OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY-OKMULGEE
ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT OF 2013-2014 ACTIVITY

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

Telephone Number: (918) 293-5498
FAX Number: (918) 296-4606
e-mail: curtis.miller@okstate.edu

November 3, 2014
Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee

Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Entry-Level Assessment

In 2013-2014, Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology (OSUIT) 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 enrolled in college credit courses. Students scoring below the cut score on any sub-test submitted to secondary testing ACT COMPASS testing before placement and enrollment. Students are allowed the option to waive the ACT testing requirement to take the COMPASS test alone. During the 2013-2014 academic year, 1121 subsequently enrolled students took the ACT National, and 480 took the ACT Residual. A total of 1132 students took the COMPASS test.

Students with COMPASS scores below proficiency levels for basic skills were enrolled in developmental courses through the *Learning and Student Success Opportunity (LASSO) Center*. The entry-level course placement process resulted in 275 enrollments in developmental English, 768 enrollments in developmental math, 183 enrollments in developmental reading, and 188 enrollments in developmental science. In all, there were 1414 total enrollments in developmental courses; 887 (62.7 percent) enrollments were successful allowing students to subsequently enroll in college level courses.

Additional entry-level assessments used within select programs at OSUIT include essays, interviews, and background checks. Also, students who are required to obtain a visa to study in the United States are eligible for admission if they show English proficiency by a TOEFL internet-based score of at least 61, TOEFL computer-based score of at least 173, TOEFL paper-based score of at least 500, IELTS score of at least 5.0, or are native English speakers.

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 all programs individually. Five Core Outcomes common to all programs of study, based on reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, ethics, diversity, and technical competencies grew from this process. A sixth Core Outcome, *Service Learning*, arose from the emphasis placed on service learning by the North Central Association of the Higher Learning Commission (NCA-HLC).

All mid-level assessment is course-embedded to motivate students to participate fully. Core Outcomes are assessed in the areas of 1) Communication; 2) Critical Thinking; 3) Ethics and Diversity; 4) History and Government; 5) Technology; and 6) Service Learning.

Mid-level assessment of general education Core Outcomes indicated that OSUIT did not reach the 80 percent benchmark of students in the fall freshmen cohort achieving scores above a minimum 70 percent proficiency; 74.6 percent achieved scores above the 70 percent mark.

Program Outcomes Assessment

Assessment of program outcomes for the 2013-2014 academic year included capstone course grades, portfolios, performance evaluations, end-of-instruction (EOI) assessments, certification exams, internship evaluations, and written exams as prescribed within each division. Overall results indicated that 76.4 percent of students attained at least a 70 percent competency level; although the benchmark is 80 percent of students making a grade of "C" or higher, this still represents a slight improvement over results from the previous year.

Student Satisfaction Assessment

Student satisfaction received renewed emphasis for 2013-2014. A new *Alumni Survey* was introduced this spring. Alumni reported satisfaction with their instructors' willingness to help them meet educational and career goals. Results also revealed that alumni were satisfied with skills gained in the areas of *Professional/Ethical Behavior*, *Communication*, and *Taking Direction from Supervisor*. Student satisfaction items added to the *Alumni Survey* were aligned consistently with the *Graduation Survey* for direct comparison between the two surveys.

New graduates reported satisfaction with the professionalism and quality of instructors within their majors, and their instructors' willingness to help them meet educational and career goals. They also reported satisfaction with Student Services in general. Graduates also reported overall satisfaction with OSUIT in that they achieved their educational goals and gained the proper skills needed for their chosen careers.

Current students were also administered the *Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory* this spring. OSUIT had many strengths including student satisfaction with the availability and knowledge of academic advisors, library resources, personalized attention from admissions staff, registration processes, assessment and course placement procedures, and class scheduling. Students also indicated a desire to have their concerns heard by administrators. However, this benchmark received a higher satisfaction score compared to national results by a full point and had a smaller performance gap. As a result, greater emphasis and effort was placed on providing feedback to students; institutional reports are now being posted on the Institutional Research website.

Student feedback led to renovation projects in Student Union facilities; completed updates to the lounge areas included the installation of numerous pieces of art created by a graduate of OSUIT's Visual Communications program. Renovation projects were also completed in the Culinary Arts "Stateroom" lab, the Visual Communications department, and the auditorium in Covelle Hall. Also, several pieces of equipment were replaced in the wellness center. Other improvements include the relocation of the Natural Gas Compression program which allowed the space to be backfilled by an expanding Southwestern Association Industrial and Farm Equipment program (recently renamed the Western Equipment Dealer Association program) and the Aggreko SelecTech program.

