

ASSESSMENT PLAN EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY
Claremore, Oklahoma

Office of Institutional Research,
Planning and Assessment

Approved May 2003

Edited 2007

Edited 2009



Rogers State University Assessment Plan Executive Summary

Approved May 2003

Edited July 2009

Rogers State University Mission Statement and Purposes

Rogers State University is a regional university, located in northeastern Oklahoma, governed by the Board of Regents of the University of Oklahoma, within a state system coordinated by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. As a university, we are committed to the preservation, transmission, and advancement of knowledge.

Our Mission:

Our mission is to ensure students develop the skills and knowledge required to achieve professional and personal goals in dynamic local and global communities.

Our commitment:

- To provide quality associate, baccalaureate, and graduate degree opportunities and educational experiences which foster student excellence in oral and written communications, scientific reasoning, and critical and creative thinking.
- To promote an atmosphere of academic and intellectual freedom and respect for diverse expression in an environment of physical safety that is supportive of teaching and learning.
- To provide a general liberal arts education that supports specialized academic programs and prepares students for lifelong learning and service in a diverse society.
- To provide students with a diverse, innovative faculty dedicated to excellence in teaching, scholarly pursuits, and continuous improvement of programs.
- To provide University-wide student services, activities, and resources that complement academic programs.
- To support and strengthen student, faculty, and administrative structures that promote shared governance of the institution.
- To promote and encourage student, faculty, staff, and community interaction in a positive academic climate that creates opportunities for cultural, intellectual, and personal enrichment for the University and the communities it serves.

2.0 Principles and Purposes of Assessment at Rogers State University

Purpose of Assessment: To measure student learning in order to improve student academic achievement and development. The goals of this Assessment Plan are: (1) to provide a means to systematically, strategically, and continually evaluate and document the degree to which the institution is accomplishing the mission and goals it has set; and (2) to assess student learning in order to determine if learning has occurred; and (3) to increase the university's capacity to adapt to a rapidly changing environment in a planned and orderly fashion.

Principles of Assessment:

1. The value of informed assessment and subsequent planning will serve as a basis for institutional and program effectiveness.
2. The assessment plan will provide a context for developing and reviewing institutional and departmental mission statements, goals, and objectives.
3. The plan will provide a useable body of knowledge to strengthen services, instruction, and institutional planning.
4. The plan will link assessment to program review, instructional and student support improvement, institutional strategic planning, and the budgeting process.
5. Departmental assessment plans will include multiple measures of cognitive skills, attitudes/values, and behaviors described in program outcomes.
6. Departments will use the information from assessment to enhance student academic achievement and

- to support student retention.
7. Data from assessment is to be used as a means to identify the need for faculty and staff development activities, which will enhance the institution's ability to meet student needs.

2.1 Assessment Committee Mission & Purposes

The mission of the Assessment Committee is to support the University by guiding and evaluating the learning outcome assessment process.

Purposes:

1. To provide the leadership necessary to maintain and refine a continuous process of institutional assessment, evaluation, and improvement.
2. To provide guidance to institutional assessment at each of the four levels: Entry-level, Mid-level (general education), Exit-level (Program Outcomes), and Student Satisfaction.
3. To operationally define efficiency and effectiveness criteria to be used for evaluating the content of academic departmental assessment plans and reports.
4. To support institutional assessment and program review processes.
5. To annually review and revise the committee's guidance and evaluation system.
6. To evaluate linkages between the University, school, department, and program mission, purpose, and goals.

3.0 Entry Level Assessment

The purpose is to ensure that entering students have the best possible chance of success in attaining their academic goals. Entry-Level Assessment results are used in the placement and advisement process in order to ensure that students enroll in courses appropriate to their skill level. As students matriculate through their academic programs, their progress is tracked and the information gained is used to evaluate and strengthen programs and services. An important component of entry-level assessment is the provision of student support activities. This requires intensive collaboration among the Assessment Committee, the Curriculum Committee, the Enrollment Management Committee and the Office of Student Affairs.

The specific priorities for entry-level assessment are to:

1. Ensure that entering students have basic skills adequate to succeed in college.
2. Improve retention rates of entering students as they matriculate through the system.
3. Provide entering students with experiences that will help them clarify their educational and personal goals.
4. Evaluate the effectiveness of the entry-level assessment/placement process.
5. Provide university-wide student support services, activities, and resources which complement academic programs
6. Strengthen the delivery of student services to improve access, placement, and advisement through integration of assessment and activities with emphasis on at-risk students
7. Produce useable centralized, qualitative and quantitative information for use in institutional decision making

