OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Annual Student Assessment Report of 2016-17 Activity

All information is to be submitted electronically as email attachments. No documents, other than a transmittal letter from the President to Chancellor Glen D. Johnson, will need to be printed and delivered.

Please submit by **December 1, 2017**.

ANNUAL REPORT OF STUDENT ASSESSMENT ACTIVITY

Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement

Activities

I-1. What information was used to determine course placement?

In January 2016, RSC conducted a large pilot of the Classic ACCUPLACER to gather data relating course placement to ACCUPLACER scores. This pilot lead to the conclusion that Classic ACCUPLACER would not meet our English placement needs, which eventually lead to the adoption of Next-Generation ACCUPLACER. Another pilot was conducted in October 2016 to determine initial placement scores for Next-Gen ACCUPLACER.

Since Next-Gen ACCUPLACER is relatively new, there is currently no national data base that can be used as a comparison for our placement scores. For the next several semesters very close attention will be paid to student performance (course pass rates and grades) and enrollment patterns.

I-2. How were students determined to need remediation (e.g., cut scores or advising process)?

Here is the link on the Enrollment Testing (EAST) website for the current placement chart: https://www.rose.edu/media/7296/placement-chart-for-fall-2017_march-29-2017.pdf

For traditional students, high school performance and the ACT are our primary methods for assessing remediation needs. The Next-Gen ACCUPLACER provides a secondary source of information for advisors to determine remediation needs. For non-traditional students, the ACCUPLACER is the primary information used.

In the developmental writing courses, professors also provide a diagnostic within the first two weeks to help ensure accurate placement.

I-3. What options were available for the students to remediate lack of preparedness?

Students are allowed to a chance exhibit preparedness by taking the ACCUPLACER. Enrollment Testing (EAST) directs students to study materials provided by ACCUPLACER if they wish to retest. Our Writing and Reading Labs provide study assistance for the ACCUPLACER. Our Summer Bridge Program was restarted this summer to provide another option for students to remediate skills prior to determining initial course placement.

In English we also offer a two-week, interim, Composition Studio course that some students may take and pass to avoid the full remedial course. Also, for students who have one or more curricular deficiencies, we now offer the Summer Bridge Program through which students may work to test out of multiple areas of developmental courses.

Analyses and Findings

I-4. Describe analyses and findings of student success in both remedial and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process or approaches to teaching as a result of findings.

For Math courses College Algebra and lower: Institutional Research provides a detailed report which includes data on all student placement scores, course grades, as well as grades in previous and subsequent math courses. This data is used to analyze pass rates, grade distributions (% of A's, B's, etc.) as well as retention to and success in subsequent and previous math courses. For students near a placement cutoff, we use the data to try to answer the question: Could this group of students be successful starting in the next higher course (or should they perhaps be starting in the previous course)?

In Spring of 2015, this analysis lead to the lowering of math COMPASS placement scores which resulted in approximately 200 students a semester starting in the next higher math course without any lowering of pass rates.

Section II –General Education Assessment

Administering Assessment

II-1. Describe the institutional general education competencies/outcomes and how they are assessed.

The objective of the Assessment Program at Rose State College reads:

- The assessment program strives to provide relevant and timely data to support efforts at continuous improvement of student learning on the campus of Rose State College.

- Presently, the specific general education outcomes that are measured include:

1. Written Communication is the ability to compose a quality written document on a collegiate level. This includes the following characteristics:

    - Development of a Central Idea
    - Diction
    - Organization
    - Support
    - Sentence Structure
    - Grammar and Mechanics

2. Quantitative Reasoning refers to the ability to analyze information when presented either numerically, or in formulas, graphs, or tables, and to critically evaluate and interpret that information for solving problems, making predictions, or drawing conclusions.

    Students who demonstrate quantitative reasoning skills will be able to:
    - Calculate: Identify relevant mathematical information, and select appropriate methods to answer questions of a numerical nature.
    - Connect: Express and/or evaluate quantitative relationships using graphs, charts, or formulas.
    - Conclude: Evaluate representations and inferences that are based on quantitative information, and recognize questionable values or assertions.

3. Global and Cultural Awareness stems from a critical analysis of and an engagement with complex, interdependent global and cultural systems and legacies (such as natural, physical, social, economic, and political) and their implications on people's lives.