Section I – Entry Level

I-1. How were instruments administered? Entry level, basic-skills assessment instruments (ACT National, ACT Residual, and COMPASS tests) were administered by members of the Assessment Services team in the Assessment and Testing Center using desktop computers to take the tests online. This team administers a variety of assessments for certification and licensing as well as academic, career, and personal development. Program-specific methods such as interviews and essays are administered within academic departments.

I-2. Which students were assessed? During the 2013-2014 academic year, 1121 subsequently enrolled students were administered the ACT National test, 480 the ACT Residual test, and 1125 the COMPASS test. All first-time college students and transfer students with less than 24 college credit hours with the exception of a) students who scored 19 or higher on the ACT, or b) students who were admitted under "Special" or "Adult" admission, were required to take the COMPASS after completing the admission application and before scheduling classes.

I-3. Describe how and when they were assessed, including options for the students to seek retesting, tutoring, or other academic support. The COMPASS is administered as a secondary or alternative assessment of basic skills. This instrument is administered online at the OSUIT campus and at remote sites approved by the college. This allows students access to testing with flexible hours and numerous sites, including students living abroad. Students are allowed to test three times on each of the COMPASS subtests. COMPASS testing provides subtest scores and immediate results 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 significantly below proficiency score levels, students are encouraged 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 and to retest.

Student Success camps sponsored by the Arts & Sciences division and the *Learning and Student Success Opportunity (LASSO) Center* allows students to work at their own pace where they could complete remediation in as little as one day. The camps are provided at no cost; however, if students wish to stay on campus, they are responsible for the costs of their lodging and food. If students choose not to seek assistance or to retest and the score remained below the proficiency level, they are enrolled in the recommended developmental courses taught by professional staff through the LASSO Center. Staff members provide one-on-one mentoring, tutoring, and academic counseling to academically at-risk students while enrolled in developmental courses.

I-4. What were the analyses and findings from the 2013-14 entry-level assessment? A total of 1414 new and continuing students were served in the LASSO Center. The entry-level course placement process resulted in 275 enrollments in developmental English, 768 enrollments in developmental math, 188 enrollments in developmental science, and 183 enrollments in developmental reading. In all, 690 students accounted for 1414 total enrollments in developmental courses for this academic period; of those enrollments, 887 (62.7 percent) were successfully completed leading to subsequent enrollment in college level courses.

An analysis of entry-level assessment revealed that, based on first-time degree-seeking freshmen for the 2013-2014 academic year (n=1127), 185 (16.4 percent) were required to take one developmental course, 99 (8.8 percent) were required to take two developmental courses, 63 (5.6 percent) were required to take three developmental courses, and 484 (42.9 percent) were required to take four developmental courses prior to taking college level coursework. Some students in majors with more rigorous math requirements required remediation in more than one math course; these students were unduplicated and counted only once for this analysis. In sum, 73.7 percent of first-time degree-seeking freshmen were required to remediate in one or more subject areas.

I-5. How was student progress tracked? OSUIT utilized its *Early Alert System*; this is an electronic intervention system used by faculty to alert the system when a student was in danger of failing or not attending classes. When the Early Alert System is activated, faculty send an electronic notice to the Retention Coordinator. The Retention Coordinator then sets up an appointment with the student to discuss possible solutions and refers the student to appropriate academic support services available on the campus. In this way, students in developmental and college-level course work receive support and encouragement to stay on track and receive academic or social interventions as needed.

I-6. 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 as a result of findings. The Assessment Committee and professional staff in the LASSO Center annually review the cut scores for entry-level assessment. Score indicators for the COMPASS placement tests were last revised on February 1, 2011. Although some fluctuation in an open-admission institution may be expected, results showed that there were continuing challenges with remediation and transitioning to college-level coursework. These results have been brought to the attention of both the Assessment Committee and the Academic Council. Alternative placement instruments are currently being examined and discussed for possible usage.

I-7. What other studies of entry-level assessment have been conducted at the institution? During academic year 2013-2014, entry-level assessment was administered at the program level as well as the institutional level for some programs. Program-specific testing is used to determine proficiency in skills needed for industry-specific areas of study. For example, the Nursing program requires 50 percent or better on the Kaplan Admission Test for Reading and Math, and a "C" or higher in all supporting courses. Likewise, the Watchmaking & Microtechnology program requires applicants to pass a hands-on mechanical aptitude test covering visualization, spatial relationships, direction following, reasoning, and problem-solving skills. This test focuses more on spatial perception, observation, and the ability to follow directions than on manual dexterity. In addition, prospective students seeking admission to this program submit a work résumé, letters of recommendation, interview with faculty and industry advisors, submit to a background check, and complete a 200-300 word essay on their preparation for the program as well as their goals and interests. Likewise, programs in Visual Communications utilize a similar portfolio and interview proves for accepting students.

