



**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY-OKMULGEE
(OSUTB-OKM)
ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT OF 2004-2005 ACTIVITY**

CONTACT PERSON:
MARY MILLIKIN, DIRECTOR
INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT & RESEARCH
ACADEMIC SUPPORT & DEVELOPMENT

Telephone Number: (918) 293-5494

FAX Number: (918) 296-4606

e-mail: mary.a.millikin@okstate.edu

Approximately 50 staff hours were required to complete this report.

DECEMBER 1, 2005

Oklahoma State University Technical Branch-Okmulgee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**Entry-Level Assessment**

In 2004-2005 Oklahoma State University Technical Branch-Okmulgee (OSUTB-OKM) used the ACT as a preliminary measure to evaluate first-time freshmen. Students scoring at least 19 on either the ACT National or ACT Residual were subsequently enrolled in college credit courses. Students scoring below the cut score on any sub-test required further testing before placement and enrollment. A total of 301 students were administered the ACT Residual. Students needing additional placement testing were administered the ACT Computer-Adaptive Placement and Support System (COMPASS). If they tested below the cut score for the COMPASS, they were enrolled in remedial course work in the College Readiness Center. After entry-level assessment was completed, 20% of students needed one remedial course, 8% required two remedial courses, and 7% required three remedial courses. A total of 1219 students were served in the College Readiness Center during the last academic year, and 60% of these students successfully completed the course work to enroll in college level course work.

To determine if students who successfully completed zero-level coursework in the College Readiness Center succeeded in subsequent college level course work, a first year retention rate of 54% was calculated for remediated students and a first year retention rate of 63% was calculated for non-remediated students. Further, course success in subsequent math and English classes was compared with students who did not require remediation. Students completing math course work in the College Readiness Center scored equally well in subsequent college level math courses.

Upon review of the 2004-2005 ACT COMPASS placement results, math faculty in the College Readiness Center have proposed and implemented new course format for Beginning Algebra and Intermediate Algebra courses. New cut scores have been established for the 2005-2006 academic year and are based upon observations by College Readiness Center faculty during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Mid-Level (General Education) Assessment

Mid-level assessment of general education competencies was conducted as described in each program's academic assessment plan. These assessments were 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, and all mid-level assessment is course-embedded to motivate students to participate in a meaningful way. Core Objectives are as follows:

- **Core Objective 1: Communication** Effectively communicate electronically, verbally and in writing
- **Core Objective 2: Critical Thinking** Demonstrate logical, systematic problem solving techniques.
- **Core Objective 3: Ethics** Develop and display a sense of personal, social and professional work ethics

- **Core Objective 4: Culture, History, and Diversity** Explain the cultural heritage and primary elements of the history and government of the U.S. and its people, especially as it impacts one's industry or field of study.
- **Core Objective 5: Technology** Access and use technology appropriate to one's field of study

The number of students who passed all Core Objectives at the benchmark level or higher was 876 from a total of 1114 students. Mid-level assessment of general education Core Objectives indicated students met the benchmark of 80% of all students in the Fall 2004 Freshmen Cohort achieving a minimum of 74% proficiency. For Communication (e.g., Reading and Writing), assessments in Technical Writing I and Freshman Composition I met and exceeded the standard. Mid-level assessment for Critical Thinking indicated students achieved expected proficiency. Moreover, mid-level, formative assessment of all five Core Objectives met the benchmark.

Program Outcomes Assessment

The primary means of assessing program outcomes for the 2004-2005 academic year included Capstone course assessments, portfolios, performance evaluations, and written exams where appropriate, as well as EOI assessments, certification exams, and internship evaluations. Overall results indicate that 90% of students achieved at least a 74% competency level of student achievement. This exceeds by 10% the criterion standard or benchmark of 80%. Individual programs of study results ranged from 100% to 77%.

After reviewing assessment results, changes have been recommended and approved to the overall assessment process. To further identify appropriate instructional change, the Assessment Committee has instituted an Assessment week beginning with the 2005-2006 academic year. Each academic year a new theme will be selected for evaluation and institutional learning. For the first year Critical Thinking, Core Objective #2, has been selected. The California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory, a nationally normed measure of critical thinking, has been selected to assess a cross-section of students and provide national comparison. Professional development for faculty and special instructional opportunities for students will be offered based upon the results of this assessment. Each academic year a new theme will be selected from the five Core Objectives. The theme of Diversity has been selected for year two.

Student Satisfaction Assessment

In Spring 2005 the Student Satisfaction Inventory published by Noel Levitz was administered to students to measure expectations and satisfaction with campus services and experiences. A total of 576 students completed the 98-item survey. All students had an opportunity to participate, and surveys were implemented during class time in all class meetings Tuesday and Thursday mornings.

