



INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY-OKMULGEE ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT OF 2018-19 ACTIVITY

CONTACT PERSON:
CURTIS E. MILLER, PH.D.
OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH

Telephone Number: (918) 293-5498

FAX Number: (918) 293-4644

E-mail: curtis.miller@okstate.edu

November 29, 2019

Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee

OKLAHOMA STATE REGENTS FOR HIGHER EDUCATION
Annual Student Assessment Report of 2018-19 Activity

Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement

Activities

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

Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology (OSUIT) uses the ACT[®] and SAT[®] exams as preliminary measures to evaluate first-time freshmen. OSUIT utilizes multiple placement measures – to include the student’s unweighted high school grade point average (GPA), Next-Generation ACCUPLACER[®] scores, ACCUPLACER[®] scores, WritePlacer[®] scores, and/or ACT COMPASS[®] scores – as secondary course placement evaluation methods. (Note: ACT COMPASS[®] scores will only be accepted for placement through Fall 2019.) Students who fail to demonstrate academic proficiency in a given subject area through one (1) of these placement methods are required to complete remediation prior to enrollment in college-level coursework in the respective subject area.

I-2. *What information was used to determine co-requisite course placement (e.g., cut scores, high school GPA, class ranking)?*

OSUIT utilizes Next-Generation ACCUPLACER[®] and/or WritePlacer[®] scores to determine placement in the institution’s corequisite remediation model, as listed below.

Subject(s)	Next-Generation ACCUPLACER [®] and/or WritePlacer [®] Scoring Range	Placement
Freshman Composition and Technical Writing	Writing: 237 – 249 <i>or</i> WritePlacer [®] : 3 – 4	Student will enroll in ENGL 1033 Technical Writing I or ENGL 1113 Freshman Composition I <i>plus</i> the required 2-hour strategies course.
Business Mathematics	Arithmetic: 237 – 249	Student will enroll in MATH 2003 Business Mathematics <i>plus</i> the required 2-hour strategies course.
College Algebra	Quantitative Reasoning, Algebra and Statistics (QAS): 237 – 249	Student will enroll in MATH 1513 College Algebra <i>plus</i> the required 2-hour strategies course.

Prior to December 2018, OSUIT utilized the following ACCUPLACER[®] and/or WritePlacer[®] scores to determine corequisite placement.

Subject(s)	ACCUPLACER [®] and/or WritePlacer [®] Scoring Range	Placement
Freshman Composition and Technical Writing	Writing Skills: 60 – 79 <i>or</i> Writing Skills: 50 – 59 <i>and</i> WritePlacer [®] : 4 or above	Student will enroll in ENGL 1033 Technical Writing I or ENGL 1113 Freshman Composition I <i>plus</i> the required 2-hour strategies course.
Business Mathematics	Arithmetic: 40 – 69	Student will enroll in MATH 2003 Business Mathematics <i>plus</i> the required 2-hour strategies course.
College Algebra	Elementary Algebra: 40 – 73	Student will enroll in MATH 1513 College Algebra <i>plus</i> the required 2-hour strategies course.

I-3. How were students determined to need remediation of deficiencies (e.g., cut scores, multiple-measure metrics, or advising process)?

OSUIT utilizes multiple placement measures to determine a student's academic proficiency in reading, writing, and mathematics. This academic proficiency may be demonstrated in one (1) of the following seven (7) ways:

1. Transferring in college credits that demonstrate academic proficiency in a subject area.
2. Submitting ACT[®] subject scores of 19 or above in subject area(s).
3. Submitting SAT[®] test scores that demonstrate academic proficiency based upon the following subject scores.

Evidence-Based Reading and Writing	480
Math	530

4. Submitting a valid high school transcript reflecting an unweighted cumulative GPA of 2.50 or higher.
5. Submitting Next-Generation ACCUPLACER[®] scores at or above the minimum required score on each component as listed below.

Exam	College-Level Placement Score	Subject(s)
Reading	250	All
Writing <i>or</i> WritePlacer [®]	250 <i>or</i> 5	Freshman Composition and Technical Writing
Arithmetic	250	Business Mathematics
Quantitative Reasoning, Algebra and Statistics (QAS)	250	College Algebra

6. Submitting ACCUPLACER[®] scores at or above the minimum required score on each component as listed below.

Exam	College-Level Placement Score	Subject(s)
Reading Comprehension	75	All
Writing Skills	80 <i>or</i> 70-79 plus WritePlacer [®] score of 5 <i>or</i> above	Freshman Composition and Technical Writing
Arithmetic	70	Business Mathematics
Elementary Algebra	74	College Algebra

7. Submitting COMPASS[®] scores at or above the minimum required score on each component as listed below. (Note: COMPASS[®] scores will only be accepted for placement through Fall 2019.)

Exam	College-Level Placement Score	Subject(s)
Reading Comprehension	81	All
English (Sentence Skills)	74	Freshman Composition and Technical Writing
Arithmetic (Pre-Algebra)	46	Business Mathematics
Elementary Algebra	68	College Algebra
College Algebra	45	College Algebra

Prior to enrollment, students are required to meet with an academic advisor. During this advisement session, factors such as placement assessment scores, high school GPA, intervening time span since the

student's last math and/or writing classes, and student's comfort level with applicable course requirements will be evaluated to determine the most advantageous plan of study for the student. Based upon these factors, a student may be placed and/or opt in to one of the following options:

- direct placement into the appropriate course;
- enrollment into appropriate course plus corequisite strategies support course; or
- enrollment into an appropriate developmental course sequence.