I-8. Describe results. Results provided students with a sense of preparedness for program course work and identified areas in which the students needed to develop or improve skill sets. As an open-admission institution, entry-level assessment does not prevent a student's admittance to this university. However, like the programs in Nursing, Watchmaking & Microtechnology, and Visual Communications, other divisions are looking into using entrance examinations that might lead to improvements in the continuity of programs through better preparedness of students upon entrance into the programs.

I-9. What instructional changes occurred or are planned due to entry-level assessment? The Assessment Committee and the LASSO Center staff continues to monitor COMPASS cut scores for appropriate placement in college-level courses. Score indicators on the COMPASS placement test were revised as of February 1, 2011 and are reviewed annually. Faculty and staff remain responsive to student needs based on review of the data and student feedback. This campus continues to provide access to readiness programs prior to the start of the fall semester.

Students Served in the Learning and Student Success Opportunity (LASSO) Center

Course	Semester	Students	# Passed	% Passed
ENGL0143 English Fundamentals	Summer 2013	**42**	**20**	**47.6**
	Fall 2013	**157**	**101**	**64.3**
	Spring 2014	**52**	**32**	**61.5**
ENGL0153 Applied English	Summer 2013	**-**	**-**	**-**
	Fall 2013	**24**	**19**	**79.2**
	Spring 2014	**-**	**-**	**-**
	total	**275**	**172**	**62.5**
MATH0143 Math Fundamentals	Summer 2013	**38**	**19**	**50.0**
	Fall 2013	**152**	**104**	**68.4**
	Spring 2014	**55**	**37**	**67.3**
MATH0153 Math Fundamentals	Summer 2013	**54**	**29**	**53.7**
	Fall 2013	**146**	**96**	**65.8**
	Spring 2014	**89**	**75**	**84.3**
MATH0163 Algebra Fundamentals	Summer 2013	**44**	**19**	**43.2**
	Fall 2013	**80**	**49**	**61.3**
	Spring 2014	**86**	**63**	**73.3**
MATH0175 Beginning & Intermediate Alg.	Summer 2013	**-**	**-**	**-**
	Fall 2013	**24**	**21**	**87.5**
	Spring 2014	**-**	**-**	**-**
	total	**768**	**512**	**66.7**
PHYS0123 Science	Summer 2013	**36**	**14**	**38.9**
	Fall 2013	**80**	**44**	**55.0**
	Spring 2014	**72**	**46**	**63.9**
	total	**188**	**104**	**55.3**
READ0143 College Reading I	Summer 2013	**22**	**10**	**45.5**
	Fall 2013	**99**	**48**	**48.5**
	Spring 2014	**38**	**20**	**52.6**
READ0153 Applied Reading	Summer 2013	**-**	**-**	**-**
	Fall 2013	**24**	**21**	**87.5**
	Spring 2014	**-**	**-**	**-**
		183	**99**	**54.1**
	Grand Total	**1414**	**887**	**62.7**

Section II — Mid-Level/General Education

II-1. Describe how assessment activities were linked to the institutional general education program competencies. Mid-level assessment of general education Outcomes was conducted as described in each program's academic assessment plan. These assessments were developed by faculty specifically for each Program Outcome. Five Core Outcomes common to all programs of study, based on reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, ethics, diversity, and technical competencies grew from this process. All program outcomes were developed from division and program missions and visions, and these were directly linked to the college and system missions and visions; these 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.

- **Core Outcome 1—Communication:** Effectively communicate electronically, verbally and in writing.
- **Core Outcome 2—Critical Thinking:** Demonstrate logical, systematic problem-solving techniques.
- **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.
- **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.
- **Core Outcome 5—Technology:** Access and use technology appropriate to one's industry or field of study.
- **Core Outcome 6— Service Learning:** Effectively utilize learned technologies and processes to aid various constituencies in both the campus community and local communities.

A uniform college benchmark was set by faculty: *At least 80 percent of students will achieve each Core Outcome and Technical Program Outcome at the 70 percent level of competency or higher.* OSUIT conducts general education measures prior to the end of the degree program for associate degree programs and prior to the completion of 70 hours for students in baccalaureate programs 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.