Students reported highest satisfaction for the scales "*Student Centeredness*," "*Instructional Effectiveness*," "*Registration Effectiveness*," "*Academic Services*," and "*Concern for the Individual*." Although students expressed satisfaction for all sub-scales, when compared with the national norm, "*Responsiveness to Diverse Populations*," "*Safety and Security*," and "*Academic Services*" showed a greater gap between student ratings of importance and satisfaction. Consequently, a Tutoring Learning Center has been established in the College Readiness Center to assist students academically. Because some student-access computer work stations have been retired, additional work stations are under advisement in the Library as well as greater flexibility in hours to meet students computer lab needs.

In summary, students expressed strong expectations for most campus services and experiences, and they were fundamentally satisfied with OSUTB-OKM. Student Centeredness, instructional effectiveness and registration effectiveness were major strengths for the college. Areas of concern included tutoring services availability, computer lab access, and some academic concerns related to program start up. In response, the college has initiated a new Tutoring Learning Center and is experimenting with ways to increase student computer lab access.

Introduction

OSUTB-OKM's assessment plan is designed to provide a body of evidence to assist improvement efforts in the learning process, to improve institutional effectiveness and, ultimately, to maximize student success. The plan asks important questions regarding the learning process and reflects the college's mission. It takes into consideration programmatic goals and objectives, and is linked to curriculum decision making and to processes such as planning and budgeting. It contains a thoughtful approach to the assessment planning process, and allows for continuity, flexibility, and improvement. To these ends, faculty, students, staff, and other individuals from both on and off campus are becoming increasingly involved in the development, implementation, and analysis of the assessment process.

Entry-Level Assessment

- 1. What methods were used for entry-level course placement? What were the instruments and cut-scores used for each subject area and course?**

Scores on academic and technical pretests, in conjunction with transcript evaluation, were used for initial entry-level course placement. Students enrolling under Adult Admission were also allowed evaluation of personal assessment of educational preparation, special job or work experience, special licensing and other pertinent educational documents.

Academic Pretests

American College Test (ACT) – Scores on either the ACT National or the ACT Residual were used as an initial step in determining basic academic proficiency. A cut score of 19 was set for each ACT subtest: Reading, Science Reasoning, English, and Math. OSUTB-OKM is an open-door institution, and student scores falling below the cut score indicates need for further testing before placement and enrollment. High school transcript evaluation was also used as an indicator of educational preparedness.

ACT Computer-Adaptive Placement and Support System (COMPASS) – If students earned an ACT score below 19, they were administered the ACT COMPASS, which replaced the Accuplacer CPT during the Fall 2004 semester. Five basic academic areas were assessed with this instrument: Reading Comprehension, Writing Skills, Pre-algebra (Arithmetic), Algebra (Intermediate) and College Algebra. New students were allowed to retest twice on any or all subtests. Students enrolled in courses in their programs of study if they earned test scores at or above the following competency levels.

Reading Comprehension. A cut score of 81 was set for entry-level proficiency for the COMPASS Reading Comprehension subtest. Students scoring 80 or below were placed in Reading Fundamentals (READ 0143) in the College Readiness Center.

Writing Skills. Students scoring 74 or above passed this requirement and were qualified to enroll in Technical Writing I (ENGL 1033) or Freshman Composition I (ENGL 1113). Student scoring 73 or below were placed in English Fundamentals (ENGL 0143) in the College Readiness Center. Students scoring 97 or above on this subtest satisfied Part I of the requirement for advanced standing credit in Freshman

Composition I (ENGL 1113). To satisfy Part II requirements, subsequent testing was scheduled with the Arts & Sciences Division.

Pre-Algebra (Arithmetic). Students scoring 46 or above proved proficiency and could enroll in Business Math (MATH 2003). Students scoring below this level were enrolled in Basic Mathematics (MATH 0123) in the College Readiness Center.

Algebra/College Algebra. Students scoring 42 or above on the College Algebra subtest qualified for entry level proficiency in College Algebra (MATH 1513). Students who scored less than 42 on College Algebra but scored 68 or above on the Algebra subtest were also enrolled in College Algebra. Students scoring below these two cut scores were placed in either Math Fundamentals (MATH 0143) or Algebra Fundamentals (MATH 0153) in the College Readiness Center, depending on their program of study.

Social Science. Students who did not demonstrate proficiency in Reading Comprehension were required to satisfy this requirement prior to enrolling in a college-level social science course.

Technical Pretests – Students enrolling in some technical programs of study were administered appropriate technical pretests, developed by faculty. Several pretests provided new students with the opportunity to qualify for advanced standing credit.

