

Oklahoma State System
of
Higher Education

**Annual
Student
Assessment
Report**



November 29, 2007

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS
FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Bill Burgess, Jr., Chairman
Lawton

Ronald H. White
Vice Chairman
Oklahoma City

Marlin "Ike" Glass Jr.
Newkirk

William Stuart Price
Secretary
Tulsa

Jimmy D. "Jimmy" Harrell
Leedy

Joseph L. Parker, Jr.
Assistant Secretary
Tulsa

Cheryl P. Hunter
Oklahoma City

Julie Carson
Claremore

John Massey
Durant

Glen D. Johnson
Chancellor

The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education in compliance with Titles VI and VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Executive Order 11236 as amended, Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 and other federal laws do not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, age, religion, handicap, or status as a veteran in any of its policies, practices, or procedures. This includes but is not limited to admissions, employment, financial aid, and educational services.

This publication, duplicated by the State Regents' central services, is issued by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education as authorized by 70 O.S. Supp. 1999, Section 3206. Copies have been prepared and distributed internally. Copies have been deposited with the Publications Clearinghouse of the Oklahoma Department of Libraries.

ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	1
Background	5
Analysis	8
Entry-Level Assessment	10
General Education (Mid-Level) Assessment	25
Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment	29
Student Satisfaction Assessment.....	32
Graduate Student Assessment.....	34
Licensure and Certification.....	35
Assessment Budgets.....	39
Tables	
Number of Students Enrolled in Remediation by Institution	40
Secondary Test Cut-Scores by Subject and Institution	41
APPENDIX	
<i>Policy on Assessment</i>	47

INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education

ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

2005-06

Executive Summary

The twelfth annual report on student assessment in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is presented as required by the State Regents' policy on "Assessment." Reports submitted by each institution are provided as an overview of the 2005-06 academic year assessment activities. Additional remediation information will be presented to the State Regents in separate documents, the Annual Student Remediation Report and The High School Indicators Report.

Background

Oklahoma legislation paved the way for development of a statewide assessment plan in 1991 by allowing institutions to charge students up to one dollar per credit hour to support the student assessment effort. The State Regents' Assessment Policy was adopted in October 1991.

The purpose of assessment is to maximize student success. The assessment plan requires the systematic collection, interpretation, and use of information about student learning and achievement to improve instruction. The policy also addresses the need to demonstrate public accountability by providing evidence of institutional effectiveness.

Each institution must evaluate students at four levels (graduate student assessment is optional):

- *Entry-Level Assessment and Course Placement* - to determine academic preparation and course placement.
- *General Education (Mid-Level) Assessment* - to determine general education competencies in reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking.
- *Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment* - to evaluate outcomes in the student's major.
- *Assessment of Student Satisfaction* - to ascertain students' perceptions of their educational experiences including support services, academic curriculum, faculty, etc.
- *Graduate Student Assessment* - to assess student learning beyond standard admission and graduation requirements and to evaluate student satisfaction.

Institutions submit an annual assessment report to the State Regents, which describes assessment efforts at each of these levels. Information on number of students assessed, results of the assessment, and detailed plans for any institutional and instructional changes due to assessment results are to be provided in the report.

Entry-Level Assessment and Placement

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist institutional faculty and advisors in making course placement decisions that will give students the best possible chance of academic success. Beginning in fall 1994, institutions were required to use a score of 19 on the ACT in the subject areas of English, mathematics, science, and reading as the "first-cut" for entry-level assessment. Students may also demonstrate curricular proficiency by means of an approved secondary assessment process.

Students unable to demonstrate proficiency in one or more of the subject areas are enrolled in remedial courses. These courses are below college-level and do not count toward degree requirements. A supplementary per credit hour fee is assessed the student for these courses.

As required by policy, institutional assessment programs not only assess the basic skills of incoming students and enroll them in appropriate courses, but also track students to measure the rates at which they succeed. In addition to measuring basic skill competencies, institutions are collecting data on student attitudes and perceptions of college life. Colleges are offering orientation courses, computer-assisted instruction, tutoring, and learning centers, all of which are intended to make initial college experiences both positive and successful.

General Education (Mid-Level) Assessment

Mid-level assessment is designed to assess the basic competencies gained by students in the college general education program. Institutions are required to assess students in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking. Mid-level assessment normally occurs after completion of 45 semester hours and prior to completion of 70 semester hours. For associate degree programs, mid-level assessment may occur halfway through the program or at the end of the program. More typically, this assessment occurs at the end of the program, after students have had sufficient time to develop basic skills.

Assessments at mid-level and in the major academic program provide important information to institutions about the degree to which their programs facilitate student achievement of desired knowledge and competencies. Results of this process have led some institutions to redesign general education programs. Both the types of courses and the way in which courses are delivered have been examined closely.

Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment

Program outcomes assessment, or major field of study assessment, is designed to measure how well students are meeting institutionally stated program goals and objectives. As with other levels of assessment, selection of assessment instruments and other parameters (such as target groups, when assessment occurs, etc.) is the responsibility of the institution. Institutions are encouraged to give preference to nationally standardized instruments that supply normative data. The instrument selected should measure skills and abilities specific to the program and to higher level thinking skills. Results are used to revise curricula.

Assessment of Student Satisfaction

Student and alumni perceptions are important in the evaluation and enhancement of academic and campus programs and services because they provide an indication of the students' subjective view of events and services, which collectively constitute their undergraduate experiences. Student satisfaction evaluation can be accomplished in several ways, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. The resulting data are used to provide feedback to improve programs and services. On many campuses, students expressed satisfaction with the availability and interest of faculty and staff, academic preparation for future occupations, classroom facilities, campus buildings and grounds, class size, libraries, cost, and other services. Common areas of dissatisfaction were food services, course availability, veteran's services, availability of student housing, job placement assistance, financial aid services, student activity fee uses, and parking.

Changes have been instituted as a result of student feedback. Common changes include technology additions and upgrades to improve academic and administrative services, student access to computers and the Internet, expanded orientation programs, enhanced tutoring services, student activities, food services, and career counseling and placement. New facilities have been constructed and older facilities have been remodeled to meet students' needs.

Graduate Student Assessment

Beginning fall 1996, higher education institutions that charge graduate students the student assessment fee must perform assessment beyond the standard requirements for admission to and graduation from a graduate program. Eight of the ten universities offering graduate programs (OSU, UCO, ECU, NSU, NWOSU, SEOSU, SWOSU, CU, and LU) reported graduate student assessment activities that include licensure, certification, and comprehensive exams; portfolios; capstone courses; practica; theses; interviews; and surveys.

Licensure/Certification Assessment

An important measure of both student achievement and program effectiveness and appropriateness is the professional exam for licensure or certification. This is the first year institutions were asked to provide the number of students taking such exams and the number of them passing.

Assessment Budgets

This is the first year that assessment budgets figures were requested. In compliance with State Regents' policy regarding the use of fees, it is important to monitor how assessment fees are being allocated for the support of assessment activities. An analysis of assessment budgets are planned for future reports.

Analysis

As evidenced by the institutional reports, Oklahoma's colleges and universities are achieving the two major objectives of student assessment: to improve programs and to provide public accountability. As institutional implementation of student assessment has evolved, continued enhancements and improvements have been documented.

Institutions have also improved the process of gathering and using assessment information. Assessment days or class times are designated to encourage more students to seriously participate in mid-level and program outcomes testing. Strategies for increasing the response rates to surveys are evaluated. Assessment information has been integrated into other institutional review processes, and results are shared widely with faculty and students.

Areas of concern include the wide variance in secondary test cutscores for a given instrument. Also, secondary testing for science is not practiced at all institutions. While some use a combination of reading and math scores and others use science tests, many institutions do not test.

Administration of general education assessment varies in methodology among the state's higher education institutions with several using locally developed tests. Using national exams could provide more consistency and comparison to national benchmarks.

Persistence and graduation rates depend on the ability of a student to succeed not only in higher level courses but in the wider world of business and industry. Implementation of state-wide assessments in writing and mathematics prior to being allowed to take course beyond 30 hours would assure that students

would have the requisite skills to be successful in college and in the work place. Pass rates of these assessments could be included in the annual student assessment report as a means of monitoring progress and increasing public transparency and accountability. Such assessments could assist in regional and departmental accreditation.

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT

2005-06

The twelfth annual report on student assessment in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is presented as required by the State Regents' policy on "Assessment." Reports submitted by each institution are provided as an overview of the 2005-06 academic year assessment activities. Additional remediation information will be presented to the State Regents in separate documents, the Annual Student Remediation Report and The High School Indicators Report.

Background

Oklahoma legislation paved the way for development of a statewide assessment plan in 1991 by allowing institutions to charge students up to one dollar per credit hour to support the student assessment effort. The State Regents' Assessment Policy was adopted in October 1991.

The purpose of assessment is to maximize student success. The assessment plan requires the systematic collection, interpretation, and use of information about student learning and achievement to improve instruction. The policy also addresses the need to demonstrate public accountability by providing evidence of institutional effectiveness.

The policy is a proactive, comprehensive assessment program, which addresses institutional quality and curricular cohesiveness. It is designed so that the results of the assessment efforts will contribute to the institution's strategic planning, budgetary decision-making, institutional marketing, and improving the quality of student services.

Each institution must evaluate students at four levels (graduate student assessment is optional):

- *Entry-Level Assessment and Course Placement* - to determine academic preparation and course placement.
- *General Education (Mid-Level) Assessment* - to determine general education competencies in reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking.
- *Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment* - to evaluate outcomes in the student's major.
- *Assessment of Student Satisfaction* - to ascertain students' perceptions of their educational experiences including support services, academic curriculum, faculty, etc.
- *Graduate Student Assessment* - to assess student learning beyond standard admission and graduation requirements and to evaluate student satisfaction.