   Through global and cultural awareness activities, students should:
   - Become informed, open-minded, and responsible people who are attentive to diversity across the spectrum of differences
   - Seek to understand how their actions affect both local and global communities
   - Address the world's most pressing and enduring issues collaboratively and equitably
   - Work cooperatively with people from populations different than their own

In future semesters, the Assessment Committee will be expanding the measurement of the general education expected competencies. At this point, we have assessed outcomes 1 and 2 two times, and outcome 3 once, with the second measurement due Spring 2018.

The strategy for assessing the learning outcomes for the selected general education competencies was established in 2012 when RSC redesigned its assessment program. It was determined that for us to gain the best measure of student learning for the specified outcomes that we would conduct the measure in sections/courses across campus. The Assessment Committee stressed that the expected outcomes of our general education program are not solely the responsibility of the disciplines most closely related to those outcomes. It was felt that each of the three expected outcomes should be stressed across the entire curriculum and educational experience at RSC.

This resulted in our designing of an assessment plan to measure the competencies from the randomly selected sections across the entire course offerings in the sample term. The demographic questions that go along with each assessment record demographic and academic data regarding the students. Most notably, the number of credit hours completed and expected semester of graduation allow us to analyze the competencies at various stages of our students in relation to their academic classification. Other demographic questions provide meaningful comparisons that prove to be valuable.

The selected sections and students are administered an assessment instrument designed to score/assess the student's competency at a point in time. These are administered in the Spring semesters to allow for the greatest exposure to instruction and completion of coursework. Professors distribute these in class, allow time for completion, collect, and turn them back to the AVP for scoring and analysis.

Each of the outcomes are assessed utilizing an internally developed measure. The instruments were developed, pilot tested, and analyzed for internal and external validity.

II-2. Describe how the assessments were administered and how students were selected.

Assessment Methodology: Using specified expectations and the error tolerance for the data, it was determined that a random sampling of students would be most efficient and equally effective to a measure conducted from the entire population of students. One challenge that we had in recent years is the over-assessment of students as collected by faculty. The faculty were constantly filling out reports, filing data, and providing duplicative scores. The current selection process and administration of the measure now involves:

1. Sections of courses are randomly selected to ensure that at least 750 students are enrolled in the sample of sections. Usually, approximately 450 measures are included in the final assessment.

2. The measures are distributed to the faculty with complete instructions. The faculty distribute the measures in class, allow time to complete the measure, and collect them. They are asked to allow approximately 30 minutes in class for the measure.

3. All assessment measures have a set of 10 demographic question that are used for comparative analyses of the results.

4. Upon completion, the measures are returned to the AVP for Academic Affairs.

5. The AVP analyzes the data and provides several reports to the campus regarding the findings over the following weeks in the *Stats of the Week* reports. These reports include observations, recommendations, and questions for thought.

In Spring 2017, the Quantitative Reasoning competency was measured for the second time using the aforementioned sampling design and methodology.

II-3. Describe strategies used to motivate students to substantively participate in the assessment.

The Assessment Committee considered these issues prior to the development and distribution of the assessment instruments. It was determined that since one of the primary factors we were attempting to measure was improvement over time, that it would be best to obtain the scores in a variety of courses that likely would have equal incentives to provide maximum effort.

The faculty administering the instrument are asked to read a statement which explained the purpose of the measure, encourage the students to provide maximum effort, and noted that their efforts and results were very important to the school's administration.

II-4. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in response to general education assessment results?

As occurred following the assessment of Effective Written Communication, the assessment of Quantitative Reasoning has contributed to the revision of our placement measure, placement scores, and a redesign of our developmental mathematics curriculum.

Rose State College has fully adopted the analysis of student outcomes and the information that can be garnered from the analysis of data. Further, our mathematics tutoring and testing processes have been revised. Our assessment continues to indicate that we are making progress, but we have much work remaining.

Analyses and Findings

II-5 Report the results of each assessment by sub-groups of students, as defined in institutional assessment plans.

2017 QR Assessment

Score

Mean	N	Std. Deviation
56.57	431	20.467

2014 QR Assessment

Score

Mean	N	Std. Deviation
53.2976	457	21.48651

Categorical Comparisons

Score * Age

Score

Age	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
19 or younger	.6012	141	.20293
20-24	.5645	146	.20881
25-29	.5632	54	.18588
30-34	.5333	30	.22060
35-39	.5176	25	.21613
40 or older	.5000	34	.18044
Total	.5663	430	.20449

Score * Sex

Score

Sex	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
Male	.6060	166	.22855
Female	.5397	264	.18402
Total	.5653	430	.20469