- 2. How were instruments administered? Which students were assessed? Describe how and when they were assessed, including options for the students to seek retesting, tutoring, or other academic support.**

Academic Pretests

Entry-level, basic-skills assessment instruments were administered by members of the Student Affairs team in the Assessment Center, dedicated to certification, licensing and career, academic and personal development. Students who had not taken the ACT National were administered the ACT Residual. All first-time college students and transfer students with less than 24 college credit hours—with the exception of students who scored 19 or higher on the ACT, students who were admitted under Special or Adult Admission, and concurrent students—took the ACT COMPASS after completing the Admission Application and before scheduling classes. All secondary assessment of basic skills (ACT COMPASS) was available for administration online at the OSUTB-OKM campus and at remote sites approved by the college. This allowed students access to testing at flexible hours and numerous sites, including those abroad. Students were allowed to test three times on each of the ACT COMPASS subtests, except for students demonstrating an ability to benefit for Financial Aid, who were allowed to test only twice.

ACT COMPASS software provides immediate results and subtest scores upon completion of the test. Student placement information and test scores are saved to a computer file, and students are provided with a hard copy of test results. If students did not score at subtest proficiency level but were within a predetermined range, they were allowed to retest again the same day. If their scores were significantly below the proficiency score levels, they were encouraged to retest after taking measures to improve performance by seeking assistance from advisors or staff in the Assessment Center or by pursuing self-directed review and study of the subjects.

If students chose not to seek assistance or to retest or if the retest score remained below the proficiency level, students enrolled in the recommended 0-level basic-skills courses taught by faculty in the College Readiness Center. The mission of the College Readiness Center is to meet individual students' needs by preparing them for success in their fundamental academic and career goals. The College Readiness Center uses a hands-on, applied approach to instruction in fundamental courses. Included in instruction are hands-on materials, large and small group activities, and continuous discussion of topics. Every effort is made to present each skill using the three learning styles: visual, auditory, and kinesthetic.

3. What were the analyses and findings from the 2004-2005 entry-level assessment?

An analysis of entry-level assessment revealed that 301 students were administered the ACT Residual, and 1148 prospective students participated in ACT COMPASS pretesting. After entry-level assessment was completed, 20% of students needed one remedial course, 8% required two remedial courses, and 7% required three remedial courses. Mean student scores appear below.

Upon review of the 2004-2005 ACT COMPASS placement results, math faculty in the College Readiness Center proposed additional levels of remediation with Beginning Algebra and Intermediate Algebra. New cut scores have been established for the 2005-2006 academic year as described below, and are based upon observations by faculty during the 2004-2005 academic year.

Mean ACT and COMPASS Scores

Test	Sub-test	Score
ACT	English	17.3
	Reading	18.7
	Math	17.2
	Science	18.9
	Comprehensive	18.3
ACT COMPASS	Reading	77.6
	Writing	59.6
	Pre-Algebra	33.7
	College Algebra	22.6
	Algebra	23.8

4. How was student progress tracked? Describe analyses of student success in both remedial and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process as a result of findings.

Faculty in the CRC provide one-on-one mentoring, tutoring, and academic counseling to academically at-risk students while enrolled in zero-level courses. The pass rates for Reading Fundamentals and English Fundamentals were 68%. For students enrolled in Math Fundamentals, Algebra Fundamentals, or Intermediate Algebra, student pass rates varied from 50% to 62%. In an effort to expedite students through zero-level course work, Math Fundamentals and Intermediate Algebra were combined during the Spring 2005 semester. Although the pass rate was 60%, faculty and administrators in Academic Affairs felt that this was too fast a pace for academically at-risk students. Consequently, this course format returned to a two-course format beginning Summer 2005. Overall pass

rate for all course work was 60%. The table below presents number and percent of students served as well as pass rate in the CRC.

Students Served In the College Readiness Center

Course	Semester	Students	# Passed	% Passed
MATH 0153 Algebra Fundamentals	Summer 2004	72	34	47%
	Fall 2004	115	61	53%
	Spring 2005	0	0	0
Total		187	95	51%
MATH 0143 Math Fundamentals	Summer 2004	51	38	75%
	Fall 2004	150	87	58%
	Spring 2005	0	0	0
Total		201	125	62%
MATH 0113 Math Fundamentals and Elementary Algebra Combination changed back	Spring 2005	168	100	60%
Total		168	100	60%
MATH 0123 Intermediate Algebra	Fall 2004	97	55	57%
	Spring 2005	109	49	45%
Total		206	106	50%
ENGL 0143 English Fundamentals	Summer 2004	35	22	63%
	Fall 2004	135	91	67%
	Spring 2005	67	47	70%
Total		237	160	68%
READ 0143 Reading Fundamentals	Summer 2004	35	26	74%
	Fall 2004	144	95	66%
	Spring 2005	41	28	68%
Total		220	149	68%
Grand Total		1219	735	60%

To determine if students who successfully completed zero-level coursework in the College Readiness Center succeeded in subsequent college level course work, a first year

retention rate of 54% was calculated for remediated students and a first year retention rate of 63% was calculated for non-remediated students. Further, course grades in subsequent math and English classes were compared for students who completed zero-level courses and those whose placement test scores did not require remediation. Using an Analysis of Variance (alpha equal to .05), no significant difference in course grades for college level mathematics was found. However, a significant difference in grades was found in college level English course work, with remediated students earning lower course grades. These results suggest that the CRC has been successful in remediating at-risk students in mathematics. However, one must be careful when interpreting results for English course work. ACT scores for remediated students ranged from 3 to 18. Because Reading scores predict all other ACT subtest scores, an interaction effect of reading skill is a factor in college success. Further research will be conducted during the 2005-2006 academic year to identify and isolate solutions for remediated students.