II-2. Describe how the instruments were administered and how students were selected. Formative mid-level assessments of general education competencies were faculty-developed, faculty-driven, and primarily course-embedded to motivate students to participate to their fullest abilities. Because it was 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 input the results of these assessments into Web-For-Faculty at the same time as they report student course

grades. Results are tabulated based upon faculty reported results in the database and flagged as "Pass", "Fail", or "Non-Applicable" in the current Student Information System.

II-3. Describe strategies to motivate students to participate meaningfully. The Assessment Committee made slight modifications to the General Education Core Competencies this year by adding courses to the analysis and changing the terminology from *objectives* to *outcomes*. *Core Outcome 1, Communication* was assessed formatively with a faculty panel-reviewed student portfolio in *Technical Writing I-III, Freshman Composition I & II, Introduction to Speech,* and *Small Group Communications*. Faculty members required multiple essays, writing samples for this assessment which were course-embedded and motivated students to participate.

Core Outcome 2, Critical Thinking was assessed formatively in all mathematics courses and *General Biology*, and was summatively assessed in all technical programs of study. The final exam in *Business Math, College Algebra, Trigonometry, Calculus I & II, Discrete Math, Elementary Statistics,* and *General Biology* served as mid-level assessments of critical thinking.

Core Outcome 3, Ethics was formatively assessed in PHIL 1213. The final exam served as the mid-level assessment in *Ethics*.

Core Outcome 4, Culture, History, & Diversity was formatively assessed in HIST 1483, HIST 1493, and POLS 1113. The final exams in *Political Science, History to 1865,* and *History Since 1865* served as the mid-level assessment of this Outcome.

Core Outcome 5, Technology was formatively assessed in either CS 1013 or ENGL 1213. An essay assigned in *Freshman Composition II*, course-embedded, served as the mid-level assessment for Technology for programs with this option.

Core Outcome 6, Service Learning was formatively assessed in *Political Science* and *College Strategies*. Students participated in a service learning activity (a community donations activity involving winter holiday gifts) and wrote a paper to reflect on the experience. The requirements of the service learning activity and reflection were the same for all students, regardless of the instructor. These Core Outcomes were also addressed summatively within each of the technical programs.

II-4. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the programs due to mid-level assessment? As prescribed in the college assessment plan, general education competencies and outcomes were evaluated and recorded using Web-for-Faculty to warehouse data. Programs of study with more developed assessment plans kept spreadsheets to record multiple assessments of outcomes. Members of the Assessment Committee continue to facilitate this process within their divisions and seek improvements to make it less labor intensive. The Assessment Committee has also been working to fully implement WEAVEonline for tracking and reporting assessment results.

II-5. What were the analyses and findings from the 2013-14 mid-level/general education assessment? Core competencies in the areas of *Communications, Ethics and Diversity,* and *History and Government* showed marked improvement over last year, while the areas of

Technology and *Service Learning* continue to present challenges. Results will be reviewed by professional staff in the LASSO Center and by members of the Assessment Committee. Focused study of the student cohort, placement test scores, and remediation procedures are recommended to affect improvements.

Mid-Level Formative Assessment, General Education Core Outcomes

Educational Standard: 80 of students will meet or exceed standard at 70 level of performance

Objective and Course in which Assessment Occurs			Assessment Results	
			Pass Ratio	**Pass Percent**
#1 Communication	Technical Writing I	ENGL 1033	175/202	86.6
	Freshman Composition I	ENGL 1113	502/672	74.7
	Freshman Composition II	ENGL 1213	361/492	73.4
	Technical Writing II	ENGL 2033	141/192	73.4
	Technical Writing III	ENGL 3323	51/66	77.3
	Introduction to Speech	SPCH 1113	355/446	79.6
	Small Group Communications	SPCH 2313	233/267	87.3
		Subtotal	**1818/2337**	**77.8**
#2 Critical Thinking	General Biology	BIOL 1114	217/232	93.5
	College Algebra	MATH 1513	221/384	57.6
	Trigonometry	MATH 1613	54/85	63.5
	Business Math	MATH 2003	193/328	58.8
	Calculus I	MATH 2144	34/59	57.6
	Calculus II	MATH 2153	20/35	57.1
	Discrete Math	MATH 3103	39/55	70.9
	Elementary Statistics	STAT 2013	34/52	65.4
		Subtotal	**812/1230**	**66.0**
#3 Ethics and Diversity	Ethics	PHIL 1213	507/628	80.7
		Subtotal	**507/628**	**80.7**
#4 History and Government	US Government	POLS 1113	564/777	72.6
	US History to 1865	HIST 1483	122/171	71.3
	US History Since 1865	HIST 1493	526/648	81.2
		Subtotal	**1212/1596**	**79.9**
#5 Technology	Computer Literacy & Applications	CS 1013	479/672	71.3
	Freshman Composition II	ENGL 1213	361/492	73.4
		Subtotal	**840/1164**	**72.3**
#6 Service Learning	U.S. Government	POLS 1113	564/777	72.6
	College Strategies	ORIE 1011	204/318	64.2
		Subtotal	**768/1095**	**70.1**
		TOTAL	**5957/8050**	**74.0**