The Next-Generation ACCUPLACER[®] exam is administered online through the OSUIT's Assessment Center and at remote sites approved by the university. This allows students access to testing with flexible hours and at numerous sites, including sites for students living abroad. OSUIT also provides students with additional flexibility in course placement processes by continuing to accept ACCUPLACER[®] and ACT COMPASS[®] scores for up to three years after the exam was administered.

I-4. *What options were available for students to remediate basic skill deficiencies?*

Student Success camps sponsored by the School of Arts & Sciences and the Learning and Student Success Opportunity (LASSO) Center allow new and prospective students to work at their own pace. It is possible for students to complete remediation in as little as one day in this manner. The camps are provided at no cost; however, if students wish to stay on campus, they are responsible for the cost of their lodging and food.

Students are allowed to test three (3) times on each of the Next-Generation ACCUPLACER[®] subtests, with immediate results available upon completion of the test. Student placement information and test scores are saved to computer files, and students are provided with a hard copy of test results. If their scores are below academic proficiency score levels, students are encouraged to improve performance by seeking assistance from advisors or staff in the Assessment Center or LASSO Center, or by pursuing self-directed review and study of the subjects, prior to retesting.

If students are unable to meet the minimum requirements established to indicate academic proficiency, they are placed in one of the following remediation pathways:

- enrollment into appropriate course plus corequisite strategies support course; or
- enrollment into an appropriate developmental course sequence.

With the exception of students enrolled in corequisite developmental coursework, students may enroll in collegiate level courses within the deficiency's discipline area only after the deficiency is satisfied. One-on-one mentoring, tutoring, and academic counseling are available to academically at-risk students while enrolled in developmental courses.

I-5. *Describe analyses and findings of student success in both remedial and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process or approaches to teaching as a result of findings.*

Student success at OSUIT is defined as passing a class with an A, B, C, D or P letter grade.

Student Success, Remedial

Course	Title	Semester	Grade	Grade	Grade	Grade	Total Students	# Passed	% Passed
			AW	P	U	W			
ENGL0102*	Technical Writing Strategies	Fall 18		1	1		2	1	50.00%
		Spr 19	2				2	0	0.00%
		ENGL0102 Subtotal	2	1	1	0	4	1	25.00%
ENGL0112	Freshman Comp Strategies	Sum 18		1	1		2	1	50.00%
		Fall 18	2	16	2	1	21	16	76.19%
		Spr 19		3			3	3	100.00%
		ENGL0112 Subtotal	2	20	3	1	26	20	76.92%
ENGL0143	English Fundamentals	Sum 18		2	1		3	2	66.67%
		Fall 18		21	12		33	21	63.64%
		Spr 19		6	4		10	6	60.00%
		ENGL0143 Subtotal	0	29	17	0	46	29	63.04%
ENGL Total			8	50	21	1	80	50	62.50%
MATH0143	Math Fundamentals	Sum 18		6			7	6	85.71%
		Fall 18	1	19	5		25	19	76.00%
		Spr 19		6	6		12	6	50.00%
		MATH0143 Subtotal	1	31	11	1	44	31	70.45%
MATH0152*	College Algebra Strategies	Sum 18		3			3	3	100.00%
		Fall 18		8	6	6	20	8	40.00%
		Spr 19		2	3	2	7	2	28.57%
		MATH0152 Subtotal	0	13	9	8	30	13	43.33%
MATH0153	Algebra Fundamentals	Sum 18		7	5	2	14	7	50.00%
		Fall 18		19	20	3	42	19	45.24%
		Spr 19		15	7	1	23	15	65.22%
		MATH0153 Subtotal	0	41	32	6	79	41	51.90%
MATH0163	Intermediate Algebra	Sum 18		10	4	3	17	10	58.82%
		MATH0163 Subtotal	0	10	4	3	17	10	58.82%
MATH0202*	Business Math Strategies	Fall 18		4	1		5	4	80.00%
		Spr 19		4	2	1	7	4	57.14%
		MATH0202 Subtotal	0	8	3	1	12	8	66.67%
MATH Total			1	103	59	19	182	103	56.59%
PHYS0123	Science	Sum 18		1			1	1	100.00%
		Fall 18		4	8		12	4	33.33%
		Spr 19		3	3		6	3	50.00%
		PHYS1023 Subtotal	0	8	11	0	19	8	42.11%
PHYS Total			0	8	11	0	19	8	42.11%
READ0143	Applied Reading	Sum 18		3	1		4	3	75.00%
		Fall 18		20	14		34	20	58.82%
		Spr 19		2	5		7	2	28.57%
		READ0143 Subtotal	0	25	20	0	45	25	55.56%
READ Total			0	25	20	0	45	25	55.56%
Grand Total			9	186	111	20	326	186	57.06%