Additionally, the college's Early Alert System is an electronic intervention system used by faculty to alert the system when a student is in danger of failing or not attending classes. Faculty in the Arts & Science Division send 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.

5. What other studies of entry-level assessment have been conducted at the institution? Describe results.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, entry-level assessment occurred at the program level as well at the institutional level. Program testing was used to determine proficiency in skills needed for industry-specific areas of study. For example, the Automotive Service Technology—GM ASEP program used the Valpar 2000 Spatial Aptitude Test and the Size and Shape Discrimination Test to identify students with lower proficiency in spatial reasoning skills. Students earning low scores on the Valpar 2000 were informed that these aptitudes are necessary for success in the program and on the job, and these students were advised to increase study time to improve needed skills. Because the test was not used to screen out students and was used for student development, Automotive Technology Unit Leaders reported that faculty sought out students with identified need for skill improvement and provided additional time and opportunities for skill enhancement.

Additionally, the Watchmaking & Microtechnology program used the Bennett Mechanical Comprehensive Test (BMCT) to measure student aptitude to learn mechanical skills. This test focused on spatial perception and tool knowledge rather than on manual dexterity. Results provided students with a sense of preparedness for the program and identified areas of need for improvement. Program faculty reported appropriate student-program fit. In addition, before students could be accepted in the Multimedia Technology Program, they were required to meet minimum a keyboarding proficiency of 25 words per minute with five or less errors.

6. What instructional changes occurred or are planned due to entry-level assessment?

The College Readiness Center continues to monitor COMPASS cut scores for appropriate placement in math and English courses. Results from the 2004-2005 academic year have been the basis for the new cut scores instituted beginning December 2005. Further, new formats for teaching Beginning Algebra and Intermediate Algebra have been investigated. Faculty remain responsive to student needs based upon empirical results and student feedback in the CRC.

There is a positive relationship between early student enrollment and college readiness. Conversely, there exists a strong negative relationship between late enrollment and college readiness. When students are assessed early in the process, they have far greater opportunities to seek assistance and take advantage of college readiness activities and student success programs. Consequently, OSUTB-OKM has committed to enrolling students earlier and providing them with greater access to readiness programs prior to the start of the semester. Additionally, the college has expanded on-campus activities for high school seniors and special enrollment days to facilitate early enrollment.

Mid-Level Assessment

- 7. What measures were used to assess reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, and other institutionally recognized general education competencies? Describe how assessment activities were linked to the institutional general education program competencies.**

Mid-level assessment of general education competencies was conducted as described in each program's academic assessment plan. These assessments were 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. Student attainment of general education competencies was measured in alignment with these Core Objectives. They are as follows:

- **Core Objective 1: Communication** Effectively communicate electronically, verbally and in writing
- **Core Objective 2: Critical Thinking** Demonstrate logical, systematic problem solving techniques.
- **Core Objective 3: Ethics** Develop and display a sense of personal, social and professional work ethics
- **Core Objective 4: Culture, History, and Diversity** Explain the cultural heritage and primary elements of the history and government of the U.S. and its people, especially as it impacts one's industry or field of study.
- **Core Objective 5: Technology** Access and use technology appropriate to one's field of study

A uniform college benchmark was set by faculty: *at least 80% of students will achieve each Core Objective and Technical Program Objective at the 74% level of competency or higher.* Mid-level assessments were developed and implemented by Arts & Sciences faculty college-wide and by faculty within each program of study as deemed appropriate.

- 8. Which and how many students participated in mid-level assessment? Describe how the instruments were administered and how students were selected. Describe strategies to motivate students to participate meaningfully.**

The Fall 2004 Freshman Cohort was targeted to measure mid-level assessment. The number of students who passed all Core Objectives at the benchmark level or higher was 876 from a total of 1114 students. Formative assessments of general education competencies are faculty-developed, faculty-driven, and primarily course-embedded to motivate students to participate to their fullest abilities. Because it is possible for a student to pass this class while not passing the assessment or to pass the assessment while not passing the class, faculty input into Web-For-Faculty the results of these assessments at the same time as they report student course grades. Results are tabulated based upon faculty reported results in the database.

Core Objective 1, Communication is summatively measured in all technical programs of study and is formatively measured with a faculty panel-reviewed student portfolio in ENGL 1033 and ENGL 1113. Faculty require multiple essays and writing samples for this assessment, which is course-embedded and motivates students to participate meaningfully.