3.1. Methodology

All students entering Rogers State University for the first time are required to participate in entry-level assessment. Students under 21 years of age are to present ACT scores before enrollment. Students 21 or over must submit ACT scores or participate in RSU's secondary assessment by taking the ACT Computer Adaptive Placement and Support System (COMPASS) Test, and the Stanford Test of Academic Skills-Science subtest. First-time students who have obtained ACT subtest scores of 19 and above in the four subject areas of science reasoning, mathematics, reading, and English, or who have successfully completed coursework in one or more of these four areas, are allowed to enroll in credit level collegiate work in the respective areas. Students not meeting the described ACT competencies described above must participate in secondary testing for those areas in which the student scored below 19 on the ACT subtest. An additional

assessment test is administered to students who are placed in basic skills courses. This pretest serves two purposes. First, it allows another measure by which to assess the student's level of competency in the four respective areas. Second, it affords the instructor the opportunity to evaluate the student's mastery of course objectives and to pinpoint where additional support might be needed. A posttest is administered to students as they exit basic skills courses. This allows a comparison of pre and posttest scores in order to evaluate the attainment of course skills and objectives and provides a basis for making decisions to improve instruction.

3.2 Responsibility for Collecting and Disseminating Entry-level Assessment Findings, Interpretations, and Conclusions

The Admissions Office is responsible for collecting ACT scores and documentation of previous course work. Students not meeting basic skills competencies by one of these two means are referred to the Testing Center. Testing Center personnel are then responsible for administering secondary instruments, collecting assessment results, and reporting those results to Admissions and the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment, Planning and Assessment. In addition, this office inputs individual scores into the student information system for tracking purposes. The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment, Planning and Assessment analyzes entry-level assessment data and reports the results on an annual basis to the administration and to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education. The Assessment Committee is responsible for monitoring entry-level assessment activities and makes recommendations for modifications to the process.

3.3 Plan for Academic Modification to improve student academic achievement

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment collects data necessary for making informed changes to improve instruction and student services. Specifically, changes are made to ensure that entering students have the necessary skills and are provided with the support needed to succeed academically. Students are encouraged to work closely with advisors throughout their academic careers to assist them in making appropriate short and long term academic decisions. The Academic Departments, the Assessment Committee, and the Curriculum Committee recommend program or process changes to improve student academic achievement, and to enhance student service.

3.4 Plan for Assessment Plan Modification

The Assessment Committee is responsible for the evaluation and modification of entry-level assessment/placement processes. The committee will make decisions to maximize student success by assessing the validity of current cut-scores and placement procedures; examining whether current assessment instruments are measuring skill competencies as determined for mastery of subsequent college-level work; and evaluating the effectiveness of current measures of student satisfaction in regard to activities that impact students upon entry to the institution.

3.5 New Assessment Efforts

RSU bears a responsibility to provide programs of support, which address the educational, vocational, physical, social, and financial needs of its students. Addressing these needs should improve student retention.

Priorities will be to:


1. Determine the effectiveness of current cut-scores and assessment instruments
2. Coordinate assessment initiatives with the College Success Course to provide a means of gathering important entry-level assessment data.
3. Assess the effectiveness of basic skills courses in preparing students for more advanced course work.
4. Analyze data as it is collected to determine patterns of evidence related to entry-level assessment/placement and in the context of a building a strong foundation for student success at all levels of assessment.

3.6 Budget

As new needs are identified at this level by the Assessment Committee, the budget for entry-level assessment activities will be considered in a larger context of institutional-wide assessment budget needs. Each academic and service unit follows the procedure described below to link planning and decision-making to assessment data and analysis, budget priorities, and planning processes. Units use assessment results to set priorities for future planning and budget requests.

- Examine priorities in light of current resources with a vision toward future need.
- Focus on the most immediate need and the impact to improvement of student learning.
- Consider viable alternatives before considering budgetary requests.
- Adopt a number of strategies for implementing programmatic initiatives in order to conserve resources.
- Consider alternate implementation timelines in the case of limited funding.
- Develop capital requests, and/or budgetary requests after a thorough examination of assessment data, alternative solutions, and prioritization of needs.
- Demonstrate how budgetary funding will provide a solution to identified priorities.

Strategic Planning Process



4.0 Mid-level Assessment

RSU's Mid-Level Assessment of General Education. The administration, Academic Departments, the University Assessment Committee and the Curriculum Committee share responsibility for general education at the institutional level, and recommend changes to strengthen general education. The processes followed by these two committees ensure the linkage between the institutional mission and the nine general education outcomes and supporting performance goals adopted by the faculty. The specific mission, student outcomes, and supporting performance goals for general education are:

Mission of General Education: General Education at Rogers State University is a shared set of experiences that imparts knowledge, skills, and perspectives necessary for lifelong learning and productive citizenship in a dynamic and global society.