Institutions submit an annual assessment report to the State Regents, which describes assessment efforts at each of these levels. Information on number of students assessed, results of the assessment, and detailed plans for any institutional and instructional changes due to assessment results are to be provided in the report.

Entry-Level Assessment and Placement

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist institutional faculty and advisors in making course placement decisions that will give students the best possible chance of academic success. Beginning in fall 1994, institutions were required to use a score of 19 on the ACT in the subject areas of English, mathematics, science, and reading as the "first-cut" for entry-level assessment. Students may also demonstrate curricular proficiency by means of an approved secondary assessment process.

Students unable to demonstrate proficiency in one or more of the subject areas are enrolled in remedial courses. These courses are below college-level and do not count toward degree requirements. A supplementary per credit hour fee is assessed the student for these courses.

Although all institutions currently use the ACT as the first entry-level assessment, testing instruments used for secondary evaluation vary. Commonly selected commercial instruments include the ACT Assessment of Skills for Successful Entry and Transfer (ASSET), the Accuplacer Computerized Placement Test (CPT), ACT Computer-Adaptive Placement and Support System (COMPASS), and the Nelson-Denny Reading Test. Institutionally developed writing and mathematics tests, as well as a predictive statistical model, are also used. Each institution is responsible for establishing secondary testing cut-scores.

As required by policy, institutional assessment programs not only assess the basic skills of incoming students and enroll them in appropriate courses, but also track students to measure the rates at which they succeed. In addition to measuring basic skill competencies, institutions are collecting data on student attitudes and perceptions of college life. Colleges are offering orientation courses, computer-assisted instruction, tutoring, and learning centers, all of which are intended to make initial college experiences both positive and successful.

General Education (Mid-Level) Assessment

Mid-level assessment is designed to assess the basic competencies gained by students in the college general education program. Institutions are required to assess students in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking. Mid-level assessment normally occurs after completion of 45 semester hours and prior to completion of 70 semester hours. For associate degree programs, mid-level assessment may occur halfway through the program or at the end of the program. More typically, this assessment occurs at the end of the program, after students have had sufficient time to develop basic skills.

Mid-level assessment is accomplished with a combination of locally developed and standardized testing instruments such as the ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP), the Riverside College Base Academic Subjects Examination (BASE), and the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE). These nationally validated instruments are useful, because they provide regional or national benchmark data from other participating institutions. Several institutions have developed local instruments for mid-level assessment in some subject areas. More qualitative assessments, such as portfolio assessments and course-embedded techniques, are also being used.

Assessments at mid-level and in the major academic program provide important information to institutions about the degree to which their programs facilitate student achievement of desired knowledge and competencies. Results of this process have led some institutions to redesign general education programs. Both the types of courses and the way in which courses are delivered have been examined closely.

Program Outcomes (Exit-Level) Assessment

Program outcomes assessment, or major field of study assessment, is designed to measure how well students are meeting institutionally stated program goals and objectives. As with other levels of assessment, selection of assessment instruments and other parameters (such as target groups, when assessment occurs, etc.) is the responsibility of the institution. Institutions are encouraged to give preference to nationally standardized instruments that supply normative data. The instrument selected

should measure skills and abilities specific to the program and to higher level thinking skills. Results are used to revise curricula.

Program outcomes assessment methods used by State System institutions are diverse. Faculty members in each academic program or major field of study are responsible for developing their own methods of assessing to what degree students meet stated program goals and objectives. Assessments include structured exit interviews, surveys of graduating seniors and employers, Educational Testing Service's (ETS) Major Field Assessment Tests (MFAT), national graduate school admission exams (GRE, MCAT, GMAT), the ACT College Outcome Measured Program (COMP), senior projects, portfolios, recitals, national and state licensing exams, internships, capstone courses, theses, transfer GPAs, admission to professional schools, retention rates, and job placement.

Assessment of Student Satisfaction

Student and alumni perceptions are important in the evaluation and enhancement of academic and campus programs and services because they provide an indication of the students' subjective view of events and services, which collectively constitute their undergraduate experiences. Student satisfaction evaluation can be accomplished in several ways, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups. The resulting data are used to provide feedback to improve programs and services. On many campuses, students expressed satisfaction with the availability and interest of faculty and staff, academic preparation for future occupations, classroom facilities, campus buildings and grounds, class size, libraries, cost, and other services. Common areas of dissatisfaction were food services, course availability, veteran's services, availability of student housing, job placement assistance, financial aid services, student activity fee uses, and parking.

Changes have been instituted as a result of student feedback. Common changes include technology additions and upgrades to improve academic and administrative services, student access to computers and the Internet, expanded orientation programs, enhanced tutoring services, student activities, food services, and career counseling and placement. New facilities have been constructed and older facilities have been remodeled to meet students' needs.

Nationally standardized surveys are used most often, but locally developed surveys are administered at some colleges and universities. Students are often surveyed at entry, during their college experience, and after they graduate. Many institutions also survey withdrawing students. The ACT Student Opinion Survey (SOS) is the most commonly used instrument. Others include the Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI), the ACT Alumni Survey, the ACT Withdrawing or Non-returning Student Survey, and the ACT College Outcomes Survey (COS).

Graduate Student Assessment

Beginning fall 1996, higher education institutions that charge graduate students the student assessment fee must perform assessment beyond the standard requirements for admission to and graduation from a graduate program. Eight of the ten universities offering graduate programs (OSU, UCO, ECU, NSU, NWOSU, SEOSU, SWOSU, CU, and LU) reported graduate student assessment activities that include licensure, certification, and comprehensive exams; portfolios; capstone courses; practica; theses; interviews; and surveys.

Licensure/Certification Assessment

An important measure of both student achievement and program effectiveness and appropriateness is the professional exam for licensure or certification. This is the first year institutions were asked to provide the number of students taking such exams and the number of them passing.

Assessment Budgets

This is the first year that assessment budgets figures were requested. In compliance with State Regents' policy regarding the use of fees, it is important to monitor how assessment fees are being allocated for the support of assessment activities.

Analysis

Student assessment in the Oklahoma State System of Higher Education is defined as:

“A multi-dimensional evaluative process that measures the overall educational impact of the college/university experience on students and provides information for making program improvements.”

As evidenced by the institutional reports, Oklahoma's colleges and universities are achieving the two major objectives of student assessment: to improve programs and to provide public accountability. As institutional implementation of student assessment has evolved, continued enhancements and improvements have been documented.

The *process* of student assessment is as important as the outcomes generated. By establishing a process to assess students, institutions have learned valuable information about their students and programs. To assess the degree to which students are meeting the goals and outcomes of a program, an institution must first define the goals and desired outcomes. Institutions have used assessment tools to measure value-added gains; that is, the skill improvement that can be directly attributed to the institution. For example, institutions found, by testing new freshmen and then retesting these students after they completed the general education requirements, that the general education curriculum achieved the desired results and improvements in students' competency levels.

Institutions have also improved the process of gathering and using assessment information. Assessment days or class times are designated to encourage more students to seriously participate in mid-level and program outcomes testing. Strategies for increasing the response rates to surveys are evaluated. Assessment information has been integrated into other institutional review processes, and results are shared widely with faculty and students.

Areas of concern include the wide variance in secondary test cutscores for a given instrument. One would assume transferable entry-level courses would require the same level of preparation. The cutscores do not reflect that. Also, secondary testing for science is not practiced at all institutions. While some use a combination of reading and math scores and others use science tests, many institutions do not test.

Administration of general education assessment varies in methodology among the state's higher education institutions. Assuming that the goals and minimum standards of a general education program are shared at all campuses, the lack of consistency in measurement techniques and practices defies any comparison as to effectiveness of, and the actual value added, by those programs. While some institutions correlate their results to ACT findings, most don't. A national norm might be more consistent than locally developed tests.

Persistence and graduation rates depend on the ability of a student to succeed not only in higher level courses but in the wider world of business and industry. Implementation of state-wide assessments in writing and mathematics prior to being allowed to take course beyond 30 hours would assure that students would have the requisite skills to be successful in college and in the work place. Pass rates of these assessments could be included in the annual student assessment report as a means of monitoring progress and increasing public transparency and accountability. Such assessments could assist in regional and departmental accreditation.

Entry Level Assessment

Entry Level Assessment and Placement is defined in State Regents' policy as an "evaluation conducted prior to enrollment which assists institutional faculty and counselors in making decisions that give students the best possible chance of success in attaining academic goals".

Each institution uses ACT subscores to provide a standard for measuring student readiness. Students scoring below the minimum level established by the State Regents in the four subject areas of science reasoning, mathematics, reading, and English are required to undergo additional testing to determine the level of readiness for college level work consistent with the institution's approved assessment plan, or successfully complete remedial/developmental course work in the subject area.

Institutions are required to report to the State Regents the methods, instruments, and cut-scores used for entry-level course placement, as well as the student success in both remedial and college-level courses. Instructional changes resulting from an analysis of entry-level assessment is also to be reported.

Several institutions use a combination of high school grade point averages, ACT subscores, and secondary test scores to determine course level placement. Minimum scores required for college level work are listed in tables with each institution. Some institutions adjust math cut-scores upward if the student's anticipated major field of study requires a higher level of mathematics skills.

The following listing by institution includes the testing instruments used for determining course placement, the subject area scores necessary for enrollment in college-level courses, and actions taken as a result of tracking student performance in their first college-level course. While a few of the tests were developed locally, the majority were obtained from testing companies. The COMPASS and ASSET instruments are produced by ACT; Accuplacer, CPT, and Writeplacer are products of The College Board. ASSET is a pencil-and-paper version of COMPASS, a computer-based format. Accuplacer and CPT are the same.

University of Oklahoma (OU)

Placement instruments: COMPASS.