Core Objective 2, Critical Thinking is summatively measured in all technical programs of study and is formatively measured in all mathematics courses. The final exam (course-embedded) in Business Math, College Algebra, and Trigonometry serve as the assessment for mid-level assessment of critical thinking.

9. How was student progress tracked into future semesters and what were the findings?

As determined in the college assessment plan, assessment of general education competencies and objectives was evaluated and recorded using Web-For-Faculty to

warehouse data. Programs of study with more developed assessment plans utilized Excel files to record multiple assessments of objectives, and results are reported below. Because this new data collection system was in its second year of operation, the percent of assessment data collected and reported increased from 63% in the first year to 92%. Concurrently, need for additional training was identified and occurred in all academic divisions during August 2005.

**Mid-Level Assessment of Core Objectives
Fall 2004 Freshman Cohort**

Course In Which Assessment Occurred		% Cohort Reported	% Students Completing Objective at Benchmark
#1 Communication	ENGL 1033	37%	85%
	ENGL 1113	97%	82%
	SPCH 1113	97%	68%
	Cumulative	91%	78%
#2 Critical Thinking	MATH 1513	100%	83%
	MATH 1613	100%	95%
	MATH 2003	100%	83%
	Cumulative	100%	87%
#3 Ethics	PHIL 1213	100%	83%
#4 History & Government	POLS 1113	99%	86%
	HIST 1483	100%	83%
	HIST 1493	100%	68%
	Cumulative	~100%	79%
#5 Technology	GTIT 1133	71%	72%
Mean Average		92%	80%

10. What were the analyses and findings from the 2004-2005 mid-level assessment?

Mid-level assessment of general education Core Objectives indicates that students have met the benchmark of 80% of all students in the cohort achieving a minimum of 74% proficiency. For Communication (e.g., Reading and Writing), assessments in Technical Writing I and Freshman Composition I meet and exceed the standard; however, assessments in Speech did not meet the standard. Upon investigation it was determined that several new faculty taught Speech during the last academic year who were hired after assessment training occurred. Consequently, there was confusion regarding accurate input of assessment results. Mid-level assessment for Critical Thinking indicates that students achieved expected proficiency. Moreover, mid-level, formative assessment of all five Core Objectives met the benchmark.

11. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the general education program due to mid-level assessment?

Mathematics faculty initially planned to have assessments for critical thinking implemented in the college's Assessment Center. Upon review, concern was expressed that students might not be motivated to perform to full capabilities if the evaluation was not linked to personal consequences. Therefore, math faculty determined to embed these assessments in math curriculum. Further, the Arts & Science division has reformed its curriculum and assessment teams to continue to address student placement, mid-level assessment, and program outcomes assessment. These teams will provide unity across objectives and across programs of study.

Another significant change that has been planned due to these results is that an institutional measure of critical thinking will be implemented during the coming academic year. This measure is norm-referenced and will indicate whether further training in teaching critical thinking will be effective.

Program Outcomes Assessment

12. Attach a table listing the assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for the degree program or department.

Multiple measures were used to provide assessment of program effectiveness and institutional effectiveness. The OSUTB-OKM assessment plan outlines both formative and summative measures of student academic achievement. Beginning with the Fall 2003 Cohort, measures included assessments in Capstone courses, end-of-instruction (EOI) assessments, posttests prior to graduation, industry certifications, and graduate exit placement. Fall 2004 Freshman Cohort outcomes assessment results appear below.

Program Outcomes Assessment

Division	Program	# Students Assessed	Assessment Measures
Arts & Sciences	Business Systems Technology	30	Industry Certification, Pre/Posttesting, Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Pre-Education	17	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Sub-total	47	
Automotive and HEVi Technologies	Automotive Service	85	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Automotive Collision Repair Technology	53	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement

Division	Program	# Students Assessed	Assessment Measures
	Heavy Equipment Vehicle Institute	47	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Sub-total	185	
Construction Division	Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Technology	49	Industry Certification, Pre/Posttesting, Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Construction Technology	39	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Sub-total	88	
Engineering Technologies	Electrical & Electronics Technology	37	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Engineering Graphics Technology	24	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Manufacturing Technology	11	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Sub-total	72	
Health & Environmental Technologies	Orthotic & Prosthetic Technology	14	Pre/Posttest, Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Pedorthic Technology	12	Pre/Posttest, Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Nursing	5	Certification, Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Sub-total	31	
Hospitality Services Technology	Culinary Arts Technology	63	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
Information Technologies	Information Technologies	75	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
Visual Communications	Graphic Design	31	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Multimedia Technology	10	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Photography	16	Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
	Sub-total	57	

Division	Program	# Students Assessed	Assessment Measures
Watchmaking		3	Certification, Capstone Assessment, End of Instruction Assessment, and Graduate Exit Placement
TOTAL		621	

13. What were the analyses and findings from the 2004-2005 program outcomes assessment?

The primary means of assessing program outcomes for the 2004-2005 academic year was via Capstone course assessments, consisting of portfolios, performance evaluations, and written exams where appropriate, as well as EOI assessments, certification exams, and internship evaluations. Overall results indicate that 90% of students achieved at least a 74% competency level of student achievement. This exceeds by 10% the criterion standard or benchmark of 80%. Individual programs of study results ranged from 100% to 77%.