Section III-1: Program Outcomes

(List, in table format, assessment measures and number of individual assessed for each major field of study.)

Division	Program	#Assessments	Passed (A, B, C)	Failed (D, F, W)	Not Tested	Assessment Measures
Arts & Sciences	Allied Health Sciences A.S.	627	359	154	114	Core Outcomes Assessment
	Business A.S.	553	285	134	134	Core Outcomes Assessment; ECON 2103, 2203; ACCT 2103, 2203
	Enterprise Development A.S.	24	16	3	5	Core Outcomes Assessment; ECON 2103, 2203; ACCT 2103, 2203
	Office Information Systems A.A.S.	38	25	9	4	Core Outcomes Assessment
	Pre-Education A.S.	785	422	193	170	Core Outcomes Assessment
Automotive Service Technologies	Automotive Collision Repair A.A.S.	36	36	0	0	Capstone Grades
	Automotive Service A.A.S.	56	55	1	0	Capstone Grades, Internship Evaluations
College of the Muscogee Nation	Gaming A.A.S.	53	14	17	22	Core Outcomes Assessment
Construction Technologies	Air Conditioning & Refrigeration A.A.S.	54	48	6	0	Capstone Grade, Internship Evaluations
	Construction Technology A.A.S.	98	96	2	0	Capstone Grade, Internship Evaluations
Culinary Arts	Culinary Arts A.A.S.	36	35	1	0	Capstone Grade
Engineering Technologies	Engineering Technologies A.A.S.	45	45	0	0	Capstone Grade
	Civil Engineering Technology B.T.	10	7	3	0	Capstone Grades; also, CET 3114, 3123, 4213, 4413
	Instrumentation Engineering Technology B.T.	30	30	0	0	Capstone Grade
Diesel and Heavy Equipment Technologies	Diesel & Heavy Equipment Technology A.A.S.	139	136	3	0	Capstone Grades, Internship Evaluations

Section III-1: Program Outcomes (continued)

Division	Program	#Assessments	Passed (A, B, C)	Failed (D, F, W)	Not Tested	Assessment Measures
Information Technologies	Information Technologies A.A.S./A.S.	210	144	66	0	End of Instruction Grades
	Information Technologies B.T.	125	113	12	0	Capstone Grades
Nursing & Health Sciences	Nursing A.A.S.	51	48	3	0	Internship Evaluations
	Orthotics & Prosthetics A.A.S.	15	12	3	0	Internship Evaluations
Visual Communications Technologies	Graphic Design A.A.S.	11	11	0	0	Capstone Grade, Internship Evaluations
	3D Modeling & Animation A.A.S.	15	15	0	0	Capstone Grade
	Photography A.A.S.	16	16	0	0	Capstone Grade
Watchmaking	Watchmaking & Microtechnology	5	5	0	0	Capstone Grade
	Total	**3032**	**1973**	**610**	**449**	

III-2. What were the analyses and findings from the 2013-14 program outcomes assessment? Out of 3032 potential summative assessments for academic and technical programs across campus, 2583 summative assessments were completed prior to graduation. Assessment of program outcomes for the 2013-2014 academic year included capstone course grades, portfolios, performance evaluations, and written exams where appropriate, as well as end-of-instruction (EOI) assessments in non-capstone courses, certification exams, and internship evaluations. Overall results indicated that 76.4 percent of students achieved at least a 70 percent competency level of student achievement based on the number of assessments passed divided by the sum of assessments taken.

III-3. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the programs due to program outcomes assessment? The academic leadership reviews assessment results of program outcomes on a regular basis and works with the faculty in the different programmatic areas to implement improvements to existing curricula. To assist in this effort, during this last year the University implemented a centralized program assessment plan process. The University wide assessment process standardized the process for faculty across all programs in both implementation and acceptance. The Assessment Committee made reporting of student outcomes a major point of emphasis. Most changes recommended and made by faculty

consisted of procedural changes and adjustments to assessments. Comprehensive assessment plans have been completed and are currently being implemented during the 2014-2015 academic year using the WEAVEonline assessment product.

