Intercollegiate Athletics adheres to NCAA rules and regulations.
The Department of Athletics provides opportunities for approximately 300
student-athletes to compete in 16 intercollegiate sports - seven for men and nine
for women. Southeast Missouri State University is a member of the Ohio Valley
Conference and Division I of the NCAA. An Assistant AD/Senior Woman
Administrator, Assistant AD/Compliance and Student Services, Business
Manager, Marketing and Promotions Director, and Sports Information Director in
addition to an Administrative Assistant and eight additional full-time employees
support the Director of Athletics. The Director of Athletic Development reports
directly to the Vice President for Advancement.

The Athletic Department provides five support units for student-athletes. They
are: 1) Athletic Training - including two certified athletic trainers, three certified
graduate assistants and 24 student trainers which operate four athletic training
facilities on campus. 2) Student Excellence Center, which provides academic
support including tutors, study hall supervision, mentoring program for
academically under prepared student-athletes and offers a personal adjustment
class for beginning student-athletes. 3) Strength and Conditioning Activities for
all student-athletes are provided by a strength coach who is assisted by a graduate
assistant. 4) Student Services include a) Student-Athlete Mentor (SAM) program
developed to address issues such as alcohol abuse and other drug usage with
education and peer intervention as well as community service activities. b) The
Student-Athlete Advisory Cabinet is comprised of a representative from each
team that meets monthly to provide input regarding departmental issues and
initiatives. c) A Minority Student-Athlete Advisory Board is also being formed to
address issues of this population. 5) Sports Information Department is
responsible for promoting the department’s accomplishments through the media.

The mission of Intercollegiate Athletics is to provide educational and competitive
opportunities at the NCAA Division I level for eligible student-athletes. Seeking
to maintain an appropriate balance between athletic and academic programs, the
University recognizes that the academic pursuits of student-athletes must take
precedence over athletic opportunities.

The goals of the Athletics Department are: 1) Offer a competitive, broad-based
intercollegiate athletics program at the NCAA Division I (I-AA) level providing
opportunities for qualified student-athletes to excel in their particular sport or
activity. 2) Provide an atmosphere in the intercollegiate athletics program that
allows for the diversity of the student population assuring equitable opportunities
for women and minorities, both student-athletes and staff. 3) Provide assistance
and encouragement for student-athletes to maintain appropriate academic progress
and to achieve their individual educational goals and objectives. 4) Serve as a
vehicle for university development by providing positive outreach activities and
expertise to the University service region.

As an NCAA Division I member institution, the department is audited annually
by an outside agency for fiscal integrity. Additionally, the University must

Following a NCAA investigation in 1997, the institution requested a compliance review from the Ohio Valley Conference. This review was conducted June 1998. As a result of the NCAA investigation, areas of enhancement were identified. Increased rules education for coaches, student-athletes, boosters and faculty/staff was initiated along with increased monitoring of the athletic program. Additionally, two full-time employees plus two part-time retired administrators were added to the Compliance and Student Services staff.

Student-athletes who have completed their eligibility evaluate athletic programs annually. Results of these “exit interviews” are compiled and shared with appropriate coaches and support staff to increase effectiveness of the department.

The Student-Athlete Advisory Board is composed of representatives from all teams and meets monthly with the Senior Woman Administrator and Faculty Athletics Representative to promote dialog between athletic administration and students.

Southeast Missouri State University takes pride in its response to the need for gender equity in its athletic programs. In 1993, a committee composed of faculty, student-athletes, staff, administrators and coaches was appointed to study gender equity in athletics. The final report was issued March 4, 1994. The institution enacted a two-phase plan to address inequity in the system. Phase I (1995-1997) targeted a 60/40 percentage (male/female athletes and expenses). Phase II for 1998 targeted a 55/45 percentage. Actual percentages for scholarships and operating budgets for 1998 were 59/41 and 53/47 respectively. Fiscal Year 2000 budget projections reflect 58/41 percentages for scholarships and 53/47 percentages for operating expenses.

Intercollegiate Athletics at Southeast Missouri State University has been very successful both on and off the playing field during the 1990’s. Student-athletes graduate at a rate approximately 12% higher than the general student body. 1999 graduation rates for 1992-93 freshmen cohort were 51% for student-athletes and 39% for the general student body.

Student-athletes who maintain a cumulative grade point average of 3.0 or higher are honored as scholar athletes. During the past few years this number has risen to a record 113 student-athletes honored during the spring 1999. This represents an increase of 48% of the 238 student-athletes at that time. During the past school year, three Southeast teams were honored by national coaches associations for team grade point averages. The Southeast women’s cross country team ranked first in the nation with a team GPA of 3.71 while the volleyball team was ranked
third nationally with a 3.54 team GPA. The gymnastics team ranked fourth nationally with a 3.49 GPA.

Challenges remain for Intercollegiate Athletics with respect to supporting its student-athletes. Graduation rates for minority student-athletes remain significantly lower than for white student-athletes. A minority student-athlete advisory committee is being established to provide more student-athlete insight and input into departmental initiatives. Student-athlete safety is a departmental concern, particularly the issue of substance abuse. The department is addressing this issue with several initiatives. First, the current drug-testing policy has been reviewed and is being revised. Student-athlete mentors (SAMS) are being trained to provide peer education and intervention with their teammates. A committee consisting of athletic administrators, coach, faculty members, athletic trainers and University Substance Abuse Coordinator serve to oversee the SAMS program and other student life initiatives.

Public Disclosure

As a public institution, the University is subject to the State of Missouri "sunshine" laws. All meetings except those dealing with real estate transactions or personnel issues are open to the public both internal and external. The local press always covers and reports on meetings of the Board of Regents. Copies of Board agendas are posted on the campus and sent to regional media. The University maintains student educational records in accordance with the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act and applicable Missouri statutes. The Board of Regents, administration, and faculty are governed by the conflict of interest policy found in the Faculty Handbook.

Recruitment, Admission, and Retention

Southeast Missouri State University promulgates policies and procedures, which reflect its ethical values in the recruitment, admission, and retention of students. Publications designed to aid in the recruitment process are accurate representations of the campus and its populations and programs. As a moderately selective institution, the University is allowed a ten percent variance in the admission of students who do not meet the high school core curriculum or ACT requirements. Based on its strategic goals, the institution strives to admit only students who can be successful. Policies on academic probation and suspension are published in the Undergraduate Bulletin. The Learning Enrichment Center provides programs to assist students with academic difficulties. Through a representative group, the Student Affairs Committee, students may appeal an academic suspension. Data on admission and retention can be found in the exhibits.
Relationships With Other Institutions

As noted earlier, Southeast Missouri State University was the leader in the state in the development of program-to-program articulations with community colleges in Southeast Missouri and Southern Illinois. Students who transfer from these institutions can be assured that the articulation program will be honored upon matriculation at the University. Also discussed earlier are the consortial arrangements between the University and other educational entities designed to provide increased access to higher education for the region.

Business Practices

The University has published business policies and procedures, (see Business Policy and Procedure Manual) which assures integrity in these practices as well as compliance with applicable state regulations. The Director of Purchasing reviews all purchase requests for compliance. Any purchase of supplies or services over $3000, by state law, must be submitted for an open bid process, usually in the immediate region. Purchases over $25,000 require the placing of a public advertisement both locally and in an appropriate location such as St. Louis. Facilities Management monitors construction bids and contracts.

Sponsored Programs

The Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) is a service component of Southeast Missouri State University with a primary mission to assist faculty, staff and students in acquiring and sustaining external support for research, education and service projects. In addition, the OSP has a mission to ensure that these projects are conducted in compliance with federal and state regulations and ethical standards. Services include: Identification of Funding Opportunities; Development of Competitive Proposals; Development of Budget; Submission of Proposals; University Policies and Procedures; Negotiations for Grants and Contracts; Compliance with Government Regulations and Sponsors’ Guidelines; and Training.

Currently, a director who is assisted by a secretary leads the OSP. Fiscal management is handled by a Grants and Contracts Accountant who reports to the Controller for the University. Most recently a compliance officer for the OSP has been hired to assure compliance with the multiple requirements of all federal and state grants and contracts.