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	81+
English	85+
Algebra	60+
College Algebra	45+

An annual analysis compares student success rates in course work with their achieved cut scores. In consultation with appropriate faculty, adjustments are made to cut scores, GPA levels, and/or other appropriate assessment criteria. The results of the analysis are made available to the English and math departments to help evaluate their curriculum, the number of classes needed, and instructional techniques.

Oklahoma State University (OSU)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	71+
English	56+
Algebra	54+

Annual trends in grades, drops, withdraw, and failure rates in common freshman courses are monitored each semester. Results of this tracking are shared with the Directors of Student Academic Services and the Instruction Council. The offices of University Assessment and Testing, and Institutional Research and Information Management evaluate the entry-level assessment and track student success in remedial and college-level courses.

University of Central Oklahoma (UCO)

Placement instruments: CPT

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Comprehension	75+
Sentence Skills	77+
Elementary Algebra	75+

Admission Officers and the Coordinator for Rose State College track student progression through the remedial course. Rose State College offers the remedial courses on the UCO campus and reports completion rates each year.

The University has formed a student retention committee composed of members from Student Affairs and Academic Affairs. The agenda for the committee is being defined.

East Central University (ECU)

Placement instruments: COMPASS for reading, writing, and math; Integrated Process Skills Test II (IPST II) for science

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	77+
Writing	42+
Algebra	29+
Science	18+

No instructional changes are currently planned.

Northeastern State University (NSU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	75+
English	79+
Mathematics	75+
WritePlacer	8+

Student progress is tracked through the First Year Experience/Enrollment Services and the Office of Academic Affairs. Cut-scores will be continually reviewed for appropriate placement. First Year Experience/Enrollment Services has taken over the tutoring aspect of the freshman experience and has increased this service dramatically.

The analysis of zero level math and English remains fairly consistent from year to year. NSU feels that the effectiveness in placement decisions is solid and that correct pass rates reflect these decisions. Cut scores have changed very little in the past several years.

Mathematics revised the two remedial courses and are now using different text/materials as a result of recent data and student performance. Both English and mathematics faculty teaching zero level classes have made adjustments and are using a common syllabus. In mathematics, fewer topics are covered in each class, but each topic is covered in more depth.

The English faculty have changed textbooks and continue to utilize a multi-station writing laboratory for those in all zero level and beginning English course work. A new writing laboratory director is now in place and the computers in the writing lab have been upgraded in number and quality.

Northwestern Oklahoma State University (NWOSU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer for reading, writing and math; combination of reading and arithmetic scores for science

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	75+
Sentence Skills	87+
Elementary Algebra	75+
Science	
Reading	75+
Arithmetic	55+

As a result of several studies involving tracking, retention, developmental education, and, the success rates in credit bearing courses, the following decisions during the 2005-2006 academic year:

- 1) continue to monitor the effectiveness of computer-assisted instruction for remedial courses.
- 2) continue studying the effectiveness of a study skills class (Peak Performance) that was designed for all at-risk students, including developmental students on Academic Notice,

and implemented in the spring 2002 semester. Data from several semesters will be necessary to make more definitive conclusions in this regard. Data collection is on-going and a study will be undertaken when enough data is gathered to yield reliable results.

3) revise policy regarding retesting with Accuplacer system during the summer 2004.

4) explore options to address the problems of low retention rates among students admitted with a math deficiency.

Southeastern Oklahoma State University (SEOSU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer for math, English, and reading; Stanford Test of Academic Skills for science

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Comprehension	78+
Sentence Skills	87+
Elementary Algebra	44+
Science	20+

A number of factors were measured, including retention in both remedial and college level courses, course GPA comparisons, and student satisfaction. Several offices were responsible for tracking these factors and ensuring the integrity of the process. One of the offices, the Learning Center, which is responsible for entry-level testing, placement, and remediation, has implemented several measures to validate the success of their program. Comparisons were made in course GPA, overall GPA, and course pre-post test scores. To measure the effectiveness of remedial instruction, students were administered a pretest and posttest for each remedial course.

Another measure of program effectiveness was the comparison of course GPAs as developmental students matriculated into regular college courses. Course GPA in freshman level history courses (to which developmental reading is a prerequisite) continues to be a concern.

Southwestern Oklahoma State University (SWOSU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	75+
Sentence Skills	75+
Elementary Algebra	65+

Students entering Southwestern Fall 1994 through Fall 1999 were tracked as they completed remedial, developmental, and collegiate-level courses. Aggregate data for each group were compared to detect variances among the groups and with a control group of entering freshmen Fall 1993. A current study tracks the success of Fall 2001, Fall 2002, and Fall 2003 entering freshmen for up to six years in subsequent courses following remediation.

Student success in remedial courses is based on the assumption that students complete the courses and earn a satisfactory grade (C or better). The percentage of students successfully completing remedial courses in 2005-2006 has remained fairly consistent with previous years.

Student success in collegiate-level courses is determined by tracking student performance in general education courses common to all students. Comparisons with the fall 1993 cohort show that students who successfully completed remedial courses fared better in their collegiate-level courses than 1993 freshmen who had deficiencies (and no remediation).

Cameron University (CU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	78+
English	64+
Mathematics	65+

The Institutional Assessment Committee (IAC) will continue to coordinate information with the General Education Committee, Academic Departments, and Associate Vice President for Enrollment Management to improve stud success and retention through the Entry Level courses.

Pre-college courses are being included in the comprehensive review of student retention issues. Each academic discipline is looking at the issues of academic support needed for their students to assure improved learning.

This year the IAC and the General Education Committee (GEC) renegotiated the role of each committee and recommended changes to assignments and responsibilities of each committee. After review and approval of the Vice President Academic Affairs, the changes were implemented. The IAC recommends assessment methods for entry and mid level general education and reports assessment outcomes to the GEC for action.

Langston University (LU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer for English and math; Nelson-Denny Reading Test for reading

Subtest	Cut-Score
Nelson-Denny	12+
English (ACT)	20+
Algebra (ACT)	20+

There have been moderate improvements in Reading, Mathematics, and English when compared to 2004-2005. Over the past five years, the trend line reflects only moderate improvements.

Student progress is tracked by instructors at least four times each semester. Feedback is shared with each student. Academic counseling, tutoring support, and other academic services are available for students who are not performing up to standard.

Collectively, cut-score evaluations and analyses of entry-level basic skills scores have resulted in relatively few changes to the entry-level assessment process. During 2005-2006, the secondary entry-level assessment instruments were administered in one session of 100 students twice daily during the assessment period. The result will be compared to Fall 2006 results.

University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma (USAO)

Placement instruments: COMPASS for math and English; LXR for science; reading skills are assessed with English

Subtest	Cut-Score
Writing	75+
Pre-Algebra	56+
Algebra	36+
LXR	24+

Student success in remediation courses, as well as college-level courses, is compared annually to align cut-cores and measure the effectiveness of remediation instruction.

A more in depth analysis of these students is planned for next year. There is no plan to make a change in the placement process at this time.

Oklahoma Panhandle State University (OPSU)

Placement instruments: Accuplacer for English, reading, and math

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	70+
English	87+
Algebra	73+

Students in remedial classes were tracked by whether the deficiencies were completed by the end of the summer 2005 term.

No changes are scheduled at this point in time.

The university will continue and expand its services in the areas of special tutoring, counseling, and personal attention to all the students.

Rogers State University (RSU)

Placement instruments: COMPASS for math, English, and reading; Stanford Test of Academic Skills in Science for science

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	82+
English	82+
Algebra	35+
Science	55+

Institutional Research, Assessment, and Planning staff tracked student progress in all developmental courses by earned letter grade. Subsequently, faculty in the Developmental Studies Program tracked student progress in four college-level courses by letter grade and retention.

No changes to existing cut-scores were made during the 2005-2006 academic year.

RSU Institutional Research, Planning and Management is currently redesigning the tracking methods of student success in both developmental courses and college-level courses. Mathematics faculty is revising curricula in order to improve success. Sample sizes will be increased in order to improve validity.

Additionally, the RSU faculty is actively participating in the College Algebra course Redesign Project.

Connors State College (CSC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS and ASSET; Accuplacer; combination of reading, writing, and math for science

Subtest	Cut-Score	Subtest	Cut-Score	Subtest	Cut-Score
COMPASS		Accuplacer		ASSET	
Reading	76+	Reading	80+	Reading	42+
Writing	75+	Writing	80+	Writing	45+
Algebra	50+	Elementary Algebra	73+	Algebra	49+
Pre-Algebra	66+	Science		Science	
College Algebra	50+	Reading	80+	Reading	42+
Science		Elementary Algebra	73+	Writing	45+
Reading	76+			Algebra	49+
Writing	75+				
Pre-Algebra	51+				
Algebra	41+				

Success rates of students in developmental courses and collegiate level course were calculated. Students were tracked from developmental class to developmental class within subject areas.

No changes were made to the cut scores; they follow the recommended ranges from the test developers.

The developmental math classes were restructured in 2005-06. The new design provided a combination of lab-based and theory instruction, with more emphasis on lab. Students and advisors resisted the change and this contributed to the low success rates (withdrawals were considered to be unsuccessful). Math faculty met with advisors to answer questions and provide a detailed explanation of the new design, as well as explain reasons behind its implementation. An evaluation of the Fall 2006 grades at mid-term indicated 49% of Basic Math students, 59% of Elementary Algebra students, and 30% of Intermediate Algebra students had a grade greater than or equal to 70. If this trend is indicative of final grades, the Basic Math and Elementary Algebra students will be back on target, but the Intermediate Algebra curriculum will require additional analysis and possible curriculum changes.

Eastern Oklahoma State College (EOSC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	72+
English	62+
Math	49+

Students are tracked from developmental courses into college-level courses.