Score * Race

Score

Race	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
White	.6107	238	.19804
African American	.4340	74	.17218
Hispanic	.5598	31	.20651
Asian	.5882	21	.17939
Native American	.5123	24	.18881
Two or more	.5610	41	.21935
Total	.5652	429	.20492

Score * High School

Score

High School	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
GED	.5353	30	.17972
Diploma	.5689	384	.20564
Neither	.6176	10	.22053
Total	.5677	424	.20414

Score * Division

Score

Division	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
BIT	.5844	92	.22383
ES	.6847	50	.20644
HU	.5606	34	.19921
SS	.5619	76	.18882
HS	.5428	141	.18593
Undecided	.4639	35	.19075
Total	.5667	428	.20467

Score * Credit Hrs

Score

Credit Hrs	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
0	.4865	48	.19519
1-15	.5463	132	.20513
16-30	.5466	89	.18627
31-45	.5787	62	.23022
46-60	.6391	52	.18784
61+	.6373	48	.19045
Total	.5657	431	.20467

Score * Num of Colleges

Score

Num of Colleges	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
0	.5588	270	.20614
1	.5614	103	.19575
2 or more	.6257	55	.19782
Total	.5680	428	.20338

Score * Graduate

Score

Graduate	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
This semester	.6422	36	.20249
Next semester	.5862	59	.20376
1-2 years	.5556	198	.19670
2-3 years	.5319	95	.20787
more than 3 years	.4910	23	.17068
non-degree seeking	.7390	16	.18473
Total	.5652	427	.20357

II-6. How is student performance tracked into subsequent semesters and what were the findings?

Our strategy has focused on the assessment of student learning across campus. This is designed to measure the educational outcome at a point in time to represent students in all majors, of varied classifications, and a cross section of demographic groupings. Again, in our judgement, the general education outcomes that we are focusing on are of such importance that they should be a focal point of all academic divisions and courses.

Resultantly, we do not track specific students over time. However, we do randomly select sections of students to assess and compare their results to gain an indication our students' abilities regarding the general education outcomes, and to assess changes over time. As noted above, we completed the second measurement of Quantitative Reasoning in 2016-2017 and noted several changes. Further, the analyses in recent years has provided insight into how our students are performing across various categorical factors that have proven to be valuable.

II-7. Describe the evaluation of the general education assessment and any modifications made to assessment and teaching in response to the evaluation.

The assessment of Effective Writing and Quantitative Reasoning have each been completed two times. Global and Cultural Awareness will be reassessed in spring 2018 for the second time.

Prior to the second administration of the first two general education outcomes, the measurement instruments were slightly revised. Following the first administration, the assessment committee determined that there were some item that needed to be reworded or deleted. Some additional questions were added to each. While this added potential variability to the scores, it was felt that the expected improvement in the measurement's accuracy would prove to be worthwhile.

Section III – Program Outcomes

Administering Assessment

III-1. List, in table format, assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for each degree program. Include graduate programs if applicable to the institutional assessment plan.

Degree Program	Capstone Course/Licensure Exam	Passed
Business and Information Technology Division		
Business Administration (AAS) General Business Admin. Human Resources Option Management Option	 BA 2191-4 -- Business Admin. Int. MGMT 2903 Management Seminar	 12/13 17/18
Computer Info. Tech. (AAS)	CIT 2313 -- Systems Implementation & Dev.	11/17
Networking	CIT 1523 – Micro Hardware and Operating Systems	120/153
Networking CyberSecurity Certificates	#4012 – Designated Approving Auth. #4013 – System Admin. in System Security ##4016 – Risk Analyst	16/16 14/14 14/14
Paralegal Studies (AAS)	LS 2993 –Capstone Seminar	16/17
Health Sciences Division		
Dental Assisting (AAS)	HSDA 1353 – Practicum II	12/12 received Expanded Duty Permits State of OK-Board of Dentistry 12 of 12 passed Dental Assisting National Board CDA exam
Dental Hygiene (AAS)	HSDH 2405 – Dental Hygiene IV	12/12 passed written NDHBE exam 12/12 passed clinical exam WREB 12/12 passed Oklahoma State jurisprudence exam
Health Information Tech. (AAS)	HSHI 2332 – Health Information Seminar	5 of 9 have taken exam 5 of 5 passed RHIT NOTE: Graduates are still taking exams
Clinical Laboratory Tech. (AAS)	HSCL 2606 – Clinical Lab. Sciences III	6 of 6 passed ASCP
Nursing Science (AAS)	HSNS 2205 – Advanced Medical Surgical Nursing	NCLEX-RN 85/94 (90.4%) passed
Radiologic Technology (AAS)	HSXT 2614 – Analytical Radiologic Tech.	12/12 continued to 2nd year; 11/11 grads passed ARRT / 1 yet to test
Respiratory Therapist (AAS)	HSRT 2334 – Respiratory Therapy Clinic III	12 of 16 passed first time, 4 have not yet taken the exam.