In 1998, Southeast Missouri State University requested $11,380,556 for research, education and service projects – an increase of 62% from 1997. A total of $5,447,316 was awarded to the University in the form of new grants and contracts (an increase of 36%) while overall funding for 1998 (continuing and new) was $11,367,501.
In 1998 the OSP processed 126 new requests for external funding - a decrease of 6.7% over 1997, due in part to the fact that the office was without a full-time director for more than six months. A total of 95 new external grants and contracts were awarded in 1998 making a total of 166 current projects – an increase of 48%. Table 1 summarizes the number of grant applications over the past four years.

**Table 9-2. Number of Grant and Contract Applications**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of Applications</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The College of Health and Human Services submitted the largest number of proposals (43, requesting $2,382,159), but the College of Science and Mathematics requested the most support ($7,036,409, from 40 proposals). Health and Human Services also received the largest number of new and continuation awards (64, bringing in a total of $3,114,602). The most active department was Human Environmental Studies – 25 submissions, along with 40 new and continuation awards totaling $3,291,542. Table 2 illustrates the trends of awards for each college since 1995.

**Table 9-3. Awards by College, 1995-1998.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College of Business</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Health, Human Services</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Science and Mathematics</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Affairs/Graduate School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When assessing the type of proposal and award, the most notable activity is the number of applications submitted for community service grants and contracts — an institutional response, consistent with the University’s strategic plan, to the very specific needs of the Missouri Bootheel region and the surrounding area.

Strengths. The strengths of the Sponsored Programs activities include a well-organized and experienced staff, the past record of many faculty members, and the support of the University. All this contributes to the overall effort of the OSP as it seeks to educate and assist its constituency and thus develop its service to the institution in the area of grants and research administration.

Challenges. Challenges include the University’s growing need for additional funding to supplement steady state funding. This will exert greater pressure on the office to increase its proficiency and efficiency. Staffing limitations (currently two full-time staff members) make it difficult to manage the multiple tasks required not only for the maintenance of current grants and contracts but also for the research, training and support necessary for increased grant and contract activity. Another potential challenge lies in the separation of the OSP and the fiscal and compliance staff. The offices are located in different buildings, and while the Grant Accountant and the Compliance Officer report to the Controller, the Director of Sponsored Programs reports to the Dean of Graduate Studies. Such separation requires a continued effort to maintain communications and a solid working relationship.

Improvements and Progress. As stated earlier, a compliance officer has been recently of the different funding agency requirements. Additional progress will follow from the achievement of the OSP’s stated goals, including the presentation of regular training workshops, and increase in collaborative efforts and an increase in the number of successful applications.
Student Complaints

As required by NCA, information on student complaints that reach the executive level (vice-president or president) and the resolution of such complaints is maintained by the Assistant to the President. The institution has noted that since the advent of the President’s Web page, lodging a complaint has become much easier for students, many of whom prefer to begin the process at the level of the President.

Self Evaluation

An examination of the published policies, procedures and public documents of Southeast Missouri State University reveals that the University conducts itself with integrity. It demonstrates consistency between policies and practice and when necessary, reviews both its policies and practices to assure that they continue to serve the University and its community in effectively meeting the University’s mission. The University’s main policy documents are the Faculty Handbook (that is publicly available on the University’s Web site) and the Business Policy and Procedure Manual that is distributed to every administrative office on the campus. Since the last NCA review, the University has diligently worked to assure that all persons associated with the University seek to develop shared values that include a sensitivity to and appreciation of the benefits of diversity.

Strengths:

1. As a group, student-athletes generally exhibit high levels of accomplishment in their academic pursuits.

2. The faculty and staff have been increasingly successful in the acquisition of external funding to support research and service activities.

3. The University Foundation has been successful in providing the extra funds needed to achieve a margin of excellence for the University.

4. The Office of University Relations produces high quality marketing materials that are recognized for excellence by their peers.

Challenges:

1. The University is challenged to intensify its efforts to attract and retain minority faculty and staff.

2. The University needs to continue its efforts to raise the sensitivities of the University and greater community to the benefits of diversity.
3. The University needs to develop strategies to increase the graduation rate of minority student-athletes.

Opportunities for Improvement:

1. The appointment of the Assistant to the President for Equity Issues provides an opportunity for experienced leadership in the practices which foster success in hiring diversity.

2. The efforts begun by President Dobbins to enhance communication among the University Community should continue and also be used as a means to clarify issues related to institutional policies and practices.
Chapter 10

Request for Change
Chapter Ten

Request for Change in Statement of Affiliation Status

1. A concise statement of the requested change

Southeast Missouri State University is requesting a change in its Statement of Affiliated Status (SAS) under the heading LOCATIONS, to allow the offering of degrees (graduate and undergraduate) at outreach centers, on community college campuses and other locations throughout its service area. Program delivery is planned through on site delivery, interactive television (ITV) and Internet/Web based instruction.

2. Rationale for requested change

As a regional, comprehensive multi-purpose institution of higher education, the mission of Southeast Missouri State University states in part “...the University maintains a strong commitment to the diverse twenty five counties of Southeast Missouri...the University supports a wide array of on-and off-campus instructional, research, and public service programs that address the intellectual, professional, personal, social, and cultural needs of its constituent groups.”

This mission was reaffirmed in 1994 through regional forums conducted by the Board of Regents and incorporated into the strategic plan (1996) for Southeast Missouri State University. As a result of the strategic planning process, regional centers and collaborative partnerships were developed as a means of meeting regional needs. In 1999, regional forums by the Board of Regents were again conducted to validate and confirm the regional mission of Southeast Missouri State University.

The regional outreach mission of the University is supported by the Coordinating Board of Higher Education (CBHE), State of Missouri Legislature and the Governor through mission enhancement funding. This funding has supported the development of a telecommunications infrastructure including the Southeast Missouri Telecommunications Educational Network (SEE-NET), the development of Southeast Missouri State University regional centers in Kennett, Sikeston, Perryville, and Park along with the establishment of the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium. Consortium partners include Southeast Missouri State University, Three Rivers Community College, Mineral Area Community College, the University of Missouri and Lincoln University.

3. Description of how the change is appropriate to the Institution’s purposes

This proposal is part of the University’s strategy to meet its outreach mission established as part of the University’s strategic plan. The plan was adopted by the
Board of Regents and supported by the CBHE, the Governor and State Legislature. The proposed change is in response to the expressed desires within the University’s service region to have improved access to post secondary and graduate education. The proposal is also consistent with the mission of the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium, a consortium established to increase access to educational programming in Southeast Missouri. Southeast Missouri State University serves a diverse region including rural, urban and suburban areas spread over 25 counties. Southeast Missouri State University is the only baccalaureate and graduate institution in the region. Institutional purpose number five which was approved by the Board of Regents in January, 2000 as part of the continuing planning process states, “Provide increased access to the University’s educational resources through the use of technology, campus centers and on-site instruction for the purpose of acquiring new knowledge and skills, updating knowledge and skills, and satisfying the need for life-one learning.”

4. Consideration of how the proposed change relates to the content of the last NCA comprehensive report.

The last comprehensive NCA review was in 1990. The 1990 team concluded that the institution met the GIR’s and that its mission was appropriate. Specifically related to the request for change, the team noted, “the University must consider ways to ... provide bachelors level education to a greater proportion of the citizens of the region...also, site approval for degree programs in the Bootheel and any future off-campus centers should be sought.” As a regional university, the institution’s commitment to serve the region in terms of external learning and economic development needs to be realized.” The proposed change in the institution’s SAS responds to these recommendations.

5. A description of the planning process that led to the proposed change.

While the planning process is on going within departments and colleges, regional forums, conducted by the Board of Regents in 1994 and again in 1999 provided momentum and validation of the outreach function of the University. Information gathered from the regional forums was incorporated into the strategic plan for the University. Further confirmation came from the institutional process leading to its mission enhancement proposal submitted and supported by the Governor and State Legislature. Additional planning involved the community colleges, leading to program-to-program articulation agreements and the development of the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium.

All degree programs flow through an institutional process of program review and approval, which includes departmental, college, and university wide review as well as review and approval by the University Board of Regents and the Coordinating Board for Higher Education.
Planning also includes academic and student support services. Both the Deans and staffs of Kent Library and Student Development have been involved in the planning required to provide services that promote student success.

6. Evidence that the institution has the necessary internal and external approvals to initiate the change.

Serving the Southeast Missouri region and expanding off-campus program offerings are core expectations under the University Strategic Plan and supported through Mission Enhancement funding from the state of Missouri. In addition to endorsement and support by the University Board of Regents, the Coordinating Board for Higher Education, and the Missouri State Legislature, expansion of the outreach mission of Southeast Missouri State University is endorsed through the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium.