Students who pass Eastern’s college developmental math classes or developmental English/reading classes go on to pass regular college math and English classes with a 90% rate (grades above a C).

A third developmental math class was added this year to serve students who were performing at a rate above “basic” developmental math but not quite ready for “intermediate” developmental math. Therefore the “basic/intermediate” level of developmental math was created.

It was determined that the placement, the cut scores, and other findings of entry-level assessment work well and are properly administered and analyzed.

Murray State College (MSC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS and ASSET

Subtest	Cut-Score	Subtest	Cut-Score
ASSET		COMPASS	
Reading Skills	36+	Reading Skills	71+
Writing Skills	36+	Writing Skills	24+
Numerical Skills	56+	Numerical Skills	101+
General Algebra	39+	General Algebra	40+

Student progress was tracked in particular by the individual student’s academic advisor and in general by the Counseling Center. At the end of the semester, each academic advisor received a grade report for his/her advisees that indicated student success or lack of success for both remedial and college-level courses. The academic advisor and the student then made any necessary changes to the student’s class schedule for the following semesters.

While a higher success rate would certainly be desirable, the placement decisions were effective in that the decisions were objectively based on the student test scores in relation to the cut scores. The ranges of cut scores have been reviewed annually since secondary assessment began at MSC.

Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College (NEOAM)

Placement instruments: CPT

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Comprehension	78+
Sentence Skills	78+
Elementary Algebra	73+

Student progress is monitored to ensure that the students are enrolling in the appropriate remedial and college-level courses. Each semester, the Testing Center coordinator receives a report that identifies students who have not enrolled properly in the remedial courses and notifies the students' advisors. Beginning spring of 2004, the College implemented a feature of the computerized Student Information System that blocks students from enrolling in college-level courses if the student has not met the proficiency requirement.

Students are tracked through the following courses:

- Basic Composition through Freshman Composition I
- Remedial math through college-level math
- Reading through core college courses such as history, government, and science
- Fundamentals of science through college-level science

No changes were made based upon the findings.

Northern Oklahoma College (NOC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	81+
Writing	75+
Math	73+
Science	
Reading	81+
Math	19+

The Office of Institutional Research and Assessment provides data to the Executive Council and the Division of Developmental Studies regarding completion rates of students enrolled in remedial coursework. Northern students' outcomes for the Developmental Studies program are that all students enrolled in remedial courses will complete the developmental courses at a 70% minimum competency rate or better. Students should progress through their college 1000-2000 level courses with a completion rate equal to students not required to enroll in remedial and/or developmental courses.

Northern continues to monitor student success as it relates to their college placement scores. The Institutional Assessment Committee periodically reviews results of those studies with the Assessment Officer to determine if changes in cut-off scores are necessary. Upon reviewing the *ACT* Concordance Table, the Assessment Committee recommended a change in cut scores to more accurately reflect the equivalency between the *COMPASS* and *ACT* sub score.

Tulsa Community College (TCC)

Placement instruments: CPT

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Skills	80+
Writing Skills	80+
College Level Math	41+

Student cohorts from each of the placement categories are tracked to validate cutscores and to measure student success. For instance, students testing in mathematics are grouped by test scores into course-level cohorts, and then the groups are tracked to obtain Page 3 of 12 overall measures of persistence and attainment. Reading and English cohorts are tracked as well.

The Entry Level Assessment Subcommittee has completed its long-term effort to validate TCC's placement program in mathematics, reading, and writing. Notable findings from the previous 9 years of research include:

- Our placement program in mathematics is sound. We have adjusted both the tests and the cut scores we use to place students in developmental math and college algebra, and have replicated our results over several years.
- Our placement instrument and cut score used to determine college-level reading skill is sound, and our enrollment practice has been adjusted to require appropriate reading development for every courses listed in TCC's general education requirements. (Students over age 21 may still waive development after appropriate advisement.)

We have not yet found a valid instrument or cut score for placement in developmental reading. Research conducted by the Office of Institutional Research found that neither the Nelson-Denny test nor the CPT exam could predict student success in developmental reading; in other words, placement based on these exams made no difference in student success in either developmental Reading I or Reading II. The Entry Level Assessment Subcommittee has communicated this information to the academic divisions for their incorporation into the decision-making process during the next developmental studies discipline self-study.

- Our placement instrument and cut score for Freshman Composition is adequate but may not identify all the relevant student needs for writing development. The Entry Level Assessment Subcommittee has communicated this information to the academic divisions for use in decision-making during their developmental studies discipline self-study.

Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City (OSU-OKC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Skills	83+
Writing Skills	82+
Algebra	76+

Enrollment of first-time, full-time students are tracked in both developmental and regular college courses. The success rate for the developmental courses and the retention rate for all first-time,

full-time students are key indicators that are used in the continuous assessment of the university's programs. A "Matriculation Study" was initiated during the 2004-05 to ensure that developmental students were as successful as possible at OSU-Oklahoma City. The study had two goals: the first, to match entry and exit objectives in each development course with the instruments used to place students in that course and to ensure that those objectives were also well matched to adjacent courses in that developmental sequence; and the second, to provide feedback to development studies faculty about how accurately students were placed in their courses and how well students learned specific skills in a particular course.

The Matriculation Study and the focus on improving student success in developmental courses also led to the decision to establish a department of Developmental Studies and to hire a department head for that department. It is anticipated that the Matriculation Study and the establishment of a Development Studies department will result in more accurate placement of students in the developmental program and greater success for those students.

Oklahoma State University Technical Branch – Okmulgee (OSUTB-OKM)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Comprehension	81+
Writing Skills	74+
Algebra	68+
College Algebra	41+
Science	
College Algebra/Reading combined	123+
Algebra/Reading combined	149+

In addition to midterm grades, OSUTB-OKM utilizes the Early Alert System, an electronic intervention system used by faculty to alert the system when a student is in danger of failing or not attending classes. Arts & Sciences faculty sends an electronic notice to a student's advisor in his or her technical program of study. The advisor sets up an appointment with the student to discuss possible solutions, and then refers that student to appropriate academic support services available on the campus. In this way, students in college-level course work are enabled to stay on track and receive academic or social interventions as needed.

Members of the Assessment Committee working in conjunction with the Arts & Sciences division and the College Readiness Center (CRC) reviewed and revised the cut scores for entry level assessment in August 2005. The result was a more rigorous proficiency mark for Intermediate and College Algebra.

The CRC continued to monitor COMPASS cut scores for appropriate placement in math and English courses. Results from the 2005-2006 academic year provided the basis for revisions instituted beginning August 2006. Further, new formats for teaching Beginning Algebra and Intermediate Algebra were investigated. Faculty remains responsive to student needs based upon empirical results and student feedback in the CRC. OSUTB-OKM continues its commitment to enroll students earlier and providing them with greater access to readiness programs prior to the start of the semester.

Western Oklahoma State College (WOSC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	80+
Writing	70+
Algebra	50+

Students are tracked from developmental courses and on through specific college level courses using success rates, grade point averages, grade distribution, and comparison of developmental students versus non-developmental students.

A study was undertaken to determine how many of Western's graduates actually took developmental courses and how well they succeeded. All *first-time full-time* entering students who graduated during the Fall 2005-Summer 2006 school year were tracked.

The PASSKEY software program is being used for students who place in English Fundamentals and Developmental Reading III. One of the main features of this software is that it allows instructors in the developmental courses to administer diagnostic tests to better determine each student's strengths and weaknesses. In addition, all these scores can be linked to the COMPASS scoring.

ACADEMIC SYSTEMS software is being used for developmental students in Basic Math and Beginning Algebra. A key feature of this software is that it will allow each student to work at their own pace to complete the course. This may enable the student to progress through the developmental math courses at a pace consistent with their abilities. In addition to the computer based math courses, traditional classroom lecture courses are available for those students preferring this method of instruction.

Redlands Community College (RCC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS and ASSET

Subtest	Cut-Score	Subtest	Cut-Score
ASSET		COMPASS	
Reading Skills	40+	Reading Skills	80+
Writing Skills	37+	Writing Skills	59+
Intermediate Algebra	36+	Algebra	57+

Entry-level assessment has driven several new innovations in mathematics instruction, particularly regarding the scheduling and sequencing of course offerings to students. Self-paced math modules are being utilized whereby students can proceed through both the developmental and college-level mathematics sequences. The "Fast Forward" program of providing students with the means to complete up to two developmental math courses per semester. Developmental math offerings are subjected to an ongoing analysis to meet the needs of our students.

Carl Albert State College (CASC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	81+
Writing	75+
Pre-Algebra	66+
Algebra	42+
Science	
Reading	81+
Algebra	42+

Results from entry-level assessment are utilized during advisement and enrollment so that students may be given the best chance to succeed during their collegiate experience. Finally, results from entry-level assessment are used to evaluate and recommend any changes to the orientation class, the developmental education curriculum, and the registration and advisement process.

Based on its high levels of persistence for first-time full-time freshmen as demonstrated by OSRHE data, CASC believes that its entry-level assessment has been effective in meeting the needs of students through placement and advisement.

Seminole State College (SSC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS and ASSET for English, reading, and math; Nelson-Denny for reading; Toledo Chemistry Test and a locally developed test for science.

Subtest	Cut-Score	Subtest	Cut-Score
COMPASS		ASSET	
Reading	71+	English	40+
English	74+	Intermediate Algebra	34+
Algebra	66+	Nelson-Denny	10.0
SSC Transitional Science Test	25+	Toledo Chemistry Test	40+

For several years, SSC has collected data in all non-credit courses and in selected credit courses to determine the degree of success experienced by students in these courses. Data is collected for both the fall and spring semesters with success defined as earning a grade of “C” or better.