*Corequisite Course

Student Success, College-Level

Course	Title	Semester	Grade								Total			
			A	AW	B	C	D	F	I	W	Students	# Pass	% Pass	
BIOL1014	General Biology (Non-Majors)	Sum 18	12		7	2			1		1	23	21	91.30%
		Fall 18	16		7	2	1	5		2	33	26	78.79%	
		Spr 19	12		9	7	1	6		1	36	29	80.56%	
	BIOL1014 Subtotal		40	0	23	11	2	12	0	4	92	76	82.61%	
BIOL1114	General Biology	Sum 18	14		11	5	3	5		2	40	33	82.50%	
		Fall 18	21	1	28	23	7	24		7	111	79	71.17%	
		Spr 19	22	1	13	9	5	10		2	62	49	79.03%	
	BIOL1114 Subtotal		57	2	52	37	15	39	0	11	213	161	75.59%	
BIOL Total			97	2	75	48	17	51	0	15	305	237	77.70%	
ENGL1033	Technical Writing I	Sum 18	8		14	15	1	7		7	52	38	73.08%	
		Fall 18	8		6	5	3	16		1	39	22	56.41%	
		Spr 19	21	2	42	18	11	9		6	109	92	84.40%	
	ENGL1033 Subtotal		37	2	62	38	15	32	0	14	200	152	76.00%	
ENGL1113	Freshman Composition I	Sum 18	28	3	13	10	1	19		5	79	52	65.82%	
		Fall 18	152	10	80	52	26	71		24	415	310	74.70%	
		Spr 19	62	3	43	22	7	27		5	169	134	79.29%	
	ENGL1113 Subtotal		242	16	136	84	34	117	0	34	663	496	74.81%	
ENGL1213	Freshman Composition II	Sum 18	30		28	20	10	15		12	115	88	76.52%	
		Fall 18	44	2	25	21	9	22		11	134	99	73.88%	
		Spr 19	91	2	84	40	24	34		19	294	239	81.29%	
	ENGL1213 Subtotal		165	4	137	81	43	71	0	42	543	426	78.45%	
ENGL2033	Technical Wrtg II	Sum 18	24		30	14	6	6			80	74	92.50%	
		Fall 18	3		10	10	2	4		2	31	25	80.65%	
		Spr 19	5		13	6	1	4		1	30	25	83.33%	
	ENGL2033 Subtotal		32	0	53	30	9	14	0	3	141	124	87.94%	
ENGL Total			476	22	388	233	101	234	0	93	1547	1198	77.44%	
HIST1483	U. S. History To 1865	Sum 18	4		11	3	1	3		5	27	19	70.37%	
		Fall 18	20		13	8	1	7		2	51	42	82.35%	
		Spr 19	9		6	5		4			24	20	83.33%	
	HIST1483 Subtotal		33	0	30	16	2	14	0	7	102	81	79.41%	
HIST1493	U. S. History Since 1865	Sum 18	82		46	28	7	16		7	186	163	87.63%	
		Fall 18	156	1	84	33	20	44		14	352	293	83.24%	
		Spr 19	110	2	40	23	7	13		11	206	180	87.38%	
	HIST1493 Subtotal		348	3	170	84	34	73	0	32	744	636	85.48%	
HIST Total			381	3	200	100	36	87	0	39	846	717	84.75%	
MATH1513	College Algebra	Sum 18	16		16	15	10	15		7	79	57	72.15%	
		Fall 18	89		61	56	26	68	1	35	336	232	69.05%	
		Spr 19	34		25	28	11	27		15	140	98	70.00%	
	MATH1513 Subtotal		139	0	102	99	47	110	1	57	555	387	69.73%	
MATH2003	Business Mathematics	Sum 18	19		24	22	10	8		2	85	75	88.24%	
		Fall 18	19		32	22	9	16		5	103	82	79.61%	
		Spr 19	31		15	11	13	9		6	85	70	82.35%	
	MATH2003 Subtotal		69	0	71	55	32	33	0	13	273	227	83.15%	
MATH Total			208	0	173	154	79	143	1	70	828	614	74.15%	
Grand Total			1162	27	836	535	233	515	1	217	3526	2766	78.45%	

Section II –General Education Assessment

Administering Assessment

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

Program-level assessment of general education outcomes is conducted as described in each program's academic assessment plan. These assessments were developed by faculty specifically for each Program Outcome. Six Core Outcomes common to all programs of study, based on reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, ethics, diversity, technical competencies, and service learning, grew from this process. All program outcomes were developed from school/program mission and vision statements and were directly linked to the university system missions and visions. These program outcomes are spelled out in the academic assessment plans. A number of courses were added to measure these Core Outcomes as a result of updates to the assessment plans. Student attainment of general education outcomes is measured in alignment with these Core Outcomes, which are also addressed summatively within each of the technical program's assessment plans.