The Assessment Committee has improved this data gathering process by collecting the data for multiple assessments in spreadsheets until such time as the campus assessment and planning management software can be fully implemented or the system database becomes more accommodating. Currently, the assessment data as it resides in the system database does not provide for multiple assessment scores within a particular course, and many courses have multiple assessments embedded in the curriculum. Preparations are underway for a major migration from SCT+ to *Banner:* a more current database management system that may allow better documentation and analysis of assessment data in the future.

Section IV: Student Satisfaction

IV-1. How were the students selected? Instructor/Course Surveys were available online to all classes each semester. Instructors were encouraged to have students complete the surveys online. Students (duplicated) completed 4749 course evaluations for a response rate of 18.7 percent.

The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory (SSI) was reinstated on this campus for spring 2014. However, instead of the traditional 70-item form in hardcopy, the shorter 40-item form B was administered online. Rather than interrupt classes, voluntary participation was encouraged through marketing efforts that included campus-wide emails, electronic newsletters, and physical signage throughout the Student Union, the academic divisions, and dormitories. Instructors were encouraged to offer extra credit for participation. The participation rate was 17.9 percent; however, where extra credit incentives were offered, participation greatly exceeded the participation rate goal of 20%. As a result, this campus will either offer incentives to increase online participation or return to paper administration in selected classes to achieve adequate participation in the future.

Satisfaction items were added to the Graduation Survey (previously Graduate Exit Interview), and similar items were included in a new Alumni Survey, both administered over the spring semester. All graduating students were encouraged to complete the Graduation Survey prior to commencement, and 537 of 687 graduates completed the surveys for a response rate of 78 percent. Alumni were less forthcoming; out of 737 invitations to respond, 66 completed the Alumni Survey for a response rate of almost nine percent. Alumni, students, and other stakeholders have been given access to the reports on the OSUIT Institutional Research website; hopefully, this will encourage better participation in forthcoming administrations of all student satisfaction measures.

IV-2. What were the analyses and findings from the 2013-14 student satisfaction assessment? Instructor/Course Surveys were used by division chairs within their divisions to provide discussion points for feedback sessions with individual faculty. Students were also invited to provide comments regarding anything not covered by the survey. Graduation Surveys also provided opportunities for graduating students to express themselves upon completion of

their degrees through the comment section of the form. Alumni Surveys were aligned with Graduation Surveys for reliable comparisons.

Results from the alumni survey support the success and accomplishments of the University as 81% of respondents reported successful employment within one month of graduation; with 92% of respondents reporting successful employment within 3 months of graduation. Alumni reported satisfaction with *Instructors' willingness to help me meet educational goals* and *Instructors' willingness to help me meet career goals*. Alumni also positively reported, to the percentage indicated, that their educational experience at OSUIT helped them improve skills in the following areas: professional/ethical behavior 95%, analytical skills 89%, communication skills 94%, problem-solving 91%, independent decision-making 92%, and teamwork 93%.

Student satisfaction items were added to the *Graduation Survey* to align with *Alumni Survey* items. Results revealed that alumni gained skills in the areas of *Professional/Ethical Behavior*, *Communication*, and *Taking Direction from Supervisor*. New graduates reported satisfaction with the professionalism and quality of their instructors, and with Student Services in general. These graduates also reported overall satisfaction with OSUIT in that they achieved their educational goals and gained the proper skills needed for their chosen careers.

Current students were also administered the *Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory* this spring. OSUIT had many strengths including student satisfaction with the availability and knowledge of academic advisors, library resources, personalized attention from admissions staff, registration processes, assessment and course placement procedures, administrators' availability to hear students concerns, and class scheduling. While students reported positively towards administrators' availability to hear concerns, students also reported this as an area of importance. As a result, greater emphasis and effort was placed on providing feedback to students; reports are now being posted on the Institutional Research website.

The largest performance gaps on the SSI comprehensive topic scale were found in *Safety and Security* (gap=.93), *Student Centeredness* (gap=.85), and *Admissions and Financial Aid Effectiveness* (gap=.85). Results were not significantly different from the national norms for *Safety and Security* and *Student Centeredness*; however, campus ratings for *Admissions and Financial Aid Effectiveness* were higher ($\alpha<.05$) than national norms for other community colleges, and ratings for *Academic Advising Effectiveness* were significantly higher ($\alpha<.001$) as well.