Degree Program	Capstone Course/Licensure Exam	Passed
Humanities Division		**C or better**
English (AA)	ENGL 2503	7/9
Fine Arts (AA)	Art & Photography Emphasis Musical Theatre Emphasis: MUS 2512 Music Emphasis: MUS 2432 & 2442 Theatre Emphasis: TH 2902	14/14 1/1 3/5 5/5
Liberal Studies (AA)	General Studies Emphasis: HUM 2501 Cultural Studies Emphasis: HUM 2501	40/49 1/1
Library Technical Assistant (AAS)	LTA 2001 Capstone Project	3/3
Modern Languages (AA)	LANG 2501 Modern Language Cap.	3/3
Social Sciences Division		**C or better**
Family Services and Child Care (AAS)	FSCD 2233 Practicum in FSCD	8 of 8
History (AA)	HIST 2993 Historical Research	5/8
Criminal Justice (AA)	CJ 2193 Criminal Justice Internship	11/12
Health & Sports Sci. (AS)	HPER 2701- 3	20/20

NOTE:
RHIT: Registered Health Information Technician Examination
NDHBE: National Dental Board Hygiene Board Examination
WREB: Western Regional Clinical Dental Hygiene Exam
NCLEX-RN: NCLEX-Registered Nurse Examination
ASCP: ASCP National Board
DANB: Dental Assistants National Board
CRT: Certified Respiratory Therapist Test
ARRT: American Registry of Radiologic Technologists

Analyses and Findings

III-2. What were the analyses and findings from the program outcomes assessment?

See table above.

III-3. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the programs in response to program outcomes assessment?

Given the success rates of the programs, few needed changes were indicated. However, as is always the case, every program and the related courses are reviewed regularly. In 2017, every program was modified due to changing academic requirements. The HPER requirement, which had been 2 credit hours for all programs (excluding Health Science), was deleted. All programs modified their general education requirements, as a result. Further, the degree sheet format was modified to make it more understandable and descriptive to students.

Some assessment data has resulted in a shift to more online and hybrid course options across all programs. We have moved to these formats following close scrutiny and careful preparation.

Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

IV-1. What assessments were used and how were the students selected?

The assessment of student engagement and satisfaction are assessed utilizing internally developed measures. The Educational Demographics measure is distributed semi-annually during the fall terms. This measure assesses many student characteristics beyond engagement. Two versions of student satisfaction assessment – one measuring facilities satisfaction and the other measuring services satisfaction – are distributed on a rotating basis in the spring terms. In Spring 2017, Student Satisfaction – Facilities was distributed.

As with the general education outcomes, the students are selected from a random sampling of sections of courses. Initially, sections of courses are randomly selected from across campus until a sample size of approximately 750 students are achieved. These assessments are distributed in the classes, taken home, and returned. Normally, this results in approximately a 60% return rate.

IV-2. What were the analyses and findings from the student engagement and satisfaction assessment?

See attached.

A much more detailed analyses were conducted and distributed to the campus in the weekly Stats of the Week reports. In these, the data were analyzed across demographic factors and other stratifications.

IV-3. What changes occurred or are planned in response to the student engagement and satisfaction assessment?

The Educational Demographics assessment gave us information that went far beyond engagement. Our discussions regarding our students now reflect our better understanding of their access to technology, paying for college, how they acquire books, their attitudes, motivation for learning, opinions regarding online courses, reasons for attending college, time spent studying, and session preferences, among others..

The Facilities measure provided us clear evidence that the recent renovation of our campus has resulted in significant improvement in student satisfaction with facilities across all areas. We did discover that satisfaction with parking was relatively low. All parking lots were resurfaced in Summer 2017.

Assessment Budgets

State Regents policy states that academic service fees "shall not exceed the actual costs of the course of instruction or the academic services provided by the institution" (Chapter 4 – Budget and Fiscal Affairs, 4.18.2 Definitions).

Provide the following information regarding assessment fees and expenditures for 2016-17:

Assessment fees	$227,804
Assessment salaries	$124,133
Distributed to other departments	$81,003
Operational costs	$22,668
Total Expenditures	$227,804