7. An analysis of the institution’s continued ability to meet GIR’S and Criteria for Accreditation.

Southeast Missouri State University has operated an outreach center, Crisp Bootheel Education Center in Malden, Missouri for approximately 12 years. At this center, courses are offered via Three Rivers Community College and Southeast Missouri State University. This facility has an ITV studio connected with Southeast and Three Rivers. In addition to this site, other locations include the Sikeston Area Higher Education Center in Sikeston, Missouri and the Kennett Area Higher Education Center in Kennett, Missouri. Additional centers are planned for the northern part of the service region. The centers and sites on community college campuses take advantage of existing programs and courses while providing the necessary support services and resources. The same standards apply to courses offered on campus and to those offered throughout the region. The centers and sites throughout Southeast Missouri are also supported by technology including ITV and Internet access.

Southeast Missouri State University has made a commitment to serving the region of Southeast Missouri. Evidence of this is found with the Board of Regents public forums, an endorsement of the strategic plan and funding through Mission Enhancement. The university has invested in university centers throughout the region as well as a technology infrastructure to better serve the region. In addition to center and technology development, investments have been made within the library and support services to provide resources and services throughout the region. Off campus programs meet the same criteria as those programs offered on campus. Academic departments are involved with all curricular decisions and use of faculty. Increasing access to degree programs for students will not impact the institution’s ability to meet the GIR’S and Criteria for Accreditation.
8. An *analysis of the anticipated effect of the proposed changes on other parts of the institution.*

The proposed change will greatly enhance the outreach efforts by departments. Departments will be able to plan and adjust resources to provide access and service to the region. Support for off campus programming has been made available to the institution under the University’s Mission Enhancement funding. This funding has made possible a telecommunications delivery system including ITV technology and web course support and development. Kent Library has a position devoted to distance learning. Student Services units are developing on line services. University outreach centers currently have support services with a director and academic coordinator.

9. *Evidence that the institution has established the processes to assure that it has the capability to initiate and maintain the proposed change and to monitor acceptable quality once the change has been implemented.*

Student requirements for off campus programs and courses are the same as on campus requirements. These requirements include admissions, retention, assessment, and graduation. Students are admitted to the university not to centers. Programs are monitored through college processes and viewed by colleges as part of their mission. Evaluation of instruction is carried out via the college processes. Additional evaluation is carried out through student satisfaction questionnaires and monitoring of enrollments in off campus courses.

10. *Evidence that the institution has organized and planned for human, financial, physical and instructional resources to initiate and support the proposed change.*

This change is requested so that program implementation can support the goals and objectives set forth in the University’s strategic plan and the expectations set forth under the Mission Enhancement plan. Programmatic delivery throughout the service region also supports the objectives of the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium.

**Human Resources:** Many courses will use ITV as an instructional delivery method. This method allows faculty to serve both the on campus and off campus student simultaneously. Additional courses are available through the Internet as web based courses. These courses serve both the on campus and off campus student with the same faculty. In some cases, where the majority of students are off campus, additional faculty are hired to meet increased demand. To ensure consistency with departmental and college standards, administrative oversight is provided by the college administrative structure and the School of Extended Learning. The outreach centers have academic coordinators that provide information, services and referral. In addition, faculty and academic advisors travel to off campus centers and locations to provide advising services.
Information is also available to students via University web sites and the Southeast Online web site.

**Financial Resources:** The outreach efforts of the University are supported through Mission Enhancement funding from the State of Missouri. This funding is additional base funding. Funding has been used for development of a telecommunications delivery system including ITV and web based delivery. Funding also has been used for the development of off campus centers including facilities and staffing. As off campus programs grow, revenues from students' fees will cover additional expansion.

**Physical Resources:** Currently, the University operates three off campus centers, in Kennett, Sikeston and Malden, Missouri, with plans for two additional centers in the northern service region. Southeast Missouri State University has fiscal and administrative responsibility for the centers. The centers also operate as part of the Southeast Missouri Educational Consortium in which community college partners offer courses and programs at the centers. This allows for the sharing of curriculum and educational resources. The centers are connected to the University electronically allowing for the sharing of resources via ITV and through the Internet.

Information services have been enhanced so that all students (on campus and off campus) have access to information services. This includes full text retrieval at one's desk, courier services to the off campus centers, and electronic access to library resources. The University maintains ITV sites at the Crisp Bootheel Education Center in Malden, on the Three Rivers Community College Campus in Poplar Bluff and will add additional receive sites at the new centers in Sikeston, Kennett and the other sites yet to be determined. The University also uses ITV sites maintained by educational partners including Three Rivers Community College, Mineral Area College and the St. Louis Community College System.

**Instructional Resources:** The academic departments and colleges have established processes to ensure appropriate faculty oversight and governance. Faculty development and instructional development support are available through the colleges as well as through the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CSTL). The CSTL provides technology training workshops, instructional applications workshops, technical support and instructional development support. Facilities are also available for faculty to prepare course materials and experiment with new instructional applications. There are articulation agreements in place for most academic programs. Off campus students, as well as on campus students follow these agreements. Off campus instruction uses a variety of delivery approaches including ITV, web based and on site instruction. Full time university faculty designs the curriculum, and the academic departments provide academic oversight.
A variety of methods are used to ensure that the library needs of students in outreach sites are adequately supported. Where the site is a community college, students are afforded library privileges. Through computer access to Kent Library, Southeast Missouri State University, students may order materials, which are either delivered by courier or mailed to students. The University has a librarian dedicated to distance learning for the purpose of strengthening relationships with cooperating libraries and enhancing student's access. Southeast also provides access to several full text databases including Pro Quest and Lexis-Nexis. In addition, the State of Missouri is developing a common library platform to facilitate collegiate library resource sharing.

Access to learning resources is provided in a variety of systems. At outreach centers, staff provide career counseling, general advising and financial aid information services. Specific academic advising is done through technology or staff and student travel. At community college sites, advising is done through the use of technology and/or through staff and student travel. For courses and programs offered at specific locations, advising is conducted through travel arrangements and with the use of technology. Moreover, teams of Student Development staff travel to outreach sites to provide programs such as the Student Success Series.

Conclusion

In summary, Southeast Missouri State University is requesting a change in its Statement of Affiliated Status to allow the offering of degrees anywhere in its service region. This change is consistent with the University mission of education and service to the region and is supported by the Board of Regents, the Coordinating Board for Higher Education and the state legislature. Through the strategic planning process and through Mission Enhancement funding, the University is investing in outreach centers and a telecommunications infrastructure to support off campus and distance learning. This change in the Statement of Affiliated Status is consistent with the outreach mission of Southeast Missouri State University.

Guidelines for Distance Education

Curriculum and Instruction

To assist in fulfilling the outreach mission, Southeast Missouri State University uses various technologies. These include interactive television (ITV) and web based instruction. Courses that use these methods of delivery are designed by faculty and follow the same approval processes as a traditionally delivered course. When classes are offered via ITV, time is allowed before and after the class session for one on one interaction between student and faculty. It is not unusual for faculty to travel to the receive sites to meet face-to-face with the distant
for faculty to travel to the receive sites to meet face-to-face with the distant student. For web-based instruction, interaction occurs via the Internet and by telephone as well as through faculty office hours.

The institution has copyright policies. Both web based and ITV courses are offered as part of the regular curriculum, taught as part of load. Faculty are given a small stipend for completing training in the use of ITV as well as preparing courses for web based delivery.

The institution provides support for faculty through an instructional designer. The instructional designer provides information and instruction to faculty on ITV teaching and course transformation for web based delivery. The instructional designer is available to faculty during the development as well as implementation of the course. In addition, the University provides technical support for faculty while the ITV course is in session. This allows the faculty to concentrate on course delivery rather than technical issues. The University also provides a secure server for web-based courses. This server is maintained twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week.