Information is sought from a variety of sources such as student opinion surveys, graduate opinion surveys, matriculation reports from Oklahoma four-year colleges, and employer satisfaction surveys. One of the primary sources of information comes from course-embedded assessment. Course-embedded reports provide data to track success in all courses, but especially in those taught for credit.

Building on a five-year Title III grant, the College continues to develop new classes along with innovative scheduling such as internet-based courses and 8-week accelerated courses. Instructors are incorporating more computer-assisted instruction and multimedia instruction in their core courses.

Rose State College (RSC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading	81+
Writing Skills	74+
Algebra	76+
College Algebra	51+

At the conclusion of each grading term, reports, prepared by the College's Institutional Research Office, identify students who have been unsuccessful in developmental courses. Those students are contacted by academic advisors who provide counseling which may include retesting or guidance into appropriate developmental classes.

Based on statistical work it was determined that current range and placement scores were appropriate. ANOVA testing also confirmed that current placement score ranges correlate with student success.

A grading analysis for each course including developmental courses is completed for academic departments. This data, coupled with ongoing analysis of placement score ranges, provides the institution with information to guide decision-making. Based on findings, departments may request a review of cut-scores for course placement.

As a result of math faculty recommendations, the Placement and Testing Committee initiated a branching range for math assessment that has already yielded significant course placement adjustments in developmental math.

During 2006, the College completed a statistical analysis of overall COMPASS "cut-scores" correlated to outcomes in remedial courses. The study emphasized: (a) an analysis of the impact of different placement ranges on student success; and, (b) a determination of whether current scores are valid and reliable.

A validity study of course outcomes from entry-level placement was conducted in 2005. The results of the study are as follows. Extensive work on the Basic Communications cutoff/placement scores was completed which validated that the scores were appropriately identified. At a minimum, the College has confirmed the utility of cutoff/placement scores.

From the adaptive math student results of pre-algebra routing, math faculty recommended initiating a branching range for math assessment that has yielded significant course placement adjustments in developmental math which are more consistent with concepts taught in each of those courses.

The *Entering Student Descriptive Report* provides information related to student placement in initial courses and the number of students placing in those courses. This information is utilized by academic divisions as a tool for student course scheduling. The validity study affirmed that no changes were warranted in regard to the current cut-off scores. The adaptive math study indicated the need for significant changes in math placement. Conclusive results will be forthcoming after the semester and follow-up study have been conducted.

Oklahoma City Community College (OCCC)

Placement instruments: COMPASS for reading, writing, and math; Riverside Biology and Chemistry tests for science

Subtest	Cut-Score
Reading Comprehension	80+
Writing	81+
Math	56+
Science	
Biological Concepts	34+
Chemistry Principles	30+

Concern over the low mathematics proficiency initiated a complete review of the mathematics placement instrument and placement rules. A revision of placement rules for mathematics courses occurred through consultation with ACT. Evaluation of results is pending the end of Fall 2006 classes.

A comparison of the Accuplacer CPT to the ACT COMPASS was made during the year. The option of switching to CPT was left as viable, but COMPASS was retained for the time being. How the Mathematics Department organizes and presents mathematics material was addressed and revised. That will remain in the domain of the Mathematics Department for analysis. Other supplemental, diagnostic instruments (e.g. A+dvancer) were taken under advisement to assist the assessment/placement process.

General Education Assessment

University of Oklahoma

Student writing skills were evaluated through a series of projects in several disciplines. Undergraduate writing samples from Geography, Anthropology and English were analyzed. The projects were designed to develop and implement discipline-specific writing classes and workshops to train graduate teaching assistants. A pilot study involving a sample of English 1213 students continues to be refined and will be reported on in the future.

Oklahoma State University

The effectiveness and learning outcomes of the general education program were evaluated using institutional portfolios, university-wide surveys, and a general education course content database. Each portfolio, based on a learner goal, includes students' work from course assignments collected throughout the undergraduate curriculum. In 2005-06, institutional portfolios were used to evaluate students' written communication skills and critical thinking skills as well as skills and attitudes about diversity. Among the university-wide surveys employed were the National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) and OSU Alumni Surveys used mainly to corroborate evidence collected from the portfolio process. The web-based General Education Course Database was used to evaluate how well each general education course was aligned with expected learning outcomes for the general education program.

OSU's General Education Assessment program is aimed at holistically evaluating student achievement of the expected learning outcomes for general education. Institutional portfolios essentially give a 'snapshot' of students' competencies at the time the portfolio is assembled, and university-wide surveys provide an overview of student achievement of general education outcomes. Because individual student information is not captured and recorded in either of these methods, the processes do not permit tracking students into future semesters. However, because portfolios are assembled each year, the process does allow us to detect changes in student general education competencies over time.

Information from the General Education Assessment Program is shared annually with the faculty who serve on the Assessment Council, Instruction Council, Faculty Council, and the General Education Advisory Council. The latter group is charged with the development and review of the general education curriculum; they consider general education assessment information in their review and approval of general education courses and in developing the criteria for those courses.

The General Education Assessment Committee plans to evaluate the effect of the new writing requirements, but recognizes that any changes in writing scores due to this curriculum change may not be identified in assessment results for 2-3 years. The committee will continue the development of institutional portfolios to assess students' general education outcomes in 2006-2007.

University of Central Oklahoma

UCO used a mix of surveys, focus groups, pre-/post-tests, embedded test questions, and writing samples to measure how well students are meeting the university's general education goals. Those goals include understanding diversity, communication and information management skills, analytical thinking, humanities, and ethics.

The English Department offers a cornerstone course as an introduction course to the major. Plans are to use this course as an avenue to look at English major's completion of general education curriculum.

East Central University

Assessment of general education centered on the Literacy Understanding Skills of written and oral communication, reading, computer literacy, critical thinking, library skills, and mathematics. Among the assessment tools used were College Basic Academic Subjects Exam (CBASE); Faculty Focus Groups; Student Focus Groups; ACT Alumni Surveys (ACTAS); East Central University Folio of Student Work in General Education; the University Assessment Committee; and the General Education Capstone Course (UNIV 3001).

Northeastern State University

The College BASE or CBASE was employed as the primary assessment instrument for general education. Supplemental instruments were developed for humanities, speech and health/nutrition, areas not assessed by CBASE.

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

The College BASE was used to assess the General Education Program. Scores are provided in each of four subject areas—social studies, science, math, and English—as well as, interpretive, strategic, and adaptive reasoning plus a composite score for the entire test.

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Ten goals were identified for the general education program. They are as follows: communication, computer literacy, mathematical or quantitative reasoning, science reasoning, critical thinking, social and political institutions, wellness, humanities, fine arts, and ethics and values. In addition to course-embedded assessment of learning outcomes, two other measures were used: CAAP subtests to evaluate student performance and the ACT College Outcomes Survey to evaluate the college experience.

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

The general education program was evaluated through curriculum-embedded assessments and standardized exams. Special quizzes, exams, reports, papers, presentations, and project were administered as a part of the curriculum to all of the students.

Cameron University

CAAP writing skills essay form, CAAP mathematics skills test, and CAAP critical thinking examinations were used to assess students in general education. Measurements for mathematics were taken in the College Algebra course, writing skills in the English Composition II course, and speaking skills in the Speech course. Critical thinking skills were measured in general education courses where faculty members volunteered to participate.

Langston University

College Board placement tests were used to measure student achievement for English and Algebra skills, and the Nelson-Denny Reading Test to measure reading levels. The same instruments are used for college readiness and general education assessment.

University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma

All rising juniors took the CAAP test to determine progress in the areas of math, science, English, reading, and critical thinking.

Oklahoma Panhandle State University

The Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET) was used to assess general education performance. The Students Needs Survey was used to determine what academic skills individual students felt they needed.

Rogers State University

General education assessment was course- or program-embedded. Most instruments are faculty-developed and are administered during class periods. Students enrolled in Composition I, General Cellular Biology, Art Appreciation, College Algebra, and American Federal Government are required to participate in the testing. The measures are designed to measure the nine general education outcomes as identified by RSU faculty

Connors State College

One of the general education core objectives, critical thinking skills, was assessed utilizing embedded assessment techniques within classes. Writing, reading, mathematics, and science skills were assessed utilizing ACT CAAP.

Eastern Oklahoma State College

Every faculty member is required to specify how each of the assessment activities were linked to the college's general education student learning outcomes. Among the instruments used were journals, course-embedded questions, and pre- and post-test. The CAAP test was also given on a voluntary basis. English-as-a-Second-Language (ESL) students were required to take the reading and English portions of the COMPASS test. Some classes used the Nelson-Denny reading test.

Murray State College

The CAAP test is used to measure reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking.

Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College

All students applying for graduation were asked to take the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (Academic Profile Test).

Northern Oklahoma College

The CAAP is used to measure outcomes in reading, writing, mathematics and critical thinking. Students' test scores were compared to the national norms for two-year public institutions.

Tulsa Community College

The assessment process centers around one of the institution's general education goals each year on a rotating basis. During the 2005-06 academic year, faculty assessed critical thinking. The actual assessment activities vary widely because individual faculty members choose activities that fit the context of their courses. Faculty member complete an Internet-based assessment reporting instrument one time per year during the fall semester describing how the goal applies to any course they teach. Faculty members use the online assessment tool to describe one specific activity used to determine if their students have demonstrated the current goal. They also identify the criteria for performance measurement, the quantity of students assessed, and the quantity of students determined to successfully perform the goal assessed.

Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City

General education assessment is currently under revision.

The Assessment Committee agreed that baseline information was needed regarding the extent to which specific skills had already been incorporated into the program curricula. The skill areas of interest were categorized into four areas: reading, writing, mathematics and critical thinking.