IV-3. What changes occurred or are planned due to student satisfaction assessment?
Student satisfaction became a focus of efforts this year as part of the overall strategic plan; results were reported to the Administrative Council on 09/09/2014, and to Senior Administration on 09/22/2014. A measure of student engagement will be included for spring 2015 with administration of the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE).

Reallocation of space continues as the Chesapeake Energy Center, the new facility for the Natural Gas Compression program, allowed other departments and programs to backfill the vacated areas, such as the Southwestern Association Industrial and Farm Equipment program (recently renamed the Western Equipment Dealer Association program) and the Aggreko

SelecTech program. Space was allocated to the Pipeline Integrity program, with sponsorship from the Gas Processors Association and Gas Processors Suppliers Association, for the GPA/GSPA Midcontinent Chapter Classroom. Renovations were completed in the cafeteria, service, and lounge areas in the student union and were featured in the September 2014 edition of *On-Campus Hospitality*, a national trade magazine. Updates include the installation of numerous displays of "pop impressionism" artwork by alumnus John Hammer, a graduate of OSU Institute of Technology's Visual Communications program. A twenty-five year campus master plan was also developed giving vision and guidance to the administration with an eye toward OSUIT's future as it relates to both academics and our relationship with the surrounding community.

Quality of life issues continue to be addressed with particular emphasis on wellness following the wellness initiatives of the main campus in Stillwater. Some of the benefits that OSUIT offers to students and employees include health screenings, workplace health and nutrition education, opportunities for physical fitness and wellness activities, management support for healthy workplace environments, tobacco cessation programs, and leadership in wellness activities within local communities.

Oklahoma HIGHER EDUCATION

Oklahoma Education Information System

OEIS

Annual Student Assessment Report 2013-2014 Activity

Reporting the assessment activities on your campus follows the regimen established with the 2006-07 survey format. As much as feasible, lists and numerical information will be collected using this form. Answers to narrative questions are to be submitted via email attachments or ftp.

Please submit your survey responses by **November 10, 2014**. The 2011-12 Annual Student Assessment Report can be viewed using the following link:

Annual Student Assessment Report

Institution Oklahoma State University Institute of Technology-Okmulgee

Contact Curtis Miller

Contact phone (918) 293-5498

Contact email curtis.miller@okstate.edu

SECTION I

Entry-Level Assessment

Select all methods used for entry-level course placement.

- ☑ ACT Subscore
- ☑ Interviews
- ☑ Secondary test
- ☑ Other, describe briefly: Essays in specific technical programs
- ☑ Other, describe briefly: OSBI background checks in specific technical programs
- ☑ Other, describe briefly: TOEFL for ESL students

List the instruments and cut-scores used as secondary tests for each subject area and course. Please report the cut-scores for each section if the instrument contains multiple sections. If tests are used in combination use multiple lines and explain in the Section I comments.

***NOTE: The three highlighted rows provide examples**

TEST BATTERY	TEST	CUT-SCORE	COURSE
COMPASS	Pre-Algebra	< 45	Developmental Math
CPT	Elementary Algebra	85-125	College Algebra
ASSET	Writing Skills	> 76	English Composition I
TEST BATTERY	**TEST**	**CUT-SCORE**	**COURSE**
ACT	English	<19	COMPASS testing required
ACT	Math	<19	COMPASS testing required
ACT	Reading	<19	COMPASS testing required
ACT	Science Reasoning	<19	COMPASS testing required

COMPASS	Reading Comprehension	<81	READ 0143 Reading Fundamentals
COMPASS	Writing Skills	74-96	ENGL 1033 or ENGL 1113
COMPASS	Writing Skills	<74	ENGL 0143 English Fundamentals
COMPASS	Pre-Algebra	<46	MATH 0143 Math Fundamentals
COMPASS	Algebra	45-67	MATH 0163 Intermediate Algebra
COMPASS	Algebra	<45	MATH 0153 Algebra Fundamentals
COMPASS	College Algebra + Reading	>125	Entry level for science courses
COMPASS	Algebra + Reading	>148	Entry level for science courses
COMPASS	College Algebra	>44	MATH 1513 College Algebra
COMPASS	College Algebra	>86	Advanced Standing Credit
COMPASS	Writing Skills	>96	Advanced Standing Credit
COMPASS	Pre-Algebra	>45	MATH 2003 Business Math
COMPASS	Algebra	>67	MATH 1513 College Algebra

In the space provided, please briefly (250 words or less) provide any details you feel are necessary regarding the information provided in SECTION I.