Program Outcomes Assessment Results

Division	Program	Benchmark	Assessment Score	Outcome
Arts & Sciences	Business	80%	84%	Exceeded
	Pre-Education	80%	92%	Exceeded
Automotive and HEVi Technologies	Automotive Service	80%	94%	Exceeded
	Collision	80%	93%	Exceeded
	Heavy Equipment Vehicle Institute	80%	93%	Exceeded
Construction Division	Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Technology	80%	88%	Exceeded
	Construction Technology	80%	81%	Met
Engineering Technologies	Electrical & Electronics Technology	80%	91%	Exceeded

	Engineering Graphics Technology	80%	Not Recorded	---
	Manufacturing Technology	80%	100%	Exceeded
Health & Environmental Technologies	Orthotic & Prosthetic Technology	80%	Not Recorded	---
	Pedorthic Technology	80%	Not Recorded	---
	Nursing	80%	100%	Exceeded
Hospitality Services Technology	Culinary Arts Technology	80%	88%	Exceeded
Information Technologies	Information Technologies	80%	90%	Exceeded
Visual Communications	Graphic Design	80%	77%	Did not meet
	Multimedia Technology	80%	81%	Met
	Photography	80%	90%	Exceeded
Watchmaking	Watchmaking	80%	100%	Exceeded
TOTAL		80%	90%	Exceeded

14. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the programs due to program outcomes assessment?

The 2004-2005 academic year was the second year for the new OSUTB-OKM assessment system, and assessment processes became more familiar. Through faculty training during the summer 2005 semester, needed training was identified and will be implemented during the coming academic year.

Because the system is in its early stages of development, most changes recommended and made by faculty consist of procedural changes and adjustments to assessments. For instance, the IT division had developed as many as 16 formative assessments for one technical Program Objective and nearly as many summative assessments. Results were recorded within Excel spreadsheets that were kept by faculty

since the OSUTB-OKM assessment database on SCT only allows for the input of one assessment per course per objective. To simplify the assessment process yet retain its meaningfulness, faculty in IT division assessment team meetings decided to consolidate the number of formative and summative assessments, retaining the most effective measures to date.

Upon review of assessment results, Culinary Arts faculty in Hospitality Services Technology formed a new faculty assessment team resulting in the review and revision of a more concise list of program objectives as well as more hands-on assessments of technical objectives.

During this second year of implementation, 70% of academic divisions were reporting, with the remaining 30% highlighting needed assessment training for the coming academic year. Further, in programs where dropout rates are more problematic such as in Graphic Design, lower mean assessment scores were observed. In the final outcomes assessment report for cohort groups, results for graduates only will be considered. Withdrawing students are a concern for our college and the Visual Communications division; however, they are not the focus of this assessment.

After reviewing assessment results, changes have been recommended and approved to the overall assessment process. To further identify appropriate instructional change, the Assessment Committee has instituted an Assessment week beginning with the 2005-2006 academic year. Each academic year a new theme will be selected for evaluation and institutional learning. For the first year Critical Thinking, Core Objective #2, has been selected. The California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory, a nationally normed measure of critical thinking, has been selected to assess a cross-section of students and

provide national comparison. Professional development for faculty and special instructional opportunities for students will be offered based upon the results of this assessment. Each academic year a new theme will be select from the five Core Objectives. The theme of Diversity has been selected for year two.

Student Satisfaction Assessment

15. What assessment activities were used to measure student satisfaction? Describe the measures used, which students were assessed, how many students, and how they were selected.

In Spring 2005 the Student Satisfaction Inventory published by Noel Levitz was administered to students to measure expectations and satisfaction with campus services and experiences. All students had an opportunity to participate, and surveys were implemented during class time in all class meetings Tuesday and Thursday mornings. A total of 576 students completed the 98-item survey, which loads items into 12 subscales. The instrument was administered by faculty during class time, and all students were given the opportunity to respond.

Students were asked to rate, on a scale of one to seven, both the importance of and satisfaction with college services and resources. The gap or difference between the importance and satisfaction ratings was calculated for each item, and OSUTB-OKM results were compared with national norms.

16. What were the analyses and findings from the 2004-2005 student satisfaction assessment?

Students reported satisfaction levels above the midpoint for all items. A gap analysis of student perceptions was conducted by calculating the difference between mean importance and mean satisfaction for each item. Students reported highest satisfaction for the scales “*Student Centeredness*,” “*Instructional Effectiveness*,” “*Registration Effectiveness*,” “*Academic Services*,” and “*Concern for the Individual*.” The scales are presented below along with mean satisfaction ratings and statistical significance.