Oklahoma State University Technical Branch – Okmulgee

General education competency assessment was developed by faculty specifically for each Program Objective. Five Core Objectives common to all programs of study, based on reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, ethics, diversity, and technical competencies grew from this process. All program objectives were developed from division and program missions and visions, which are directly linked to the college and system missions and visions. General education assessments were developed and administered by Arts & Sciences faculty college-wide and by faculty within each program of study as deemed appropriate.

Western Oklahoma State College

The CAAP is used to measure general education achievement. The CAAP report indicates whether students have made progress since entering the institution. Students who participated in the CAAP testing were tested in one or more of the following areas: Writing Skills, Mathematics, Reading, and Critical Thinking.

Redlands Community College

The Assessment Through Writing pilot study was initially administered during the 2001-2002 academic year for general education assessment at RCC. It was been continued through 2005-2006. Students wrote an essay of their choice from a list of prepared topics. Topics were drawn from the following areas: employment after graduation, problem solving, leadership, and social problems.

Carl Albert State College

CASC used the CAAP, licensure examinations, post transfer GPA comparison data, ACT Alumni Survey, program review/accreditation, and capstone courses that included a variety of faculty-selected tests and surveys to measure student achievement.

Seminole State College

A combination of the Measure of Academic Proficiency and Progress (Academic Profile Test), course-embedded assessment, and grades from selected General Education Courses was used to determine student general education achievement.

Rose State College

All classes for critical thinking, effective communication, technology proficiency, and quantitative literacy, have been assessed in rotation since fall 2002. In fall 2005, the area assessed was technology proficiency. Students were required to demonstrate proficiency based on the context-specific criteria of the individual professors.

Oklahoma City Community College

The Academic Profile Test was used to address several of the general education program competencies specifically critical thinking, reading, writing, mathematics, humanities, social sciences, and natural sciences.

Program Outcomes Assessment

Listed below are the methods and tools used by each institutions to assess program outcomes.

University of Oklahoma

Grade point averages in certain courses, exit interviews, capstone courses, surveys, research papers, graduate school application success, projects, employment rates, external evaluators, licensing and certification exams, course evaluations, and self-studies

Oklahoma State University

Grade point averages in certain courses, exit interviews, surveys, projects, external evaluators, adjudicated events, competitions, and proficiency tests

University of Central Oklahoma

Exit interviews, capstone courses, surveys, research papers, portfolios, graduate school application success, projects, licensing and certification exams, course evaluations, focus groups and self-studies

East Central University

Grade point averages in certain courses, exit interviews, comprehensive exams, capstone courses, surveys, research papers, portfolios, projects, external evaluators, licensing and certification exams, course evaluations, focus groups, and self-studies

Northeastern State University

National standard tests in addition to the Oklahoma Subject Area Test

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Portfolio review, field and area tests, licensing exams, course embedded assessment, and exit interviews

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

External evaluators, certification exams, surveys, national standard tests, employment rates, research papers, portfolios, exit exams, exit interviews, competitions, pre-and post- testing

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Portfolio review, subject area tests, national standard tests, licensing exams, exit interviews, presentations, performance assessments, value added exams, and internships

Cameron University

Locally developed and tested exams, standardized exams, capstone courses, surveys, portfolio reviews, exit interviews, benchmarking, and employer perceptions

Langston University

Licensure and certification exams, national standard tests, internships, departmental exams, and leadership skills inventory

University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma

National standard tests, licensure and certification exams, portfolios, adjudicated presentations, and locally developed tests

Oklahoma Panhandle State University

Employment rates, graduate school admission rates, national standard tests, capstone courses, subject area tests, writing samples, surveys, adjudicated presentations, licensure and certification exams, and projects

Rogers State University

Licensure and certification exams, employment rates, and general education test

Connors State College

CAAP test

Eastern Oklahoma State College

CAAP, licensure exams, advisory committee and transfer reports, locally-developed exams, writing projects, course-embedded questions, and post-tests

Murray State College

Locally-designed tests, and licensure exams

Northeastern Oklahoma A&M College

Capstone courses, licensure and certification exams, pre- and post-tests, research papers, surveys, and presentations

Northern Oklahoma College

CAAP test

Tulsa Community College

Course-embedded assessment, survey, and course/instructor evaluations

Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City

Practicum evaluations, post-tests, capstone courses, projects, surveys, advisory board evaluations, completion rates, licensure and certification exams, job placement rates, written exams, portfolio reviews, supervisor feedback, and outside expert assessors

Oklahoma State University Technical Branch – Okmulgee

Research papers, licensure and certification exams, portfolio reviews, and capstone courses

Western Oklahoma State College

Course-embedded, pre- and post-testing, portfolios, and juried performances

Redlands Community College

Licensure and certification exams, capstone courses, advisory committees, student evaluations, employer feedback, surveys, workplace observations, and assigned reports

Carl Albert State College

Capstone courses, and licensure exams

Seminole State College

ACT COMPASS, capstone courses, surveys, licensure and certification exams, and clinical grades

Rose State College

College transfer rates

Oklahoma City Community College

Portfolio reviews, graded presentations, and licensure and certification exams

Student Satisfaction Assessment

University of Oklahoma

ACT Student Opinion Survey, Complete Withdrawal Information Survey

Oklahoma State University

Undergraduate Program Alumni Survey, Graduate Program Alumni Survey, Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey

University of Central Oklahoma

National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE), Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP), graduating student survey

East Central University

ACT Alumni Survey, ACT Survey of Student Opinions

Northeastern State University

Senior survey

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Locally developed student opinion survey, alumni survey

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Academic advising and outreach center, college outcome survey, student satisfaction survey, graduate survey, junior survey, library survey

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Course/Instructor evaluations, student satisfaction survey, senior survey, graduate degree survey

Cameron University

ACT College Outcomes Survey

Langston University

Student perception survey

University of Science and Arts of Oklahoma

NSSE, senior survey

Oklahoma Panhandle State University

Student satisfaction survey, graduation survey

Rogers State College

Student Opinion Survey, Course Evaluation, Withdrawal Questionnaire, eCollege Student Course Evaluation

Connors State College

ACT Faces of the Future, graduates survey, student housing survey, library survey

Eastern Oklahoma State College

ACT Student Opinion Survey, Library Media Survey, exit/graduation survey, instructor evaluations

Murray State College

Student Satisfaction Questionnaire,

Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College

Student Satisfaction Survey

Northern Oklahoma College

ACT Faces of the Future, Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE)

Tulsa Community College

Exit questionnaires, focus groups with current students, prospective students and parents, on-campus random assessment

Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City

ACT Student Opinion Survey, graduate survey, instructional evaluations

Oklahoma State University Technical Branch- Okmulgee

Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory

Western Oklahoma State College

Entering student survey, continuing student survey, college outcomes survey

Redlands Community College

CCSSE

Carl Albert State College

ACT Student Opinion Survey, ACT Alumni Survey for Two-Year Colleges

Seminole Community College

ACT Faces of the Future Survey, Graduate Opinion Survey, feedback on classroom instruction

Rose State College

ACT Student Satisfaction Survey

Oklahoma City Community College

ACT Student Opinion Survey, Graduate Survey

Graduate Student Assessment

University of Oklahoma

Faculty evaluation, survey, graduate exam, exit interviews, job placement

Oklahoma State University

Qualifying Exams, comprehensive exams, research activity, theses, dissertation, creative component papers, projects, presentations, and defenses.

University of Central Oklahoma

Mixed with outcome assessment.

East Central University

Oklahoma Subject Area Test (OSAT), surveys, portfolio reviews, administrator evaluations, comprehensive exam, certification exams, research, oral reports and class presentations, graduate assessment exam, practicum evaluation.

Northeastern State University

National examinations, exit interviews, certification exams, teacher-developed instruments, portfolio reviews.

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Survey

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Surveys, intern evaluation, benchmarking with peer institutions, capstone course, employment rates, writing samples, subject area tests, portfolio review, research paper

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Exams, portfolio, capstone courses, adjudicated presentations

Cameron University

Portfolio reviews, performance ratings, locally developed and tested exams, exit interviews, employer perceptions

Langston

Portfolio reviews, comprehensive exams, student self-assessment

Licensure and Certification

An important measure of both student achievement and program effectiveness and appropriateness is the professional exam for licensure or certification. This is the first year institutions were asked to provide the number of students taking such exams and the number of them passing. Some institutions report that certain licensing agencies cited privacy concerns as the reason for not releasing student data back to the institution. Also, many students do not attempt licensing or certification exams until after graduation. Future assessment reports should have more complete information.

Program and Exam	Number of Students Tested	Number of Students Passing
-------------------------	--	---

University of Oklahoma

No licensure or certification data were reported.

Oklahoma State University

Chemistry (ACS Accreditation)	6	
Teacher Certification		
Construction Management (AC Certification)	28	19
Hotel & Restaurant Administration (NRAPMD National Certification)	80	
Nutritional Sciences (CDR National Registration Exam)	87	
Mechanical Engineering (FE)	52	44
Mechanical Engineering (PE)	5	3
Civil Engineering (FE)	32	21
Civil Engineering (PE)	20	9
Chemical Engineering (PE)	4	3

University of Central Oklahoma

UCO reported that no licensure or certification results were available.