Science proficiency determined by adding COMPASS Reading score to either Algebra or College Algebra score; passing score on math and reading components required. Other qualifications in particular technical programs included industry-specific requirements such as interviews, essays, measures of manual and mechanical adeptness, and OSBI background checks.

SECTION II

Mid-Level Assessment/General Education

List measures used to assess reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, and other institutionally recognized general education competencies.

MEASURE	# OF STUDENTS ASSESSED	HOW WERE STUDENTS SELECTED

Communication: Technical Writing I, Technical Writing II, Technical Writing III, Freshman Composition I, Freshman Composition II, Introduction to Speech, Small Group Communications	2337	Assessments were embedded near or at the end of these courses. Students who completed these courses would be expected to complete the assessments as well.
Critical Thinking: General Biology, College Algebra, Trigonometry, Business Math, Technical Calculus I and II, Discrete Math, Elementary Statistics	1230	Assessments were embedded near or at the end of these courses. Students who completed these courses would be expected to complete the assessments as well.
Ethics and Diversity: Ethics, Ethics of Leadership	628	Assessments were embedded near or at the end of these courses. Students who completed these courses would be expected to complete the assessments as well.
Culture, History, and Diversity: U.S. History to 1865, U.S. History Since 1865, U.S. Government	1596	Assessments were embedded near or at the end of these courses. Students who completed these courses would be expected to complete the assessments as well.
Technology: Computer Literacy and Application, Freshman Composition II	1164	Assessments were embedded near or at the end of these courses. Students who completed these courses would be expected to complete the assessments as well.

In the space provided, please briefly (250 words or less) provide any details you feel are necessary regarding the information provided in SECTION II.

Service Learning was also included in the General Education Mid-level Assessment. This outcome was assessed in U.S. Government (POLS1113) and College Strategies (ORIE1011). There were 1095 students assessed in these courses.

SECTION III

License or Certification Assessment

For programs requiring license or certification, list the number of students taking the licensing exam and the number who passed for the ten programs with the largest number of completers.

PROGRAM	# TAKING EXAM	# PASSING
Air Conditioning & Refrigeration Program: EPA Certification	38	34
Culinary Arts Program: ServSafe Certification	101	75

In the space provided, please briefly (250 words or less) provide any details you feel are necessary regarding the information provided in SECTION III.

EPA Certification in the Air Conditioning and Refrigeration program resulted in an 89 percent pass rate. The ServSafe Food Protection Manager Certification Examination was administered seven times during the academic year with an average exam score of 78% and a 74.3 percent pass rate.

SECTION IV

Student Satisfaction/Engagement Assessment

List assessment activities that were used to measure student satisfaction/engagement and how many students were assessed.

ACTIVITIES	# OF STUDENTS
Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory	432
Graduation Survey (in-house instrument)	338
Alumni Survey (in-house instrument)	66
Instructor/Course Survey (course evaluations, in-house)	4749

In the space provided, please briefly (250 words or less) provide any details you feel are necessary regarding the information provided in SECTION IV.

Number of students responding to the Instructor/Course Survey is NOT unduplicated. Due to procedures implemented to ensure anonymity, these results reflect individual students potentially completing a survey for every class in which they enrolled.

SECTION V

Graduate Student Assessment

Only institutions that charged graduate students the student assessment fee in 2012-12 should respond to this section of questions.

ACTIVITIES	# OF STUDENTS

In the space provided, please briefly (250 words or less) provide any details you feel are necessary regarding the information provided in SECTION V.

Not applicable

SECTION VI

Assessment Budget

PLEASE ROUND ALL AMOUNTS TO THE NEAREST WHOLE DOLLAR and EXCLUDE COMMAS.

List the amount of assessment fees collected at your institution. $ 84278

How much was budgeted for assessment salaries (including benefits) within the assessment office? $ 108936

How much was distributed to other departments for assessment activities? $ 0

How much was budgeted for operational costs (including licensing fees for test instruments)? $ 24835

In the space provided, please briefly (250 words or less) provide any details you feel are necessary regarding the information provided in SECTION VI.

Actual salaries for FY14 totaled $114,556.

To save your data or to submit the completed form, please verify that your assigned login and password are in the appropriate spaces below and click either the save or submit button.

Assigned Login: OSU-Okmulgee

Assigned Password: •••••

Clear form without saving | Save | Submit Completed Form