Evaluation and Assessment

As a regional comprehensive university, Southeast Missouri State University offers primarily upper division and graduate programs in collaboration with community college partners. The more experienced higher education student will have less difficulty adjusting to the ITV delivery. Web based courses serve both on and off campus students. These highly interactive courses are part of the regular curriculum of the University. As such, the courses are evaluated and reviewed as part of the regular academic review system. In addition to evaluation of instruction, students complete additional evaluations for technology-mediated courses. For some web-based courses, testing is required on campus while for other courses assessment of learning is done through various methods such as projects and formal papers. Overall assessment of student academic achievement is the same for all students in a major regardless of the location of the instruction. Retention in courses is monitored and compared with regular that in on campus courses.

Library and Learning Resources

The institution provides access to the on campus library through terminal access at distance sites and through arrangements with community colleges. A courier system is in place to move materials between the different locations. The University employs a distance-learning librarian to ensure access and facilitate student use of library resources.

Use of library and learning resources are part of the student satisfaction evaluation process. The use of laboratories and special facilities may require on campus
time. When these are required, students are informed before the initiation of the program or course. Online student support services are available via the Southeast Online web site.

**Student Services**

At formal outreach centers, full time staff provide necessary support services such as advising, financial aid information and career counseling. Course materials are delivered on site and distributed by center staff or paid facilitators. Materials and services are also available to students via the web.

Student complaints are directed to the appropriate administrative entity for action. Students also have access to an online help desk.

Off campus students receive information that accurately addresses programmatic issues through on-site sessions, and interaction with academic advisors. The centers as well as Extended Learning provide a schedule of classes in print and electronic format.

At most receive sites, technicians are available to assist classes. Where technicians are not on-site, a student facilitator is trained to manage the touch pad. Every class is supported by an on-campus technician who can provide assistance to off campus sites either through ITV system, fax or phone.

The web site for the online courses informs students of the technical requirements for online courses. Students also receive a letter before the web course begins, on technical requirements and expectations of taking online courses. In addition to faculty interaction, students have access to a Southeast Online help desk. Students can communicate with this help desk for problem resolution. Computer assistance is available from the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning as well as the academic computing center.

**Facilities and Finances**

The institution has been offering ITV classes for approximately four years. The University maintains two on campus ITV rooms and two off campus ITV rooms. Plans are in progress to expand both the on campus and off campus ITV rooms. A new studio is planned and funded for the Seabaugh Polytechnic Building. Two full time technicians and a cadre of well-trained student technicians support the ITV technology. Faculty receives training before teaching on the ITV system.

Web based courses are offered on a secure server maintained twenty four hour a day seven days a week by the Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning (CSTL). The CSTL also trains faculty on the development and implementation of web based courses.
Distance education is an important element in the University's strategic planning process. In recognition of the need to reach out to the citizens of the region, the Governor and legislature have awarded the university base budget funding to underwrite the Southeast Missouri Educational Network (SEE-NET). The primary use of these funds is to support all aspects of distance education including infrastructure, faculty development, student support, academic support and technology equipment.
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Conclusions, Request for Continuing Accreditation

Through the self-study, the Steering Committee and campus identified the strengths of the institution, the challenges it faces, and recommended actions for improvement. Based on the review of the patterns of evidence related to the five criteria for accreditation, the institution, through its continual planning and assessment activities, is posed to continue to be effective in fulfilling its mission in the future. The following strengths and challenges are broadly institutional and are derived from the more specific versions found at the end of each chapter of the self-study.

Strengths:

The University’s planning priorities and institutional actions are consistent with its mission and purposes.

The University focuses on teaching and student learning and maintains class sizes consistent with enhancing faculty-student interactions.

The Strategic Plan is a “living document” which has led to program development, a model for continuous improvement, and is used to influence budget decisions.

The University is careful with its financial resources and is fiscally sound.

The University employs a high quality faculty as measured by their academic preparation, scholarship, and service to the region. There is a high ratio of full to part-time faculty.

The commitment to program accreditation and external review assures the quality of the curriculum.

The University has made significant progress in providing support for the use of technology to enhance the teaching and student learning.

The University demonstrates a strong commitment to assessment as a means to improvement of student learning. Funding for Results provides a tangible means to support these efforts.

The University understands its role as a regional institution and strives to serve the region in every way that matches its abilities. Strong evidence is provided by the expansion of higher education centers and the use of technology to deliver instruction.
The growth in external support as evidenced by the increased contributions to the University Foundation is a major strength.

The University has enhanced the quality of the student body as evidenced by completion of the high school core curriculum and an increase in ACT scores. External relationships with other institutions, and in particular the formation of consortia and program-to-program articulations, have allowed the University to more fully serve the needs of the region.

Challenges:

The University needs to continue to support non-academic units in the use of external reviews and other measures that assess their performance.

Strategies to develop more effective communication at the unit/department level are needed.

Despite improvements over the last decade, work is still needed to develop an effective Office of Institutional Research.

Academic programs need to concentrate on reaching the next level with respect to the assessment of student learning. Particular emphasis on graduate programs and the professional development of faculty in the use of various tools will be needed. Annual reporting among the colleges needs to be more consistent to facilitate planning and assessment.

Department annual reports need to be streamlined and become a part of the departmental planning culture. Faculty involvement is critical to the process.

Efforts to reach diversity goals through the recruitment of minority students and faculty need continued and perhaps, additional, support.

Developing the River Campus and off-campus centers to their full potential will require consistent attention and support.

Recommendations:

One goal of the self-study was to integrate the process with the University’s ongoing evaluation and reformulation of its strategic plan. The challenges expressed in the self-study at the institutional and the departments, colleges, divisions, and University Planning Committee will use unit levels as they prepare for the Strategic Plan 2000-2005, which is in progress as this report is being written.
Request for Continued Accreditation

The self-study has documented that the University fulfills the General Institutional Requirements and meets the NCA criteria for accreditation. The University has addressed the concerns expressed in the 1990 review and has built upon its strengths. The completion of the self-study process concurrently with the re-writing of the Strategic Plan provides the University with an opportunity to continue to live a planning process that assists it in meeting its mission.

The University requests a change in its affiliation status regarding new degree sites. The recommended reading follows: "No prior commission approval required for offering degree programs at new sites within its service area including those utilizing alternative forms of delivery." The University has experience in offering degree programs off-campus using both "live" and electronically transmitted instruction. The ability to expand degree offerings is in concert with the recommendations of the 1990 NCA review team and will assist the University in its continuing efforts to effectively serve its region.
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Credits, Program Length, and Tuition

The University uses a standard semester hour of credit consisting of approximately 750 minutes of instructional time per semester hour. All undergraduate baccalaureate programs must consist of a minimum of 124 semester hours with graduate programs expected to offer a minimum of 32 semester hours. At both the undergraduate and graduate levels, tuition (incidental fees) is based on credit hours enrolled.

Institutional Compliance with the Higher Education Reauthorization Act

Material in the exhibits indicates that the University complies with the Higher Education Reauthorization Act. Materials to be found include the default reduction plan for the one year the institutional rate was over 15% as well as independent Auditor reports.

Institution's Advertising and Recruitment Materials

The institution prepares its advertising and recruitment materials collaboratively. University Relations, Enrollment Management, and the academic units all provide input into the materials to insure they accurately represent the institution. Wherever NCA accreditation is mentioned, the address and telephone number of the Commission is given.