East Central University

Elementary Education (OSAT)	82	59
Early Childhood Education (OSAT)	40	35
Nursing (NCLEX)	37	33
H.P.E.R Education (OSAT)	27	24
Special Education (OSAT)	27	27
English Teacher Certification (OSAT)	9	7
History Teacher Certification (OSAT)	9	5
Criminal Justice (CLEET)	8	8
Music Teacher Certification (OSAT)	7	7
Art Teacher Certification (OSAT)	4	4

Northeastern State University

Education: Subject Area Test (OSAT)	991	719
Education: Professional Teaching Examination (OPTE)	433	399
Education: Oklahoma General Education Test (OGET)	255	176
MA Ed. School Counseling		19
MS Counseling Psychology		36

Northwestern Oklahoma State University

Nursing (Alva campus)	12	11
Nursing (Enid campus)	9	9
Nursing (Woodward campus)	2	1
Education	63	63
Health and Physical Education	10	8

Southeastern Oklahoma State University

Elementary Education	264	173
Physical Education	43	21
Reading Specialist	26	20
Principal Core	14	11
Special Education	10	7
Secondary Principal	10	4
Science Education – Biology	10	4
English Education	9	8
Elementary Principal	7	4
Counseling and Music Education	5	5

Southwestern Oklahoma State University

Master of Education in Educational Administration	74	54
Pharm. D.	83	79
Elementary Education	54	47
Nursing	30	27
HPER Education	15	15
Special Education	16	13
Technology	19	14
Occupational Therapy Assistant	11	10
Radiologic Technology	11	10
Physical Therapist Assistant	12	7

Cameron University

No licensure or certification data were reported.

Langston University

BS Nursing	52	48
BA in Education	18	16
Doctor of Physical Therapy	3	2

University of Science and Arts and Oklahoma		
BS in Elementary Education	14	14
Oklahoma Panhandle State University		
No licensure or certification data were reported.		
Rogers State University		
Nursing (AAS) NCLEX-RN	62	60
Connors State College		
Nursing	61	61
Child Development	24	24
Eastern Oklahoma State College		
Nursing (NCLEX)	57	
Murray State College		
Nursing	51	50
Veterinary Technology	4	6
Northeastern Oklahoma A & M College		
Associate Degree Nursing	33	33
Medical Laboratory Technician	9	9
Physical Therapist Assistant	12	9
Northern Oklahoma College		
Nursing Registered	67	60
Tulsa Community College		
Nursing	127	115
Patient Care Technician	11	11
Medical Laboratory Technology	6	4
Radiography	26	25
Medical Assistant	7	7
Health Information Technology	10	10
Physical Therapist Assistant	10	9
Respiratory Therapy	65	59
Legal Assistant	7	5
Dental Hygiene	13	13
Oklahoma State University – Oklahoma City		
Nursing (NCLEX)		89.42%
Oklahoma State University Technical Branch – Okmulgee		
National Council Licensure Examination	21	11
Watchmakers of Switzerland Training and Education Program	7	7
Environmental Protection Agency Certification Test	13	12

Western Oklahoma State College

Radiologic Technology	8	8
Nursing (RN)	62	59

Redlands Community College

No licensure or certification data were reported.

Carl Albert State College

Nursing	20	18
Physical Therapist Assistant	24	18
Radiologic	7	2

Seminole State College

Medical Laboratory Technology	11	11
Nursing	21	19

Rose State College

Nursing Science (AAS)	91	88
Dental Hygiene (AAS)	12	12
Clinical Laboratory Tech (AAS)	6	6
Radiologic Technology (AAS)	17	17
Respiratory Therapist (AAS)	20	20
Health Information Tech (AAS)	7	7
Court Reporting (AAS)	4	2
Accounting (AAS) (ACAT)	10	7

Oklahoma City Community College

Occupational Therapy Assistant	23	19
Paramedic	9	8
Nursing	137	120
Physical Therapy	16	14

Assessment Budgets

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) This is the first year that institutions were asked to supply assessment budget figures. An analysis of those budgets are planned for future assessment reports.

Number and Percent of Students Enrolled in Remediation by Institution

Institution	Number of Fall 2005 First-Time Freshmen	All Remedial		English		Math		Science		Reading	
		Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%
OU	3,291	360	10.94%	33	1.00%	339	10.30%	0	0.00%	36	1.09%
OSU	3,442	60	1.74%	8	0.23%	54	1.57%	4	0.12%	3	0.09%
Total											
Research	6,733	420	6.24%	41	0.61%	393	5.84%	4	0.06%	39	0.58%
UCO	2,107	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
ECU	639	222	34.74%	43	6.73%	202	31.61%	23	3.60%	24	3.76%
NSU	1,165	608	52.19%	294	25.24%	541	46.44%	1	0.09%	0	0.00%
NWOSU	302	149	49.34%	98	32.45%	122	40.40%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
SEOSU	628	243	38.69%	121	19.27%	118	18.79%	96	15.29%	94	14.97%
SWOSU	795	267	33.58%	116	14.59%	206	25.91%	0	0.00%	124	15.60%
CU	1,073	567	52.84%	381	35.51%	430	40.07%	0	0.00%	128	11.93%
LU	728	511	70.19%	142	19.51%	484	66.48%	144	19.78%	27	3.71%
USAO	280	66	23.57%	16	5.71%	60	21.43%	17	6.07%	0	0.00%
OPSU	213	111	52.11%	72	33.80%	87	40.85%	0	0.00%	38	17.84%
Total											
Regional	7,930	2,744	34.60%	1,283	16.18%	2,250	28.37%	281	3.54%	435	5.49%
CASC	915	280	30.60%	112	12.24%	263	28.74%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
CSC	613	430	70.15%	267	43.56%	387	63.13%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
EOSC	530	255	48.11%	130	24.53%	212	40.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
MSC	567	290	51.15%	111	19.58%	262	46.21%	1	0.18%	0	0.00%
NEOAMC	681	444	65.20%	275	40.38%	371	54.48%	195	28.63%	0	0.00%
NOC	1,366	810	59.30%	287	21.01%	762	55.78%	5	0.37%	145	10.61%
OCCC	3,498	1,817	51.94%	1,036	29.62%	1,507	43.08%	9	0.26%	29	0.83%
OSU-OKC	1046	605	57.84%	316	30.21%	518	49.52%	0	0.00%	199	19.02%
OSU-OKM	1,209	344	28.45%	194	16.05%	289	23.90%	20	1.65%	126	10.42%
RCC	576	233	40.45%	77	13.37%	208	36.11%	0	0.00%	63	10.94%
RSC	1,656	1,021	61.65%	422	25.48%	911	55.01%	8	0.48%	23	1.39%
RSU	913	463	50.71%	257	28.15%	396	43.37%	50	5.48%	133	14.57%
SSC	617	359	58.18%	202	32.74%	316	51.22%	18	2.92%	79	12.80%
SWOSU- SAYRE	116	57	49.14%	11	9.48%	51	43.97%	0	0.00%	28	24.14%
TCC	2,725	1,407	51.63%	644	23.63%	1,212	44.48%	0	0.00%	22	0.81%
WOSC	485	196	40.41%	85	17.53%	181	37.32%	0	0.00%	63	12.99%
Total											
Community	17,513	9,011	51.45%	4,426	25.27%	7,846	44.80%	306	1.75%	910	5.20%
State Total	32,176	12,175	37.84%	5,750	17.87%	10,489	32.60%	591	1.84%	1,384	4.30%

Source: Annual Student Remediation Report, February, 2007

Remediation rates for each institution are the result of several factors, among them are the age of the entering freshman, students for whom English is a second language, first-generation students, institution mission, and secondary test cutscores. It should be noted that Oklahoma State University (OSU) has most of their remedial courses taught by Northern Oklahoma College (NOC). The University of Central Oklahoma (UCO) has a similar arrangement with Rose State College (RSC) to teach all of their remedial courses. Remediation rates for NOC and RSC reflect those arrangements.

Secondary Test Cut-Scores by Subject and Institution

MATH

<p>CPT: Elementary Algebra NEOAMC 73+</p>	<p>ASSET: Numerical Skills MSC 56+</p>
<p>CPT: College Level Math TCC 41+</p>	<p>ASSET: Algebra CSC 49+</p>
<p>COMPASS: Math EOSC 49+ NOC 73+ OCCC 56+</p>	<p>ASSET: General Algebra MSC 39+</p>
<p>COMPASS: Numerical Skills MSC 101+</p>	<p>ASSET: Intermediate Algebra RCC 36+ SSC 34+</p>
<p>COMPASS: Pre-Algebra CSC 66+ CASC 66+</p>	<p>Accuplacer: Mathematics NSU 75+ CU 65+</p>
<p>COMPASS: General Algebra MSC 40+</p>	<p>Accuplacer: Elementary Algebra UCO 75+ NWOSU 75+ SEOSU 44+ SWOSU 65+ CSC 73+</p>
<p>COMPASS: Algebra OU 60+ OSU 54+ ECU 29+ USAO 36+ RSU 35+ CSC 50+ OSU-OKC 76+ OSUTB-OKM 68+ WOSC 50+ RCC 57+ CASC 42+ SSC 66+ RSC 76+</p>	<p>Accuplacer: Algebra LU 20+ OPSU 73+</p>
<p>COMPASS: College Algebra OU 45+ CSC 50+ OSUTB-OKM 41+ RSC 51+</p>	

ENGLISH**CPT: Sentence Skills**

UCO	77+
NEOAM	78+
TCC	80+

COMPASS: English

OU	85+
OSU	56+
ECU	42+
USAO	75+
RSU	82+
CSC	75+
EOSC	62+
MSC	24+
NOC	75+
OSU-OKC	82+
OSUTB-OKM	74+
WOSC	70+
RCC	59+
CASC	75+
SSC	74+
RSC	74+
OCCC	81+

ASSET: Writing Skills

CSC	80+
RCC	37+
SSC	40+

Accuplacer: Sentence Skills

NSU	79+
NWOSU	87+
SEOSU	87+
SWOSU	75+
CU	64+
LU	20+
OPSU	87+
CSC	45+
MSC	36+

READING**CPT: Reading Comprehension**

UCO	39+
NEOAM	78+
TCC	80+

COMPASS: Reading

OU	81+
OSU	71+
ECU	77+
RSU	82+
CSC	76+
EOSC	72+
MSC	71+
NOC	81+
OSU-OKC	83+
OSUTB-OKM	81+
WOSC	80+
RCC	80+
CASC	81+
SSC	71+
RSC	81+
OCCC	80+