Institutional Summary

SCALE	Mean Satisfaction (3.5 = midpoint)	Importance minus Satisfaction Gap
Student Centeredness	5.31	0.56
Instructional Effectiveness	5.29	0.76
Registration Effectiveness	5.29	0.73
Academic Services	5.23	0.72
Concern for the Individual	5.21	0.73
Campus Climate	5.21	0.66
Academic Advising/Counseling	5.19	0.79
Service Excellence	5.19	0.70
Responsiveness to Diverse Populations	5.12	*
Admissions and Financial Aid	5.03	0.97
Campus Support Services	4.97	0.51
Safety and Security	4.70	1.17

**Importance not available*

Areas for improvement for OSUTB-OKM when compared to the national norm are: “*Responsiveness to Diverse Populations*,” “*Safety and Security*,” and “*Academic Services*.” Items of greatest strength for the college when compared to the national norm are: “*Childcare facilities are available on campus*,” “*Internships or practical experiences are provided in my degree/certificate program*,” “*Personnel in the Veteran’s Services program are helpful*,” and “*I generally know what’s happening on campus*.”

Performance gaps for Spring 2005 were compared with results for Spring 2004, Spring 2003, and Spring 2002. The table below presents the SSI results for the last four years.

Student Satisfaction Inventory Performance Gap By Academic Year

ITEM	Spring 2005 Survey	Spring 2004 Survey	Spring 2003 Survey	Spring 2002 Survey
1. Most students feel a sense of belonging here.	0.09	0.21	0.31	0.39
2. Faculty care about me as an individual.	0.44	0.48	0.46	0.68
3. The quality of instruction in the vocational/technical programs is excellent.	0.66	0.55	0.62	0.90
4. Security staff are helpful.	0.67	0.83	0.54	0.73
5. The personnel involved in registration are helpful.	0.62	0.58	0.59	0.94
6. My academic advisor is approachable.	0.61	0.52	0.44	0.65
7. Adequate financial aid is available for most students.	1.18	1.21	1.26	1.65
8. Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient.	1.03	1.00	1.17	1.44
9. Internships or practical experiences are provided in my degree/certificate program.	0.85	0.59	0.63	0.65
10. Childcare facilities are available on campus.	-0.05	0.20	-0.10	-0.05
11. Security staff respond quickly in emergencies.	0.94	0.93	0.96	1.07
12. My academic advisor helps me set goals to work toward.	0.81	0.74	0.65	0.87
13. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	1.25	1.38	1.12	1.65
14. Library resources and services are adequate.	0.61	0.82	1.32	1.15
15. I am able to register for classes I need with few conflicts.	0.99	1.02	0.91	1.15
16. The college shows concern for students as individuals.	0.84	0.93	0.87	1.30
17. Personnel in the Veterans' Services program are helpful.	0.07	0.30	0.12	0.11
18. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent.	0.78	0.68	0.80	0.90
19. This campus provides effective support services for displaced homemakers.	0.41	0.41	0.47	0.34
20. Financial aid counselors are helpful.	0.97	1.04	1.08	1.77
21. There are a sufficient number of study areas on campus.	0.61	0.70	0.80	0.68
22. People on this campus respect and are supportive of each other.	0.66	0.79	0.70	0.91
23. Faculty are understanding of students' unique life circumstances.	0.77	0.94	0.87	0.98
24. Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.	1.24	1.35	1.30	0.96
25. My academic advisor is concerned about my success as an individual.	0.88	0.78	0.77	0.85
26. Library staff are helpful and approachable.	0.56	0.61	0.75	0.72
27. The campus staff are caring and helpful.	0.59	0.61	0.60	0.84
28. It is an enjoyable experience to be a student on this campus.	0.64	0.80	0.80	1.29
29. Faculty are fair and unbiased in their treatment of individual students.	0.85	0.83	0.89	1.18