- **Core Outcome 1 – Communication:** Effectively communicate electronically, verbally and in writing. Communication is assessed in ENGL 1033 Technical Writing I, ENGL 1113 Freshman Composition I, ENGL 1213 Freshman Composition II, SPCH 1113 Introduction to Speech Communications, and SPCH 2313 Small Group Communications.
- **Core Outcome 2 – Critical Thinking:** Demonstrate logical, systematic problem-solving techniques. *Critical Thinking* is assessed in BIOL 1114 General Biology and in specific mathematics courses, as determined by the student's program of study.
- **Core Outcome 3 – Ethics and Diversity:** Develop and display a sense of personal, social, and professional ethics, as well as an appreciation of and encouragement for diversity. *Ethics* is assessed in PHIL 1213 Ethics.
- **Core Outcome 4 – History and Government:** Explain the cultural heritage and primary elements of the history and government of the U.S. and its people, including diversity, especially as it impacts one's industry or field of study. *Culture, History, & Diversity* is assessed in HIST 1483 U.S. History to 1865, HIST 1493 U.S. History since 1865, and POLS 1113 U.S. Government.
- **Core Outcome 5 – Technology:** Access and use technology appropriate to one's industry or field of study. *Technology* is assessed in CS 1013 Computer Literacy & Applications.
- **Core Outcome 6 – Service Learning:** Effectively utilize learned technologies and processes to aid various constituencies in both the campus community and local communities. *Service Learning* is assessed in ORIE 1011 College Strategies as provided by the School of Arts and Sciences.

Faculty set a uniform college benchmark: At least eighty percent (80%) of students will complete each assessment at a seventy percent (70%) level of competency or higher (Exception: Additional, more rigorous external criteria were set for Nursing and Culinary Arts programs). OSUIT conducts general education measures for associate degree programs prior to the end of the degree program and for baccalaureate degree programs prior to the completion of seventy credit hours of instruction and at the end of the degree program. Measures include those chosen by faculty to improve teaching and learning in areas such as communication, critical thinking, mathematics, reading, and writing. These assessment

methods have been standardized to ensure that the same assessment instrument is utilized in each course section, regardless of faculty.

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

Formative mid-level assessments of general education outcomes are faculty-developed, faculty-driven, and primarily course-embedded to motivate students to participate to their fullest abilities. Because it is possible in some cases for a student to pass a particular class while not passing the assessment, or to pass the assessment while not passing the class, faculty enter the results of these assessments into the Banner Student Information System at the same time as they report student course grades. Results are tabulated based upon faculty reported results in the database and flagged as a numerical score representing “Pass,” “Fail,” or no score for “Non-Applicable” in the current Banner Student Information System. In addition, individual passing and failing scores are collected in order to utilize the information in revision of assessment processes. In most cases, a passing score is 70 percent or higher; however, the Nursing and Culinary Arts programs require a more rigorous 80 percent to pass.

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

The courses selected for inclusion in the assessment process are core requirements for each program area, thereby providing an opportunity for all students to participate in the assessment process. Assessments are developed as core elements within courses, and each assessment is integrated into the course structure. Assessment instruments are tied to required course components and curriculum requirements to motivate students to participate to their fullest abilities.

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

A review of program assessment data takes place during the summer semester. Changes are made to assessment plans for the next academic year based on assessment data, program advisory group recommendations, classroom observations, and changes within industry. Each assessment is integrated into the course structure. Changes to specific assessment tools within courses, changes to course objectives, ordering of courses, and additional assessment tools occurred in various assessment plans.

No changes were made in response to general education outcomes. The current standards are appropriate for student learning in applicable courses.

Analyses and Findings

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

Core Outcome Assessment Results

OBJECTIVE AND COURSE IN WHICH ASSESSMENT OCCURS			Assessment Results		
			Passed	Total	Pass Percent
#1 COMMUNICATION	ENGL1033	TECHNICAL WRITING I	112	138	81.16%
	ENGL1113	FRESHMAN COMPOSITION I	378	441	85.71%
	ENGL1213	FRESHMAN COMPOSITION II	347	419	82.82%
	ENGL2033	TECHNICAL WRITING II	125	137	91.24%
	ENGL3323	TECHNICAL WRITING III	29	31	93.55%
	SPCH1113	INDRODUCTION TO SPEECH	315	330	95.45%
	SPCH2313	SMALL GROUP COMMUNICATIONS	146	151	96.69%
		SUBTOTAL	1452	1647	88.16%
#2 CRITICAL THINKING	BIOL1114	GENERAL BIOLOGY	173	174	99.43%
	MATH1513	COLLEGE ALGEBRA	190	335	56.72%
	MATH1613	TRIGONOMETRY	0	0	0.00%
	MATH2003	BUSINESS MATH	153	206	74.27%
	MATH2144	CALCULUS I	2	19	10.53%
	MATH2153	CALCULUS II	2	6	33.33%
	MATH3103	DISCRETE MATH	9	19	47.37%
STAT2013	ELEMENTARY STATISTICS	0	0	0.00%	
		SUBTOTAL	529	759	69.70%
#3 ETHICS & DIVERSITY	PHIL1213	ETHICS	421	444	94.82%
		SUBTOTAL	421	444	94.82%
#4 HISTORY AND GOVERNMENT	POLS1113	US GOVERNMENT	436	477	91.40%
	HIST1483	US HISTORY TO 1865	0	0	0.00%
	HIST1493	US HISTORY SINCE 1865	361	400	90.25%
		SUBTOTAL	797	877	90.88%
#5 TECHNOLOGY	CS1013	COMPUTER LITERACY & APPLICATIONS	450	504	89.29%
	ENGL1213	FRESHMAN COMPOSITION II	347	419	82.82%
		SUBTOTAL	797	923	86.35%
#6 SERVICE LEARNING	POLS1113	US GOVERNMENT	436	477	91.40%
	ORIE1011	COLLEGE STRATEGIES	220	275	80.00%
		SUBTOTAL	656	752	87.23%
TOTAL			4652	5402	86.12%

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

Each program within each school has a unique assessment plan. These program-level assessment plans have been developed by faculty teaching courses within specific programs. Assessments are developed as core elements within courses. Each assessment is integrated into the course structure. Courses build upon the learning from previous courses. Students are assessed at multiple levels per the program assessment plan.

