UMKC Standardized Tests Report
Executive Summary 2011-2012

During the 2011-2012 academic year, undergraduate students at UMKC participated in standardized tests measuring their learning outcomes for General Education (through the ETS-Proficiency Profile test), as well as learning outcomes for students’ majors (in the Major Field Tests). Detailed reports have been written for each of these tests. In the bullet points below, we have summarized the findings:

ETS—Proficiency Profile (1,448 students)

- Scores were above our benchmark peers for all four areas: Reading, Critical Thinking, Writing, and Mathematics
- On individual items, our scores were better than the national average on 51 out of 53 items
- Our higher scores may be due to the fact that most UMKC students take the ETS-PP before they graduate, whereas students’ at other schools may take the test at various times in their undergraduate experience

Major Field Tests (MFTs)

Biology (87 Students) – UMKC scored above average on 8 of 9 Assessment Indicators

Business (192 Students) – UMKC scored above average on 4 of 9 Assessment Indicators

Psychology (81 Students) – UMKC scored above average on 2 of 6 Assessment Indicators

Political Science (20 Students) – UMKC scored above average on 1 of 3 Assessment Indicators

Computer Science (23 Students) – UMKC scored above average on 1 of 3 Assessment Indicators

Chemistry (117 Students) – UMKC scored above average on 0 of 2 Assessment Indicators

UMKC students also take MFTs in Computer Science, Mathematics, and Physics, but there were insufficient numbers of students who took these tests to allow for comparable samples.

In summary, UMKC is excelling in the ETS-PP and Biology MFTs. We are holding par on the Business, Psychology, and Political Science MFTs, and we are below the curve on our Chemistry MFTs. The full findings for each of these areas are outlined in individual reports.

These reports have been sent to all relevant departments, and the General Education scores have been reviewed by the General Education Committee, the University Assessment Committee, and the Assessment Academy Team. Departments have been encouraged to discuss how they can enhance their curriculum to address the areas of weakness within each test. We will collect data during the 2012-2013 academic year to determine any changes over time.