Professional Accreditation

The University holds professional accreditation in many programs. However, no single accreditation affects a program serving one third or more of the student population. Copies of all reviewers’ reports from program accreditations 1990-99 are provided in the exhibits. NCA is the only agency that accredits the institution.
University Organization
Undergraduate and Graduate Enrollments 1997-1999
### Academic Undergraduate Majors—Fall 1997, 1998, and 1999 Enrollments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donald Harrison College</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of Business</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Business</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-MBA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared-Business</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admins.Asst(gen)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admins.Asst(legal)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off.Sys.Manage</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organ. Admins.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics (BA)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics(BS)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics(BSBA)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management(gen)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangement(HR)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangement(ops)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mangement(ldrshp)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIS</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark.Mang.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark. Comm.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared-Education</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Ed.</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excep. Child</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Ed.</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Manag.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Ed.</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Ed.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Health and Human Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared-HHS</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communic. Disord.</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim. Just. Correc.</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim. Just. Law Enforc</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crim.Just.Security</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth Man.Ath.Trn</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth Man.Prom.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hlth Man.Spts.Med</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phys. Therapy Asst.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Liberal Arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>179</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared Liberal Arts</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.F.A.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Education</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng./lang. option</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng./lit. option</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng./writing option</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Education</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Preserv.</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Stud. Educ.</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Comm. Advertising</td>
<td>81</td>
<td></td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Comm. Journalism</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass Comm. Media Studies</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Comm. Public Relations</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass. Comm. Corp Video</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music-Composition</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Ed./Instrum.</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music Ed./Vocal</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform. Instrum.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform. Vocal</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science BA</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science BS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>209</td>
<td></td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major</td>
<td>Credits</td>
<td>Hours</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology BA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology BS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speech Education</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. Comm. Inter.&amp; Sm. Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sp. Comm. Forensic Comm.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>College of Science and Mathematics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared-Science &amp; Math.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biology Education</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Dental</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Medical</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Optometry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Physical Therapy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry BA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry BS</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Technology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Pharmacy</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>App. Comp. Sci. Tech.</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Sci. Math Systems</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Sci. Systems</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comp. Sci. Scientific</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earth Science Educ.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geoscience</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics Education</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math. App. Math/Stats</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Phys./ Comp. Apps</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eng. Phys./ Applied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Engineering</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School of Polytechnic Studies</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared-Polytechnic</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agronomy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Science</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticulture</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture Business</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Veterinary Med.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Computer Tech</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Electronics</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Indus. Management</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Manufacturing</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Production</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Technology</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Technology(st.louis)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Technical Graphics</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT-Visual</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Architecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Drafting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Certificate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphics Arts</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graphic Technology</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Tech/Automanufac.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Tech/Comp. Graphics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Tech/Microcomp.Sys.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Man. Engin. Tech.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interdisciplinary Studies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Major Declared</td>
<td>1643</td>
<td>1198</td>
<td>1134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annual Graduate Enrollment
Unduplicated count of all students enrolled, both on and off campus, during the calendar year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Counseling</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Administration</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Child Education</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counseling</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Administration</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Education</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Education</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Level Education</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Master of Business Administration  | 96   | 72   | 61   | 32   | NA   |

| Master of Natural Science          |      |      |      |      |      |
| Biology                            | 30   | 40   | 37   | 38   | 49   |
| Chemistry                          | 10   | 8    | 3    | NA   | NA   |
| Geosciences                        | 8    | 13   | 12   | 13   | 9    |
| Mathematics                        | 20   | 18   | 18   | 16   | 19   |
| Science Education                  | 6    | 4    | NA   | NA   | NA   |

| Master of Science in Administration|      |      |      |      |      |
| Athletic Administration            | 8    | 4    | NA   | NA   | NA   |
| Criminal Justice                   | 41   | 41   | 25   | 17   | 23   |
| Health Care                        | NA   | 1    | 4    | 4    | 7    |
| Health Fitness                     | 14   | 14   | 1    | NA   | NA   |
| Human Services                     | 18   | 19   | 18   | 21   | 21   |
| Public                             | 31   | 34   | 33   | 32   | 47   |

| Master of Science in Nursing       | 63   | 66   | 63   | 39   | 40   |

| Specialist in Education            | 129  | 111  | 105  | 83   | 94   |

| Doctoral                           | 14   | 7    | 7    | NA   | NA   |

| Non-Degree                         | 1033 | 786  | 879  | 999  | 804  |
| TOTAL                              | 2174 | 1855 | 1870 | 1864 | 1713 |

Average Undergraduate G.P.A. of degree seeking students = 3.251
Minority Students = 3%
Non SE undergraduates = 49%  International Students = 3%
Basic Institutional Data
## Basic Institutional Data Form A

### PART 1 - FULL-TIME ENROLLMENT (HEADCOUNT)

Opening Fall Enrollment for Current Academic Year and Previous Two Years

Name of institution/campus reported: Southeast Missouri State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Degree oriented</td>
<td>1582</td>
<td>1735</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupationally oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore Degree</td>
<td>1328</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>1168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupationally oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeclared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>1304</td>
<td>1286</td>
<td>1162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>1432</td>
<td>1403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>5545</td>
<td>5602</td>
<td>5633</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GRADUATE            |                 |                |              |
| Master's            | 138             | 124            | 191          |
| Specialist          | 2               | 2              | 10           |
| Doctoral            | 0               | 0              | 0            |
| TOTAL GRADUATE      | 140             | 126            | 201          |

| PROFESSIONAL (by degree) |                 |                |              |

| TOTAL PROFESSIONAL |                 |                |              |
| TOTAL ALL LEVELS   | 5685            | 5728           | 5834         |
| OTHER              | 88              | 92             | 108          |
### North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
#### Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400, Chicago, IL 60602-2504
(800) 621-7440; (312) 263-0456; Fax: (312) 263-7462

**Basic Institutional Data Form A**

**PART 2 - PART-TIME ENROLLMENT (HEADCOUNT)**

Opening Fall Headcount for Current Academic Year and Previous Two Years

**Name of institution/campus reported:** Southeast Missouri State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERGRADUATE</th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td>Extension</td>
<td>Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Degree oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Definition 1, A &amp; B)</td>
<td>634</td>
<td>718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupationally oriented</td>
<td>(Definition 1, C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undeclared (Definition 1-D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Degree oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Definition 1, A &amp; B)</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occupationally oriented</td>
<td>(Definition 1, C)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Undeclared (Definition 1-D)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>232</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>1547</td>
<td>1605</td>
<td>1563</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRADUATE**

| Master's | 671 | 837 | 1082 |
| Specialist | 70 | 75 | 92 |
| Doctoral | 7 | 7 | 14 |

### TOTAL GRADUATE

| 748 | 919 | 1188 |

**PROFESSIONAL (by degree)**

| TOTAL PROFESSIONAL | 2295 | 2524 | 2751 |
| TOTAL ALL LEVELS | 166 | 150 | 176 |

*Prepare separate reports for each campus. Please add attachments and additional sheets wherever necessary.*
Basic Institutional Data Form A

PART 3 - FULL-TIME EQUIVALENT ENROLLMENT

Opening Fall FTE Enrollment for Current Year and Previous Two Years

Name of institution/campus reported: Southeast Missouri State University

FORMULA USED BY INSTITUTION TO COMPUTE FTE:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td>5341.8</td>
<td>5430.6</td>
<td>5451.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRADUATE</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>167.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>5454.8</td>
<td>5534.1</td>
<td>5618.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Basic Institutional Data Form A

PART 4 - OTHER SIGNIFICANT INSTITUTIONAL ENROLLMENTS
(e.g., non-credit, summer session, other)

Most Recent Sessions and Previous Two Years

Identify types of enrollment reported:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19____ - _____</td>
<td>19____ - _____</td>
<td>19____ - _____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL GRADUATE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL PROFESSIONAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NON-CREDIT CONTINUING EDUCATION ENROLLMENTS (headcount)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL NON-CREDIT REMEDIAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL ENROLLMENTS (FTE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL OTHER</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Basic Institutional Data Form B

PART 1 - STUDENT ADMISSIONS

Opening Fall Enrollment for Current Academic Year and Previous Two Years

Name of Institution/campus reported: Southeast Missouri State University

Provide as much of the following information as is available about applicants for admission in the current and previous two academic years. If exact figures cannot be supplied, careful estimates may be given. Students enrolled in a previous year should not be included as applicants in a subsequent year.