ASSET: Reading Skills

CSC	42+
MSC	36+
RCC	40+

Accuplacer: Reading Comprehension

NSU	75+
NWOSU	75+
SEOSU	78+
SWOSU	75+
CU	78+
OPSU	70+
CSC	80+

Nelson-Denny:

LU	12+
SSC	10+

SCIENCE

Integrated Process Skills Test II

ECU 18+

Accuplacer

NWOSU	Reading	75+
	Arithmetic	55+
CSC	Reading	80+
	Elementary Algebra	73+

Stanford Test of Academic Skills for Science

SEOSU 18+

RSU 55+

Logic eXtension Resources (LXR)

USAO 24+

COMPASS

CSC	Reading	18+
	Writing	75+
	Pre-Algebra	51+
	Algebra	41+
NOC	Reading	81+
	Math	19+
OSUTB-OKM	College Algebra/Reading combined	123+
	Algebra/Reading combined	149+
CASC	Reading	81+
	Algebra	42+

ASSET

CSC	Reading	42+
	Writing	45+
	Algebra	49+

SSC Transitional Science Test (locally developed)

SSC 25+

Toledo Chemistry Test

SSC 40+

Riverside Biological Concepts

OCCC 34+

Riverside Chemistry Principles

OCCC 30+

INTENTIONALLY BLANK

APPENDIX

INTENTIONALLY BLANK

Policy On Assessment

3.20 ASSESSMENT

3.20.1 Purpose

Accountability to the citizens of Oklahoma within a tax-supported educational system is very important. Improvement in student learning, measurable through assessment programs, is an achievable outcomes, and the responsibility of the State System.

3.20.2 Definitions

The following words and terms, when used in the Chapter, shall have the following meaning, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

“Assessment of Student Satisfaction” are measures of perceptions of student and alumni satisfaction with campus programs and services.

“Basic Academic Skills: Minimum required skills for college success in English, mathematics, science, and reading.”

“Basic Academic Skills Deficiencies: Assessment requirements that have not been met by either the minimum ACT subject scores (English, math, science reasoning, or reading) or institutional secondary assessments required for a student to enroll in college-level courses in the subject area.”

“Curricular Deficiencies: High school curricular requirements for college admission that have not been met by the student in high school.”

“Curricular Requirements: The 15 units of high school course work required for college admission to public colleges and universities in the State System. These include four units of English, three units of mathematics, two units of laboratory science, three units of history and citizenship skills and three units of elective course that fit into one of the categories above or foreign language or computer science.”

“Elective Courses: Those courses that fulfill the additional three high school units to meet the total of 15 required by the State Regents for college admission.”

“Entry Level Assessment and Placement” is an evaluation conducted prior to enrollment which assists institutional faculty and counselors in making decisions that give students the best possible chance of success in attaining academic goals.

“General Education Assessment” are measures of competencies gained through the student’s general education program.

“Graduate Student Assessment” are measures of student learning and evaluations of student satisfaction with instruction and services beyond the standard assessment requirements for admission to and graduation from a graduate program.

“Program Outcomes Assessment (or major field of study assessment)” are measures of how well students are meeting institutionally stated program goals and objectives.

“Remedial/Developmental Courses: Zero-level courses that do not carry college credit and are designed to raise students’ knowledge competency in the subject area to the collegiate level.”

“Remediation: Process for removing curricular or basic academic skills deficiencies through remedial/developmental course work or supplemental instruction or other interventions that lead to demonstration of competency.”

“Student Assessment” is a multi-dimensional evaluative process that measures the overall educational impact of the college/university experience on students and provides information for making program improvements.

3.20.3 Institutional Requirements

Each college and university shall assess individual student performance in achieving its programmatic objectives. Specifically, each institution will develop criteria, subject to State Regents' approval, for the evaluation of students at college entry to determine academic preparation and course placement; general education assessment to determine basic skill competencies; program outcomes assessment to evaluate the outcomes in the student's major; and student perception of program quality including satisfaction with support services, academic curriculum, and the faculty. Such evaluation criteria must be tied to stated program outcomes and learner competencies. Data at each level of assessment will be reported to the State Regents annually and will include detailed information designed to ensure accountability throughout the system. Detailed information on assessment reporting is available in the Academic Affairs Procedures Handbook available upon request.

In recognition of varying institutional missions and clientele served, assessment components will be campus based under the leadership of the local faculty and administrators providing the procedures meet the requirements detailed in the following sections. Assessment programs should consider the needs of special populations in the development of policies and procedures. Finally, as institutions develop criteria and select assessment mechanisms, each program component should be coordinated and complement the whole.

3.20.4 Entry Level Assessment and Placement

A. Minimum Basic Academic Skills Requirements

Each institution will use established ACT scores at or above the State Regents’ established minimum in the four subject areas of science reasoning, mathematics, reading, and English as the initial determinant for individual student readiness for college level course work. These minimum ACT subscores provide a

standard for measuring student readiness across the State System and are evaluated by the State Regents on an annual basis. Students scoring below the minimum level, will be required to undergo additional testing to determine the level of readiness for college level work consistent with the institution's approved assessment plan, or successfully complete remedial/developmental course work in the subject area. Students must remediate basic academic skills deficiencies at the earliest possible time but within the first 24 college-level hours attempted. Students continuously enrolled in courses designed to remove deficiencies may be allowed to continue enrollment beyond the 24 hour limit. More information concerning removing curricular deficiencies may be found in the State Regents' *Remediation and Removal of High School Curricular Deficiencies Policy*. Similarly, institutions may, within their approved assessment plans, establish higher standards by requiring additional testing of those students meeting or exceeding the minimum ACT subject test score requirement. These minimum subject test score requirements will be communicated regularly to college bound students, parents, and common schools for the purpose of informing them of the levels of proficiency in the basic academic skills areas needed to be adequately prepared for college level work. Students admitted under the special adult admission provision may be exempt from entry-level assessment requirements consistent with the institution's approved assessment plan.

B. Concurrently Enrolled High School Students

For high school students wishing to enroll concurrently in college courses the established ACT score in the four subject areas will apply as follows: A high school student not meeting the designated score in science reasoning, mathematics, and English will not be permitted enrollment in the corresponding college subject area. A student scoring below the established ACT score in reading will not be permitted enrollment in any other collegiate course (outside the subjects of science, mathematics, and English). Secondary institutional assessments and remediation are not allowed for concurrent high school students.

C. Institutional Programs

Institutional entry level assessment programs should include an evaluation of past academic performance, educational readiness (such as mental, physical, and emotional), educational goals, study skills, values, self-concept and motivation. Student assessment results will be utilized in the placement and advisement process to ensure that students enroll in courses appropriate for their skill levels. Tracking systems should be implemented to ensure that information from assessment and completion of course work is used to evaluate and strengthen programs in order to further enhance student achievement and

development. The data collection activities should be clearly linked to instructional improvement efforts.

3.20.5 General Education Assessment

The results of general education assessment should be used to improve the institution's program of general education. This assessment is designed to measure the student's academic progress and learning competencies in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, and other areas of general education.

General education assessments will normally occur after the student has completed 45 semester hours and prior to the end of the degree program for associate degree programs and prior to the completion of 70 semester hours for students in baccalaureate programs.

Examples of appropriate measures include academic standing, GPA, standardized and institutionally developed instruments, portfolios, etc.

3.20.6 Program Outcomes Assessment

Selection of the assessment instruments and other parameters (such as target groups, when testing occurs, etc.) for program outcomes assessment is the responsibility of the institution subject to State Regents' approval. Preference should be given to nationally standardized instruments. The following criteria are guidelines for the selection of assessment methodologies:

- A. Instrument(s) should reflect the curriculum for the major and measure skills and abilities identified in the program goals and objectives.
- B. Instrument(s) should assess higher level thinking skills in applying learned information.
- C. Instrument(s) should be demonstrated to be reliable and valid.

Nationally normed instruments required for graduate or professional study, or those that serve as prerequisites to practice in the profession, may be included as appropriate assessment devices. Examples are the Graduate Record Exam (GRE), National Teacher Exam (NTE), and various licensing examinations.

3.20.7 Assessment of Student Satisfaction

Perceptions of students and alumni are important in the evaluation of and the enhancement of academic and campus programs and services. Such perceptions are valuable because they provide an indication of the students' subjective view of events and services which collectively constitute their undergraduate experiences. Evaluations of student satisfaction can be accomplished via surveys, interviews, etc. Resulting data are to be used to provide feedback for the improvement of programs and services.

Examples of programs/activities to be included in this level of assessment are satisfaction with student services, quality of food

services, access to financial aid, residence hall facilities, day care, parking, etc.

3.20.8 Graduate Student Assessment

Higher education institutions that charge graduate students the student assessment fee must perform graduate student assessment. An institution that charges the assessment fee will include a description of graduate student assessment and assessment fee usage in its institutional assessment plan. Graduate student assessment results will be included in the institution's annual assessment report to the State Regents. In addition to the annual reporting requirements described above, graduate programs should attempt to present instrument data that compare graduate student performance with statewide or national norms.

The institution's plan for graduate student assessment will explain each graduate program's assessment process, including stages of assessment, descriptions of instruments used, methods of data collection, the relationship of data analysis to program improvement, and the administrative organization used to develop and review the assessment plan. The institution will adopt or develop assessment instruments that augment pre-assessment fee instruments (i.e. grade transcripts, GRE scores, course grades, and comprehensive exams). Departmental pre-tests, capstone experiences, cohort tracking, portfolios, interviews, and postgraduate surveys are some commonly used assessment methods.

Approved October 4, 1991. Revised April 15, 1994; June 28, 1995; June 28, 1996.