For each learning objective, methods are identified that will be used to measure student proficiency (a specific method may assess multiple objectives). Assessments are identified as either formative or summative. Findings are analyzed, and changes recommended, during the summer semester review of program assessment data, which includes consideration of both formative and summative assessment results.

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

Again, each program within each school has a unique assessment plan. These individual assessment plans have been developed by faculty teaching courses within specific programs. Assessments are developed as core elements within courses. Each assessment is integrated into the course structure.

Learning Outcomes - For each program assessment plan, faculty identify fifteen to thirty Program Level Outcomes needed by graduates to be successful working in the professional environment.

Learning Objectives - Learning Objectives are skills needed by graduates to meet each of the stated Program Level Outcomes successfully. Using the concepts of *Introduction*, *Reinforcement*, and *Mastery*, learning objectives are mapped to the appropriate course(s). Each objective is embedded and assessed within at least one (1) program course.

Assessment Methods - Assessment of program outcomes and objectives may include capstone projects, portfolios, performance evaluations, end-of-instruction (EOI) assessments, certification exams, internship evaluations, and written exams as prescribed within each school. These assessment methods have been standardized to ensure that the same assessment instrument is utilized in each course section, regardless of faculty.

Collection Methods - Data is collected each semester from predetermined assessment instruments built into individual courses. The assessment score is recorded by the faculty through the Banner Student Information System and is verified by the Assessment Coordinator.

Revisions - As mentioned previously, a review of program assessment data takes place during the summer semester. Changes to assessment plans for the next academic year are also based on program advisory group recommendations, classroom observations, changes within industry, as well as the assessment data from embedded assessments. Specific changes in general education courses are made to specific assessment tools and course objectives during the program assessment review.

Section III – Program Outcomes

Administering Assessment

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

Assessment by Program

School/Program (Assessments vary by program and are course embedded)		Assessment Results		
School	Program	Total Passed	Total Assessed	Passed Percent
School of Arts & Sciences	AAS Office Info Systems Tech	0	0	0.00%
	AS Allied Health Sciences	263	311	84.57%
	AS Business	337	377	89.39%
	AS Pre-Education	160	187	85.56%
	AS Pre-Education (Elementary)	14	17	82.35%
	AS Pre-Education (Secondary)	26	31	83.87%
	AS Pre-Professional Studies	1030	1191	86.48%
	NDUG General Studies-GENN	4	4	100.00%
	UND General Studies	429	473	90.70%
School of Arts & Sciences Total		2263	2591	87.34%
School of Automotive Tech	AAS Auto Collision Repair Tech	26	32	81.25%
	AAS Auto Serv Tec-Toyota T-TEN	80	88	90.91%
	AAS Auto Srv Tech-Chrysler CAP	58	61	95.08%
	AAS Auto Srv Tech-Ford ASSET	102	115	88.70%
	AAS Auto Srv Tech-GM ASEP	74	85	87.06%
	AAS Auto Srv Tech-Pro-Tech	58	77	75.32%
School of Automotive Tech Total		398	458	86.90%
School of Construction Tech	AAS AC and Refrigeration Tech	485	533	90.99%
	AAS Const Tec-Hi Volt Lineman	553	619	89.34%
	AAS Constrctn Tec-Constrctn Mg	24	28	85.71%
	AAS Construction Technology	523	633	82.62%
	AAS Constructn Tech-Electrical	33	41	80.49%
School of Construction Tech Total		1618	1854	87.27%
School of Culinary Arts	AAS Culinary Arts	507	604	83.94%
	CERT Culinary Certificate 01	3	3	100.00%
	CERT Culinary Certificate 02	3	4	75.00%
School of Culinary Arts Total		513	611	83.96%
School of Diesel & Heavy Equip	AAS Diesel/Hvy Eqp-Aggreko ST	1	1	100.00%
	AAS Diesel/Hvy Eqp-CAT Dealer	129	139	92.81%
	AAS Diesel/Hvy Eqp-Komatsu ACT	102	111	91.89%
	Diesel & Heavy Equip/Truck Tec	113	147	76.87%
	Diesel & Heavy Equip/WEDA Tech	62	67	92.54%
	Diesel & Heavy Equip/WEDA Tech	20	20	100.00%
School of Diesel & Heavy Equip Total		427	485	88.04%