Check if appropriate: Open Admissions Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRESHMAN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to the freshman class</td>
<td>2792</td>
<td>2772</td>
<td>2907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants accepted</td>
<td>1687</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>1678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of freshmen applicants actually enrolled</td>
<td>1217</td>
<td>1362</td>
<td>1509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission with advanced standing (transfer)</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>890</td>
<td>789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of advanced-standing undergraduate applicants accepted</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of advanced-standing undergraduate applicants actually enrolled</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MASTER'S</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to master’s programs</td>
<td>536</td>
<td>566</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants accepted for master’s programs</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>451</td>
<td>451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants actually enrolled in master’s programs</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIALIST</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to specialist programs</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants accepted for specialist programs</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants actually enrolled in specialist programs</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### DOCTORAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to doctoral programs</td>
<td>19 ___ - ___</td>
<td>19 ___ - ___</td>
<td>19 ___ - ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants accepted for doctoral programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants actually enrolled in doctoral programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROFESSIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Report by degrees</th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants with complete credentials for admission to professional programs</td>
<td>Report by degrees</td>
<td>19 ___ - ___</td>
<td>19 ___ - ___</td>
<td>19 ___ - ___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants accepted for professional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of applicants actually enrolled in professional programs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PART 2 - ABILITY MEASURES OF FRESHMEN

**Name of institution/campus reported:** Southeast Missouri State University  
**Specify quarter/semester reported:** Fall 1999  
**Check if appropriate:** ☐ No scores used or routinely collected

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Class ranking of entering freshmen</th>
<th>C. Mean ACT scores for entering freshmen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent in top 10% of high school class</td>
<td>Composite 22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in top 25% of high school class</td>
<td>Mathematics 22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in top 50% of high school class</td>
<td>English 22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent in top 75% of high school class</td>
<td>Natural Sciences 22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. SAT scores for entering freshmen 132 Total</th>
<th>D. Other tests used for admission or placement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class average SAT score</td>
<td>Test name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>511</td>
<td>525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent scoring above 500</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent scoring above 600</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent scoring above 700</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PART 3 - ABILITY MEASURES OF ENTERING GRADUATE STUDENTS

**Report for last full academic year**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Graduate Record Examination *</th>
<th>B. Miller Analogies Test *</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(for total Graduate School excluding professional schools)</td>
<td>(for total Graduate School excluding professional schools)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Range</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On a separate sheet, indicate other test data used for admission to professional programs.

*Estimated based on scores for all graduate students in Fall 1999.*
PART 4 - UNDERGRADUATE STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
(Report for last full fiscal year)

Name of institution/campus reported: Southeast Missouri State University

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDING</th>
<th>TOTAL $ AMOUNT</th>
<th>NO. OF STUDENTS AIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Scholarships</td>
<td>3,740,781</td>
<td>2348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>14,085,176</td>
<td>4633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>327,311</td>
<td>291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Scholarships</td>
<td>846,056</td>
<td>761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Scholarships</td>
<td>5,645,094</td>
<td>2793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2,128,212</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FROM OTHER SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Scholarships</td>
<td>1,168,801</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>26,313</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unduplicated number of undergraduate students aided: 6,525
Number of students receiving institutional athletic assistance: 221
Percentage of institutional aid for athletic assistance: $1,467,831

PART 5 - GRADUATE AND PROFESSIONAL STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
(Report for last full fiscal year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDING</th>
<th>TOTAL $ AMOUNT</th>
<th>NO. OF STUDENTS AIDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Fellowships</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>1,197,108</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants and Fellowships</td>
<td>4,815</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INSTITUTIONAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Fellowships, Asst.</td>
<td>485,118</td>
<td>610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>92,249</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FROM OTHER SOURCES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants, Fellowships, Asst.</td>
<td>88,625</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loans</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unduplicated number of graduate students aided: 845
1) **NUMBER OF STUDENTS AIDED**
   These figures do not represent unduplicated headcounts. For each type of aid included in a category, the number of students receiving the aid is counted (e.g. Federal Grants and Scholarships-386 student received Federal SEOG funds and 1,962 students received Federal Pell Grant funds for a total of 2,348 students). The unduplicated count would be fewer; however, DHE 14-1 does not provide an unduplicated headcount by category.

2) This figure is also included under Institutional Grants and Scholarships

3) Graduate Institutional Employment does not include the graduate assistantship stipend amounts paid through the University payroll office. The dollars reported are from regular institutional student employment earned concurrently while the student is a graduate assistant or during the summer.
Basic Institutional Data Form C

PART 1 – FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AND FACULTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distribution by Sex</th>
<th>Distribution by Race</th>
<th>Distribution by Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants &amp; other teaching personnel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated rank</td>
<td>X X X X X X X X X</td>
<td>X X X</td>
<td>X X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructional staff added for current academic year</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructional staff employed in previous academic year, but not reemployed for current academic year</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Basic Institutional Data Form C

**PART 1 continued – FULL-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AND FACULTY INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diploma, Certificate, or None</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Professor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Professor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assistant Professor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructor</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching Assistants &amp; other teaching personnel</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research staff &amp; Research Assistants</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Undesignated rank</strong></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of instructional staff added for current academic year</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of instructional staff employed in previous academic year, but not reemployed for current academic year</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>RANGE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>$61,442.80</td>
<td>$93,000.00</td>
<td>$47,967.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>$49,970.31</td>
<td>$65,021.76</td>
<td>$41,460.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>$40,975.20</td>
<td>$62,190.24</td>
<td>$31,000.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$34,347.19</td>
<td>$52,884.60</td>
<td>$27,878.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants &amp; other teaching pers.</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated rank</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Basic Institutional Data Form C

#### PART 3 – PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AND FACULTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distribution by Sex</th>
<th>Distribution by Race</th>
<th>Distribution by Age Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants &amp; other teaching personnel</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated rank</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructional staff added for current academic year</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructional staff employed in previous academic year, but not reemployed for current academic year</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Basic Institutional Data Form C

#### PART 3 continued – PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AND FACULTY INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HIGHEST DEGREE Earned</th>
<th>Diploma, Certificate, or None</th>
<th>Associate</th>
<th>Bachelor's</th>
<th>Master's</th>
<th>Specialist</th>
<th>Doctoral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants &amp; other teaching personnel</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated rank</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructional staff added for current academic year</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of instructional staff employed in previous academic year, but not reemployed for current academic year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Basic Institutional Data Form C

**PART 4 – SALARIES OF PART-TIME INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF AND FACULTY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MEAN</th>
<th>RANGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>$4,485.96</td>
<td>$19,243.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assistants &amp; other teaching pers.</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research staff &amp; Research Assistants</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undesignated rank</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXXX</td>
<td>XXXXXXXXX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools  
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education  
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400, Chicago, IL 60602-2504  
(800) 621-7440; (312) 263-0456; Fax: (312) 263-7462  

Basic Institutional Data Form D  

LIBRARY / LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER  

Report for current year and previous two years - Estimate if necessary (identify estimates)  

Name of institution/site reported:  Southeast Missouri State University

- Check here if you have specialized libraries not included in this data. If you do, please identify these specialized libraries or collections on a separate page.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. USE AND SERVICE</th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total use of the collection (number of books or other materials circulated annually)</td>
<td>107,284</td>
<td>100,428</td>
<td>85,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total circulation to students</td>
<td>64,370 est.</td>
<td>60,257 est.</td>
<td>51,482 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita student use (circulation to students divided by number of enrolled students)</td>
<td>9.19 est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total circulation to faculty</td>
<td>32,185 est.</td>
<td>30,128 est.</td>
<td>25,741 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita faculty use (circulation to faculty divided by number of FTE faculty)</td>
<td>66 est.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total circulation to Community Users</td>
<td>10,728 est.</td>
<td>10,043 est.</td>
<td>8,580 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of items borrowed from other libraries via interlibrary loan</td>
<td>2,547</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>3,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of items lent to other libraries via interlibrary loan</td>
<td>5,088</td>
<td>5,010</td>
<td>3,814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours open per week</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line electronic database searches (usually mediated by library staff)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Library staff presentations to groups/classes</td>
<td>364</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tours and one-time presentations</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on instruction for using electronic databases</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on instruction for Internet searching</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semester-length bibliographical instruction</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. COLLECTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Two Years Prior</th>
<th>One Year Prior</th>
<th>Current Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of different titles in collection</td>
<td>1,426,304</td>
<td>1,562,061</td>
<td>1,592,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books and other printed materials</td>
<td>325,440</td>
<td>335,216</td>
<td>340,786</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print serials/periodicals</td>
<td>2,469</td>
<td>2,757</td>
<td>2,764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic serials/periodicals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other electronic materials (except serials/periodicals)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms (units)</td>
<td>803,925</td>
<td>1,212,207</td>
<td>1,236,082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepare separate reports for each campus. Please add additional sheets whenever necessary.