Student Satisfaction Inventory Performance Gap By Academic Year

ITEM	Spring 2005 Survey	Spring 2004 Survey	Spring 2003 Survey	Spring 2002 Survey
30. The career services office provides students with the help they need to get a job.	0.92	0.83	0.92	0.92
31. The campus is safe and secure for all students.	0.76	0.89	0.86	0.87
32. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about my program requirements.	0.77	0.58	0.61	0.72
33. Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their recruiting practices.	0.91	0.68	0.69	1.00
34. Computer labs are adequate and accessible.	0.79	0.99	1.32	1.06
35. The policies and procedures regarding registration and course selection are clear and well-publicized.	0.76	0.69	0.71	1.09
36. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus.	0.54	0.67	0.64	0.89
37. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course.	0.80	0.83	0.78	0.94
38. The student center is a comfortable place for students to spend their leisure time.	0.60	0.69	0.79	0.82
39. The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate.	2.17	2.15	2.06	2.53
40. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer requirements of other schools.	0.93	0.81	0.94	0.72
41. Admissions staff are knowledgeable.	0.69	0.71	0.77	0.91
42. The equipment in the lab facilities is kept up to date.	0.84	0.91	1.18	1.39
43. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable.	0.56	0.52	0.55	0.52
44. I generally know what's happening on campus.	0.71	0.73	0.92	0.67
45. This institution has a good reputation within the community.	0.36	0.57	0.38	0.71
46. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course.	0.81	0.85	0.82	0.99
47. There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career.	0.74	0.74	0.77	0.87
49. Admissions counselors respond to prospective students' unique needs and requests.	0.78	0.65	0.70	0.87
50. Tutoring services are readily available.	0.87	0.65	0.66	0.76
51. There are convenient ways of paying my school bill.	0.74	0.75	0.79	1.09
52. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my educational goals.	0.93	0.90	0.86	1.33
53. The assessment and course placement procedures are reasonable.	0.67	0.61	0.51	0.77
54. Faculty are interested in my academic problems.	0.82	0.70	0.68	0.94
55. Academic support services adequately meet the needs of students.	0.80	0.65	0.69	0.76
56. The business office is open during hours which are convenient for most students.	0.64	0.69	0.61	0.78
57. Administrators are approachable to students.	0.69	0.55	0.62	0.84
58. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their fields.	0.65	0.49	0.57	0.81
59. New student orientation services help students adjust to college.	0.61	0.67	0.56	0.84
60. Billing policies are reasonable.	0.79	0.76	0.77	1.13
61. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours.	0.56	0.55	0.54	0.64
62. Bookstore staff are helpful.	0.47	0.48	0.57	0.38
63. I seldom get the "run around" when seeking information on	0.97	0.93	1.03	1.56

Student Satisfaction Inventory Performance Gap By Academic Year

ITEM	Spring 2005 Survey	Spring 2004 Survey	Spring 2003 Survey	Spring 2002 Survey
this campus.				
64. Nearly all classes deal with practical experiences and applications.	0.72	0.61	0.62	0.79
65. Students are notified early in the term if they are doing poorly in a class.	1.14	0.99	0.90	1.09
66. Program requirements are clear and reasonable.	0.82	0.62	0.57	0.86
67. Channels for expressing student complaints are readily available.	1.03	0.89	1.00	1.36
68. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained.	0.55	0.58	0.57	0.70
69. There is a good variety of courses provided on this campus.	0.79	0.80	0.87	1.11
70. I am able to experience intellectual growth here.	0.65	0.64	0.65	0.94

Ten items were specific to the OSUTB-OKM campus and had no normative data. Because these ten items vary from year to year, there is no annual trend data for them, and they were not included in the table above, nor were the remaining demographic variables.

A majority of items continued to evidence significant reduction in performance gap for student satisfaction at OSUTB-OKM. The greatest improvements as measured by reduced performance gap were “*Childcare facilities are available on campus,*” “*Personnel in the Veterans’ Services program are helpful,*” “*This institution has a good reputation within the community,*” “*Library resources and services are adequate.*” A theme of positive campus culture emerged in the items experiencing the greatest performance gap improvement.

There were also items that experienced an increase in performance gap. The greatest gaps were “*Internships or practical experiences are provided in my degree/certificate program,*” “*Admissions counselors accurately portray the campus in their recruiting practices,*” “*Tutoring services are readily available,*” and “*Computer*

labs are adequate and accessible.” Although students express satisfaction with these items, they represent areas for improvement and are addressed below.

12. What changes occurred or are planned due to student satisfaction assessment?

In the 2003-2004 academic year, the item with the greatest increase in performance gap was “*Childcare facilities are available on campus.*” This item experienced the greatest improvement in the last academic year, resulting in a mean higher satisfaction rating than mean importance rating. New facilities are currently under construction for childcare services. Further, new indoor play and outdoor playground equipment have been purchased.

Library resources was another item evidencing high satisfaction. Over the last two years, the library has increased its paper and electronic resources and has instituted activities for students and families that add to a sense of belonging for the campus and make students feel welcome.

During the 2004-2005 academic year, the new Bachelor of Technology programs were established in the Information Technology division and the Engineering Technology division. New programs have a tendency towards fluidity in curriculum for the first year. As these new programs mature, it is likely that student perceptions will adjust as well.

Other performance gaps are being addressed during the 2005-2006 academic year. Beginning with the Fall 2005 semester, a Tutoring Learning Center has been established in the College Readiness Center to assist students academically. Because some student-

access computer work stations have been retired, the Library is proposing additional work stations and greater flexibility in hours to meet students computer lab needs.

In summary, students expressed strong expectations for most campus services and experiences, and they were fundamentally satisfied with OSUTB-OKM. Student Centeredness, instructional effectiveness and registration effectiveness were major strengths for the college. Areas of concern included tutoring services availability, computer lab access, and some academic concerns related to program start up. In response, the college has initiated a new Tutoring Learning Center and is experimenting with ways to increase student computer lab access.