Assessment by Program (continued)				
School	Program	Total Passed	Total Assessed	Passed Percent
School of Energy Technologies	AAS Industrial Maint Tech	309	364	84.89%
	Natural Gas Compression	15	23	65.22%
	Pipeline Integrity Technology	105	128	82.03%
	Power Plant Technology	57	69	82.61%
School of Energy Technologies Total		486	584	83.22%
School of Engineering Tech	AAS Eng-Civil Eng/Surveying	78	89	87.64%
	AAS Eng-Electrical/Electronics	11	16	68.75%
	AAS Eng-Eng Grphs: Desgn/Drft	169	184	91.85%
	AAS Engineering Technologies	422	545	77.43%
	AAS Eng-Instrumental Tech	92	112	82.14%
	AAS Eng-Manufacturing Tech	15	17	88.24%
	AAS Watchmaking & Microtech	15	18	83.33%
	BT Civil Engineering Tech	11	12	91.67%
	BT Instrumentation Eng Tech	74	80	92.50%
School of Engineering Tech Total		887	1073	82.67%
School of Information Tech	AAS Information Technologies	819	981	83.49%
	AS Information Technologies	19	20	95.00%
	BT Information Technologies	616	699	88.13%
School of Information Tech Total		1454	1700	85.53%
School of Nursing & Health Sci	AAS Nursing	453	491	92.26%
	AAS Orthotics and Prosthetics	112	125	89.60%
School of Nursing & Health Sci Total		565	616	91.72%
School of Visual Communications	AAS 3D Modeling and Animation	68	75	90.67%
	AAS Graphic Design Technology	215	246	87.40%
	AAS Photography Technology	15	15	100.00%
School of Visual Communications Total		298	336	88.69%
Grand Total		8909	10308	86.43%

The assessment measures vary from program to program. The measures include portfolios, research papers, persuasive speeches, service learning projects, tests, labs, observation assessments, etc., and are tied to courses within each program. A review of program assessment data takes place during the summer semester. Changes are made to assessment plans for the next academic year based on this data, program advisory group recommendations, classroom observations, and changes within industry.

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

Note: OSUIT's ten academic schools were merged into four schools as of July 1, 2019. Program outcomes are reported under the new school headings.

School of Arts, Sciences, and Health

Arts & Sciences: In all programs (Allied Health Sciences, Business, Enterprise Development, Pre-professional Studies, and Pre-Education) Outcomes were adjusted to reflect commonalities across Arts & Sciences degrees. Three outcomes were selected for particular focus with the plan to add outcomes in the future. A new Outcome was created by committee to provide an additional data point concerning fundamental elements that faculty felt were necessary for an A.S. student transferring after graduation.

Separation of assessment scores (previously averaged) led to more targeted analysis and specific changes. However, the new method for adding assessment scores into the Student Information System may have led to incomplete input of assessment data for the current year; not all faculty entered the same exam scores in their proper entry fields.

Culinary Arts: In Culinary Arts, objectives were added last year to reflect information covered in courses but not reflected in assessments, and new outcomes and objectives were created specifically for the new Baking and Pastry option. However, upon re-evaluation, faculty determined that the assessment plan required revision from its original form to a simpler standard.

Nursing & Health Sciences: In the Nursing program, Outcomes based on review of data and course outcomes for academic year 2018-2019 included results from OSUIT Graduation Surveys and Employer Surveys. Standards remain consistent for graduation rates, NCLEX-RN pass rates, and 12-month employment rates. In O&P, adherence to PPE use and compliance with machine operation rules is challenging to assess in a fair and consistent manner across eight labs and work areas.

School of Creative and Information Technologies

Information Technologies AAS, AS, BT: Starting in 2018, the Computing Accreditation Commission (CAC), which is the technical support for ABET in matters related to IT programs, released a set of changes to their student outcome and performance indicator guidelines. The ABET IT student outcome set (A – N) yielded six program outcomes in addition to the six institutional outcomes; this significantly modifies the assessment matrix for the IT program. Any changes to program outcomes and objectives (what ABET calls performance indicators) are on hold until OSUIT receives word from ABET on our current accreditation duration. If the accreditation expires within three years then significant changes to our measures will happen starting January 2020. If the accreditation expires within the normal six year cycle then changes to our measures will happen starting January 2022.

Visual Communications Technologies: In 3-D Animation and Graphic Design programs, Outcomes were evaluated as sufficient for the current academic year; due to the lack of communication and management from previous faculty responsible for the deployment of assessment instruction, the remaining faculty were uncomfortable making decisions based solely on the data. Data will be revisited at the completion of the next assessment cycle.

School of Engineering and Construction Technologies

Construction Technologies: In Air Conditioning & Refrigeration, evaluation of outcomes led to revision replacing “Perform lab work...” with “Demonstrates skills...”; the former allowed description of the activity without evidence of comprehension. Several objectives were rewritten to make them more measurable.

Energy Technologies: In the Natural Gas Compression program, Outcomes were added and wording was revised. Instructors were tasked with doing a better job entering assessment grades correctly. In the Pipeline Integrity program, additional safety training from industry partners was implemented due to newly emerging safety standards.

Engineering Technologies: In Civil Engineering/Surveying, the program is being evaluated after substantial faculty changes associated with the cancellation of the Civil Engineering BT program; industry partner feedback will advise decisions in revising program outcomes and objectives for 2019-2020. In Engineering Graphics and Design Drafting, formative and summative assessments had been revised during the previous year to challenge students and to have them work in a team environment. Faculty note that the change was effective and yielded positive results, but more data is needed for analysis. In the Electrical-Electronics and Instrumentation, failure of students to turn in lab assignments

led to lower assessment scores, and provision of additional tutoring resulted in score improvements; data was incomplete for some assessments to which faculty have made assurances of improved performance in reporting. No results were available for the IET-BT and Power Plant programs.