**North Central Association of Colleges and Schools**  
**Commission on Institutions of Higher Education**  
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400, Chicago, IL 60602-2504  
(800) 621-7440; (312) 263-0456; Fax: (312) 263-7462

**Basic Institutional Data Form D**

**LIBRARY / LEARNING RESOURCE CENTER (continued)**

Name of institution/campus reported: _Southeast Missouri State University_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-print materials (e.g. films, tapes, CDs)</td>
<td>6,374</td>
<td>8,212</td>
<td>7,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government documents not reported elsewhere</td>
<td>287,366</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1,269</td>
<td>1,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subscribed/purchased electronic on-line databases</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of CD-ROM databases available for searches by students</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>15 est.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of subscriptions to scholarly journals</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. STAFF (1 FTE Staff~35-40 hours per week)</th>
<th>figured differently this year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of FTE professional staff</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FTE non-professional staff</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of FTE student staff</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of other FTE staff (please explain on back)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seating ratio (number of seats divided by student headcount enrollment)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of publicly accessible computers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated linear shelving space remaining for expansion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated linear feet of materials stored off-site</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. EXPENDITURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For staff (exclude fringe benefits):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total professional staff salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total non-professional staff salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total student staff salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total professional staff salaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Books /other printed materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print serials/periodicals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-print materials (e.g. films, tapes, CDs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government documents not reported elsewhere</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer software (electronic resources)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepare separate reports for each campus. Please add attachments and additional sheets wherever necessary.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access and other services</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interlibrary loan</td>
<td>1,287</td>
<td>2,540</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line database searches</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network membership</td>
<td>38,631</td>
<td>35,589</td>
<td>61,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binding, preservation, and restoration</td>
<td>24,701</td>
<td>15,078</td>
<td>21,322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production of materials (on- or off-site)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other equipment and furniture purchase/replacement</td>
<td>48,081</td>
<td>68,024</td>
<td>46,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other operating expenses (excluding capital outlay)</td>
<td>43,498</td>
<td>74,822</td>
<td>211,526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total library expenses</td>
<td>2,199,303</td>
<td>2,366,082</td>
<td>2,777,229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F. OTHER

Output measures:

- Does the library attempt to measure/record patron visits to the library? X
- Does the library attempt to measure/record reference questions answered? X
- Does the library attempt to measure/record user satisfaction? X
- Does the library attempt to measure/record in-library use of other resources? X

Agreements and policies:

- Are there formal, written agreements to share library resources with other institutions? X
- Are there formal, written consortorial agreements for statewide or regional use of library materials? X
- Are there formal, written agreements allowing the institution's students to use other institutions' libraries? X
North Central Association of Colleges and Schools
Commission on Institutions of Higher Education
30 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2400, Chicago, IL 60602-2504
(800) 621-7440; (312) 263-0458; Fax: (312) 263-7462

Basic Institutional Data Form E
INSTITUTIONAL COMPUTING RESOURCES
Report for Current Academic Year

Name of the institution/campus reported: Southeast Missouri State University

WorldWideWeb (WWW) URL address: http://www.semo.edu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. ORGANIZATION, PLANNING, and POLICIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Please attach an organizational chart. Include names)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated administrator(s) for institutional computing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated administrator(s) for Administrative computing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated administrator(s) for Academic computing?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Centralized computing services?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal, written, and approved technology plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technology plan linked to institutional mission and purposes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing resources included in institutional strategic plan?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies on the purchase, replacement, and repair of hardware?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policies on the purchase and updating of software?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional computing responsible/ethical use policy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional policies that include institutional computer issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional policies that include administrative computing issues?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional policies that include academic computing issues?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. FACILITIES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional network backbone?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer labs networked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classrooms functionally networked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-media computers in labs?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative offices networked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic offices networked?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence halls wired?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of non-networked computer labs
Number of networked labs 50
Total number of stations 1009

Type of access?
- Wired through network
- Personal computers
- Wired ports
- Internet
- Remote dial-up access
- Slip/ppp connection to WWW

Prepare separate reports for each campus. Please add attachments and additional sheets wherever necessary.
### C. FUNCTIONS: ADMINISTRATIVE (Place checks where appropriate)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Available To</th>
<th>Via</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Direct Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remote Access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WWW</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Activity Calendar</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Catalog</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class Schedule</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Aid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line registration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Record</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E-mail: Intra-institution? **X** Yes **No**  Inter-institution? **X** Yes **No**

### D. FUNCTIONS: ACADEMIC

- Computers in all full-time faculty offices?
- Computers in all full-time faculty offices networked?
- All part-time faculty have access to computers?
- All divisional / departmental offices networked?
- All students required to have computers?
- Internet access available from all faculty offices?
- Library access available from all faculty offices?
  - If YES, is access available to
    - the institution's library(ies)?
    - the state-wide or region-wide library system?
    - other libraries?
- Library access available from all classrooms?
- Computers integrated into instruction?
- Off-campus access?
  - If YES, is off-campus access available by
    - the institutional network?
    - the academic network?
    - the Internet?
  - If NO, plans to provide off-campus access within three years?
- Courses on Internet?
- Interactive courses in real-time (i.e., 2-way video and voice?)

E-mail: Intra-institution? **X** Yes **No**  Inter-institution? **X** Yes **No**
E. SUPPORT and TRAINING

Number of FTE technical staff?  12  Number of programmers:  13  
Number of FTE training staff?  1  Integrated with Human Resources unit (Y/N)  N  
Name and Title of the designated educational specialist? Carla Downing 
Instructional Design Specialist

F. FINANCES/BUDGET for COMPUTING (Current Fiscal Year)

Total Annual Academic Outlay, Operating Funds: 4,991,371
Total Annual Administrative Outlay, Operating Funds: 722,582
Capital funds available: Academic combined*  
Capital funds available: Administrative combined*  
Amount of grants/restricted purpose funds available:  
Technology fee assessed? (Y/N) Yes
If YES, amount per academic year? $1 per credit hour

G. EVALUATION

Formal system of evaluation by students of academic computing? X  
Formal system of evaluation by students of administrative computing? X  
Formal system of evaluation by faculty of academic computing? X  
Formal system of evaluation by faculty of administrative computing? X  
Systems of evaluation linked to plan to evaluate overall institutional effectiveness? X  
Results of evaluation linked to institutional planning and budgeting processes? X  

* Plus departmental budgets.
## Basic Institutional Data Form

### Certificate and Degree Program Completions

**Southeast Missouri State University**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certificate of Degree Program</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Adminis. Asst(general)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Adminis. Asst(legal)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Accounting</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Business Ed</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Office Sys.Manage</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS BA Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS BA Economics</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Management (general)</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Management (personnel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Management (prod/op)</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Management (hum. resource)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Management (org. leadership)</td>
<td></td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Marketing</td>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Marketing (management)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSBA Marketing (integrated communication)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd Early Childhood</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd Elementary Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>111</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd Exceptional Child Ed.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd Physical Educ. k-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd Physical Educ. 7-12</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd Middle School Educ.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Communication Disorders</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS Criminal Justice (corrections)</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice (law enforcement)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Criminal Justice (security mange.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Geography</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Health Mang.(ath. trn)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Health Mang.(hlth prom)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Health Mang.(spts. medicine)</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Physical Therapy Asst.</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Recreation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Child Care &amp; Guidance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Fam. Cons. Sci Ed.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Fashion Mdse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Food/Nutrition</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSVHE</td>
<td>Voc.Home Ec.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Social Work</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Art</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>English(language)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>English(literature)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>English(writing)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Historic Preservation</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Social Studies</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mass Comm (corp video)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Major</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mass Comm (advert)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mass Comm (journal)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mass Comm (media)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mass Comm (pub.rel)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mass Comm (tv/radio)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Music</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Music (instrum)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BME</td>
<td>Music (vocal)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Perform. (instrum)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>Perform. (vocal)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Speech (forensic)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Speech (inter/smlgrp)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Speech (org/soc)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Speech (public)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Speech Education</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Theatre</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Med. Technology</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Appl Comp Sci (info)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Appl Comp Sci (tech)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Comp. Sci (scientific)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Comp. Sci (math/sci)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Comp. Sci (systems)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Comp. Science</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>CS/Math Systems</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Earth Science</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Geoscience</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Mathematics Educ.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engin. Physics (appl)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Engin. Physics (comp Applications)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Physics Educa.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Agriculture (business)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Agriculture (agronomy)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Agriculture (animal sci)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Agriculture (general)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Agriculture (horticult)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Comp. Tech</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Comp. Tech (graphics)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Comp. Tech (micro systems)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAS</td>
<td>Comp. Technology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Design Drafting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind Tech (electric)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind Tech (ind mgt)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind Tech (manufac)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind Tech (product)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind Tech (technology)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind. Tech (visual)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Ind Tech (tech graph)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Industrial Ed.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSEd</td>
<td>Industrial Tech Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Interdisciplinary Stud.</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGS</td>
<td>General Studies</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Graduate Program Completions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>1997</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Communication Disorders</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Community Counseling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Elementary Administration</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Elementary Education</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Exception Child Ed.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Guidance &amp; Counseling</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>History</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Home Econ.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Secondary Administration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>Business Adminstr.</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MME</td>
<td>Music Educ.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Geosciences</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MNS</td>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Criminal Just.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Health Fitness</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>na</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>Public Admin</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSN</td>
<td>Nursing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDS</td>
<td>Specialist in Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Name of institution/campus reported: SOUTHEAST MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY

Intercollegiate athletic programs (as opposed to intramural and/or physical education programs) involve: a) formal agreements (association, league) to compete with other institutions; b) student athletes identified as members of a particular team; and c) professional staff.

Provide the name(s) of the intercollegiate athletic associations in which the institution holds membership and the level of membership: NCAA DIV. I OHIO VALLEY CONFERENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF SPORT</th>
<th>FOR MOST RECENT ACADEMIC YEAR 1998-99</th>
<th>OPERATING BUDGET FOR INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PROGRAMS (list current year last)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN INTERCOLLEGIATE ATHLETIC PROGRAMS</td>
<td>NUMBER OF ATHLETIC SCHOLARSHIPS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSB</td>
<td>Men: 29, 9.72, Women: 3,425</td>
<td>Women: 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB</td>
<td>Men: 19, Women: 9.92</td>
<td>Men: 5,220, Women: 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Men: 8, Women: 3.54</td>
<td>Men: 7,518, Women: 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VB</td>
<td>Men: 12, Women: 8.96</td>
<td>Men: 7,120, Women: 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN XC &amp; TRACK</td>
<td>Men: 25, Women: 15.41</td>
<td>Men: 6,402, Women: 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOMEN SOCCER (1998-99, new coach hired in spring 99; limited budget)</td>
<td>Men: 5</td>
<td>7,881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total - Men</td>
<td>1,157,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total - Women</td>
<td>818,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total all</td>
<td>1,975,331</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepare separate reports for each campus. Please add attachments and additional sheets whenever necessary.
Self Study Committees
NCA Self Study Committees

Steering Committee

Rickert Althaus, Professor, Political Science
Kimberly Barrett, Associate Provost and Dean of Students
Sheila Caskey, Dean Emeritus and Self-Study Coordinator
Rodger Chisman, Director, Telecommunications
Brian Cochran, Student
Sarah Cron, Dean of Academic Information Services and Director, Kent Library
Christina Frazier, Professor of Biology and Faculty Associate to the Provost
Connie Heuschober, Associate Director, Facilities Management
Dennis Holt, Vice Provost
Demetrius Karathanos, Professor, Management
Joseph Lanni, Director, Institutional Research
Karen Myers, Director, New Student Programs
Marcia Nahikian-Nelms, Associate Professor, Human Environmental Studies
Michael Readnour, Professor, Chemistry
Judy St. John, Director, Center for Health and Counseling
Margaret Theobald, Professor, Middle and Secondary Education
Robert Zeller, Professor, English

University Committees Serving as Sub-Committees

University Affirmative Action Committee
University Planning Committee
Information Technology Committee
Library Committee
Graduate Council
University Studies Council
University Budget Review Committee
University Athletic Committee
College Councils

Special Sub Committees

Articulation: Randy Shaw, School of Polytechnic Studies
Mishea Culbreath, Admissions
Sandy Hinkle, Registrar

Staff and Faculty Development: Dennis Holt, Interim Provost
David Sterrett, Center for Scholarship in Teaching and Learning
Jane Stough, Training and Development
Jenny Brune, Wellness Program
Facilities Management: Michael Cobb, Department of Physics  
Robert Dillon, Department of Speech Communication and Theatre  
Kerry Wynn, Learning Enrichment Center  
Beth Glaus, Department of Public Safety  
Mary Kay Poljan, University Center  
Andreas Minke, Facilities Management  
James Daume, Facilities Management

Fundraising and Development: Deborah Beard, Alumni Council  
Susan Burton, University Foundation  
Wayne Davenport, University Foundation  
Robert Foster, University Foundation  
Katherine Hart, Student  
Beverly Petch-Hogan, Faculty  
Grace Hoover, Booster Board of Directors

Publications: Jim Biundo, University Relations  
Juan Crites, Publications  
Jay Goff, Admissions  
Ann Hayes, University Relations  
Ron Hines, Sports Information  
Fred Janzow, University Studies  
Don Krueger, Computer Services  
Jason Lane, Student  
Mary Kay Poljan, University Center  
Dana Schweiger, Computer Services  
Diane Sides, University Relations  
Archie Sprengel, Computer Services  
Art Wallhausen, Presidents Office  
Wade Walker, University Relations

Student Services: Trent Ball, Minority Student Programs  
Irene Ferguson, Learning Enrichment Center  
Lisa Peden, Student Life Studies  
Judy St. John, Center for Health and Counseling  
James Settles, Residence Life

Academic Advising: Nancy Birk, School of University Studies  
Sharon Burgard, Athletics  
Maureen Carman, Harrison College of Business  
Carol Heisserer, College of Liberal Arts  
Joe Huskey, College of Education  
Linda Little, College of Health and Human Services  
Kim Madigan, School of Polytechnic Studies  
Cheryl McAllister, College of Science and Mathematics
Self Study Plan
Southeast Missouri State University, in anticipation of reaccreditation in the Fall of 2000 has prepared a self-study plan which will enable the institution to evaluate itself and plan for the future. The objectives of the self-study processes are as follows:

- To gather the necessary data to assess the current strategic plan and form the basis for a new five year plan.
- To verify the effectiveness of programs designed to assess student academic achievement.
- To demonstrate that Southeast Missouri State University is an effective institution that is organized to continue to accomplish its mission and purposes.
- To engage the broadest possible constituency in a comprehensive review of the institution.
- To utilize the self-study process as a means of focusing attention on strengths of the institution and the challenges it faces.

Status and Scope

Southeast Missouri State University will seek a change in scope as part of the self-study process. Specifically, the institution seeks approval to offer degree programs anywhere within its service area. The desired wording is “No prior Commission approval required for offering degree programs at new sites within its service area including those utilizing alternate forms of delivery.”

Self-Study Process

- President Nitzschke appoints a 13-15 member Steering Committee representative of the university community. Among these individuals will be key leaders who serve on the University Planning, Assessment Review, Budget Review, and Information Technology Committees.

- Wherever possible, subcommittees will be drawn from the existing committee structure. Sub-committees will be assigned topics found in the table of contents with a charge to review, ascertain what data is available and needed, and identify strengths, challenges, and recommendations. Each member of the Steering
Committee will be responsible for “managing” one or more subcommittees to ensure an appropriate task orientation among the committees.

**Time Table**


- **November, 1998**  Steering Committee appointed by President Nitzschke.

- **January, 1999**  A full day workshop for the Steering Committee to develop an understanding of the self-study process and NCA criteria. Subcommittees will be approved and work will begin defining the evidence needed to meet each criterion and Self-Study Plan.

- **January/February, 1999**  Coordinator will meet with Deans/Academic Chairpersons/Non-Academic Directors/Vice Presidents/Faculty Senate/Administrative Council/ and, Sub committees to build an understanding of the criteria and process.

- **February-May, 1999**  The coordinator will gather data that responds to concerns expressed in the 1990 review and that demonstrates that the institution continues to meet the General Institutional Requirements.

- **April, 1999**  The coordinator and at least two members of the Steering Committee will attend the NCA annual meeting.

* During this time period, the Steering Committee will meet every 3-4 weeks to report on progress.

- **September-December, 1999**  The Steering Committee receives reports from subcommittees, develops the documentation for “Patterns of Evidence.” The draft reports are shared with appropriate entities to be certain that strengths, challenges, actions, and recommendations are clearly identified. The Steering Committee will meet every two weeks.

- **January-May, 2000**  In January and February the draft report will be written and circulated to all members of the university community. Following the period of comment, the Steering Committee will make the appropriate adjustments to the self-study. The goal is to have the self study completed and all documentation identified and gathered by May, 2000.

- **August-?, 2000**  Logistical issues related to support of the NCA team, indexing and establishing the resource room materials.
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