School of Transportation and Heavy Equipment

Automotive Technologies: Administrators and faculty determined that there are too many Outcomes and Objectives, and faculty did not know what to assess. Decision was made to develop a new assessment plan that will provide information useful for monitoring and to improve the programs. The 2019-2020 data will be collected and reviewed by program faculty and the Dean and Assistant Dean of the School of Transportation and Heavy Equipment the semester after the affected courses are taught. Faculty in the Chrysler MOPAR program will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Safety during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in the Ford ASSET program will complete a detailed review of outcomes in Ford Information Systems during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in the General Motors ASEP program will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Electrical/Electronics during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in the Pro-Tech program will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Electrical/Electronics during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in the Toyota T-TEN program will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Safety during the summer 2020 review.

Diesel & Heavy Equipment Technologies: Administrators and faculty determined that there are too many Outcomes and Objectives, and faculty did not know what to assess. Decision was made to develop a new assessment plan that will provide information useful for monitoring and to improve the programs. The program faculty and the Dean and Assistant Dean of the School of Transportation and Heavy Equipment collect and review the data during the semester after the affected courses are taught. Faculty in CAT Dealer Prep will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Electrical Safety during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in Komatsu ACT will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Electrical during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in the Truck program will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Electrical during the summer 2020 review. Faculty in Western Equipment Dealers Association (WEDA) will complete a detailed review of outcomes in the areas of Fundamentals and Safety during the summer 2020 review.

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

School of Arts, Sciences, and Health

Arts & Sciences: In Allied Health Sciences, Pre-Education, and Pre-Professional programs, the College Algebra assessment tool was modified and the textbook replaced. In Business, assessment tools were adjusted in ECON 2013 and 2203 to better fit the course objectives. No changes noted in Enterprise Development program.

Culinary Arts: No changes noted.

Nursing and Health Sciences: In Nursing, no instructional changes were noted. In Orthotics & Prosthetics, two new courses were launched for the 2018-2019 academic year: OPT 2422: Lower Extremity Orthotics KAFO and OPT 1412: CAD/CAM for Orthotics and Prosthetics.

School of Creative and Information Technologies

Information Technologies: Student involvement in the lower division courses continues to be a challenge. Projects that take multiple weeks to complete that assess overall understanding of course material are occasionally avoided by sets of students. Plans are underway to introduce mandatory study hall events, linked to the course professional development grade, which encourage students to attend and learn a proactive way to complete major projects. Changes are planned for nine courses; changes include reductions in workload, aligning more class content with associated textbooks, and combining class elements to reduce redundancies.

Visual Communications: No changes noted.

School of Engineering and Construction Technologies

In Air Conditioning & Refrigeration, after discussion, faculty observed or identified several key indicators consistently contributing to student performance issues. Changes based on data included 1) holding students accountable for missed time in the classroom, and 2) increased rigor based on academic expectations of the student rather than student expectations. In Construction Technology with the Construction Management option, data revealed increases in assessment scores; will continue instruction with current curriculum. Construction Technology with the Electrical Construction option, assessment scores need to improve and adjustments to make courses more rigorous may amplify this concern. The addition of a new course, ECNT 2123 Electrical Calculations was added to provide students with additional practice and application of industry-related mathematical operations. In the High Voltage Lineman Program, assessment scores remain around the 90th percentile; replacing climbing equipment with safer equipment led to improved safety and confidence that allowed students to focus more on climbing and learning climbing techniques.

School of Energy Technologies: In Pipeline Integrity program, a change in training methods for leak detection is being implemented. No changes noted for Natural Gas Compression or Power Plant Technologies.

School of Engineering Technologies: No changes noted in Civil Engineering/Surveying, Engineering Graphics & Design Drafting, or Electrical/Electronic Technologies, or Instrumentation Engineering (BT) programs.

School of Transportation and Heavy Equipment

With confirmation of the new Dean for the School of Transportation & Heavy Equipment, departmental leaders determined that the assessment objectives were cumbersome and too numerous for the faculty to get a valid view of strengths and weaknesses in the course offerings. Every program had an assessment plan consisting of 117 pages of objectives. Working with the faculty, the number of objectives was reduced to more accurately reflect the student(s) knowledge of the subject gained through instruction. The new assessment rubric was fashioned with 6 – 8 main objectives with 4-6 sub objectives connected to each main objective.

Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

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

Course Evaluations - At the end of each term (based on eight-week or full semester classes), all students are asked to voluntarily complete a course evaluation for each class in which they are enrolled. Administration of course evaluations using the *Class Climate Course Evaluation System* (Scantron) for all credit bearing classes began in summer 2017 and continues to present. The response rate for academic year 2018-2019 was 46.16 percent.

Graduation Survey - Each graduating student was asked to complete the *Graduation Survey* (previously the Graduate Exit Interview) during his or her last semester at OSUIT prior to graduation. Administrative assistants and program advisors direct students who have applied for graduation to complete a *Graduation Survey* preferably within the last two weeks before graduation. The response rate for academic year 2018-2019 was 58.6 percent, down from 70.4 percent the previous year.

Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) and Priorities Survey for Online Learners (PSOL) - The *SSI* and *PSOL* are nationally recognized instruments comparing institutional data with normative data collected from other institutions for benchmarking purposes. The instruments use Likert-type ratings of satisfaction for comparisons of means while also gathering data on the importance of the mean scores for context. Results from the OSUIT campus were compared to national norms, while single- and multi-year trends within the institution were identified from previous years' administrations of these instruments.

The paper version of the *SSI* was administered in summer 2019; 43 courses were selected using a stratified random sampling method. Administration of the 40-item paper version in summer 2019 yielded a response rate of 84.3 percent, up from 82.6 percent the previous year. The *PSOL* was implemented to gather satisfaction information based on the experiences of students in classes with an online component. All students enrolled in an online, blended, or hybrid course were invited to participate in the online administration of the *PSOL*. The response rate for the 2019 administration of the *PSOL* was 27.4 percent, up from 27.0 percent the previous year.

OSUIT Alumni Survey - The Alumni Survey was developed in-house and includes scales for satisfaction in retrospect with regard to 1) work-related skills, 2) the educational experience, and 3) educational goals, as well as three summary items reflecting overall satisfaction with OSUIT. The response rate for the 2019 Alumni Survey was 14.7 percent, down from 15.5 percent the previous year.

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

Course evaluations were used to elicit discussion between faculty and the deans of their respective schools regarding strengths, challenges, and overall classroom management. Results of course evaluations at OSUIT are not shared publicly.

The satisfaction scales on the Graduation Survey revealed an increase in favorable responses from graduating students in almost every area of the college experience. In terms of academics, highest satisfaction was reported for “Advisement I received on my degree requirements” and “Professionalism of instructors”.

On the *SSI*, OSUIT benchmark comparisons with the national group showed a decrease in student satisfaction this year, but not as much as the dramatic increase in satisfaction observed in 2018. While

trailing behind the national comparison group generally, the scale Academic Advising Effectiveness was not statistically different from the national group for satisfaction this year. Year-to-year comparison at OSUIT yielded statistically significant differences in two areas: satisfaction with Safety and Security improved for 2019 and, to a lesser extent, satisfaction for Campus Services declined in 2019. Campus Security was bolstered by dramatic improvement on scale-specific items “The amount of student parking space on campus is adequate” and “Parking lots are well-lighted and secure.” Although the majority of a protracted parking lot renovation project concluded during the spring term, the degree of positive response was still surprising. On the other hand, decreased satisfaction for Campus Services items placed the focus on 1) providing online access to services, 2) improving access to tutoring services, and 3) making sure the lab equipment and facilities are maintained and current.

For online students responding to the PSOL, OSUIT’s strengths in 2019 reflect a general satisfaction by online learners with choices for course offerings and instructional methods, registration and billing/payment procedures, hands-on experience when appropriate for the program/major, and accessibility of program advisors. Challenges focus more specifically on Instructional Services such as the quality of online instruction, faculty responsiveness to student needs, and providing timely feedback to students on their academic progress. Compared to benchmarks set by the national group, OSUIT online students reported lower satisfaction for faculty responsiveness to student needs, quality of online instruction, clear definition of assignments in the syllabus, and registration issues for online courses.

Alumni expressed the highest levels of satisfaction with their instructors’ knowledge of subject, willingness to help student reach educational and career goals, and being able to reach their educational goals at OSUIT. Lower satisfaction was reported in areas that may differentiate students in technical programs from those in general education majors, particularly in the areas of gaining off-campus field experience and student clubs and organizations, which are seldom included in the general education programs.

The Institutional Research page of the OSUIT website provides links for each of the reports and instruments on satisfaction and engagement mentioned above.

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

In response to feedback received through the instruments listed above, OSUIT completed related projects and has a number of new projects and initiatives in place.

School of Arts, Sciences, and Health

In Arts & Sciences, Culinary Arts, and Nursing & Health Sciences no changes noted.

School of Creative and Information Technologies

Information Technologies: Student involvement in the lower division courses continues to be a challenge. Projects that take multiple weeks to complete that assess overall understanding of course material are occasionally avoided by sets of students. Plans are underway to introduce mandatory study hall events, linked to the course professional development grade, which encourage students to attend and learn a proactive way to complete major projects. Changes are planned for nine courses; changes include reductions in workload, aligning more class content with associated textbooks, and combining class elements to reduce redundancies.

Visual Communications: No changes noted.

School of Engineering and Construction Technologies

Discussions with industry partners on advisory committees addressed issues identified from student feedback. Committee members agreed to support their respective academic programs by providing: 1) Campus seminars on topics related to industry; 2) more opportunities for off-campus site visits; and 3) sessions to help students build resumes and develop interview skills.

School of Transportation and Heavy Equipment

In response to the student engagement and satisfaction assessment, the data led to a number of changes in terms of the deployment and training of human resources.

Assessment Budgets

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

Provide the following information regarding assessment fees and expenditures for 2018-19:

Assessment fees	\$72,000
Assessment salaries	\$97,572
Distributed to other departments	\$0
Operational costs	\$33,300
Total Expenditures	\$130,872

Respectfully submitted November 29, 2019
Curtis Miller, Analyst
OSUIT Office of Institutional Research
(918) 293-5498