General Education Outcomes: Acknowledging that critical and creative thinking are encouraged by all of the following, the specific student outcomes for General Education are to:

1. Use and analyze written and spoken English effectively.

Core General Education Courses:

ENGL 1113, ENGL 1213; SPCH 1113

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 1.1 Students will use the writing process to produce a coherent written product.
- 1.2 Students will synthesize information from various sources in order to create a research project.
- 1.3 Students will effectively express ideas through oral presentations.
- 1.4 Students will successfully analyze and evaluate written, oral, and visual communication.

2. Demonstrate knowledge of and application of scientific principles and recognize the role of science in our society.Core General Education Courses:

PHYS 1014, GEOL 1014, PHYS 1114, GEOL 1114, GEOL 1124, GEOL 1224, CHEM 1315; BIOL 1114, BIOL 1144, BIOL 1134, GEOL 2124, BIOL 3104

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 2.1 Students will demonstrate use of scientific method.
- 2.2 Students will acquire basic content knowledge of sciences.
- 2.3 Students will apply scientific principles to solve practical problems.
- 2.4 Students will demonstrate an appreciation of science and the world around them.

3. Apply mathematics and logic to problem solving.Core General Education Courses:

MATH 1503, MATH 1513, MATH 1613, MATH 2264, MATH 1715, PHYS 1014, PHYS 1114, CHEM 1315

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 3.1 Students will demonstrate quantitative competency.
- 3.2 Students will apply a variety of mathematical techniques to solve problems.
- 3.3 Students will use mathematical concepts to comprehend, interpret and communicate quantitative information across various contexts.

4. Gain a perspective on the humanities and recognize their value to individuals and society.Core General Education Courses:

PHIL 1113, ENGL 2613, ART (HUM) 1113, MUSC (HUM) 2573, HUM 2113, HUM 2223, HUM 2893, COMM (HUM) 2413

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 4.1 Students will acquire basic content knowledge of the humanities.
- 4.2 Students will use their knowledge of the humanities to produce a comprehensive project.
- 4.3 Students will develop an appreciation for the humanities.

5. Demonstrate knowledge of the history and functions of social institutions.Core General Education Courses:

HIST 2483, HIST 2493, POLS 1113; PSY 1113; SOC 1113; ECON 2113, ECON 2123

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 6.1 Students will demonstrate knowledge of democratic societies.
- 6.2 Students will identify major political trends, events, and personalities.
- 6.3 Students will demonstrate knowledge of major historical periods.
- 6.4 Students will identify political systems, and processes.
- 6.5 Students will demonstrate an understanding of the history and major social trends of family, education, politics, economics or religious institutions.

6. Demonstrate knowledge of diverse human values, beliefs, and behaviors.Core General Education Courses:

LANG 1113, SPAN 1113, NAMS 1143, PHIL 1313, HIST 2013, HIST 2023, GEOG 2243, NAMS 2503, HUM 2113, HUM 2223, HUM 3633, POLS 3053, PSY 1113, BIOL 3104, ECON, 3003, HUM 3633, SOC 3213

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 7.1 Students will acquire basic content knowledge of the relevant culture(s).
- 7.2 Students will critically compare and contrast their own culture with that of others.
- 7.3 Students will recognize differences in and develop an appreciation of the customs, practices, and values of various cultural groups.

7. Demonstrate knowledge of the meaning and purpose of the arts.Core General Education Courses:

ART (HUM) 1113, MUSC (HUM) 2573, ENGL 2613, HUM 2113, HUM 2223, HUM 2893

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 8.1 Students will analyze, interpret, and respond to selected works of art.
- 8.2 Students will acquire basic content knowledge of selected fine arts.

8. Demonstrate knowledge of the relationship among people and their physical and social environments.Core General Education Courses:

PSY 1113, SOC 1113, ECON 2113, ECON 2123,

Supporting Performance Goals:

- 9.1 Students will understand the individual's behavior, his or her roles, and responsibilities to society.
- 9.2 Students will demonstrate knowledge of the forces shaping and altering society.
- 9.3 Students will demonstrate an awareness of ethical issues.
- 9.4 Students will report the impact of science on their lives and their impact on the environment.

4.1 Methodology

Rogers State University approaches general education assessment from three perspectives: course-embedded measures, external benchmarks, and student satisfaction. Assessment of general education involves both formative and summative assessment measures. Methodologies include focus groups, artifact sampling, pre-post tests, student surveys, and exit tests. To ensure alignment with the eight general education outcomes outlined in 4.0 above, each department is asked to submit a General Education Course Assessment Report for general education courses within their respective disciplines. The report must be submitted to the Curriculum and Assessment Committee prior to major course revisions or new course proposals. The report is reviewed by the Assessment Committee. The Assessment Committee reviews the department's General Education Plan against established criteria delineated in the General Education Plan Worksheet Analysis. Additionally, this same committee reviews the annual general education report within each department's area of responsibility.

4.2 Responsibility for Collecting and Disseminating Mid-Level Assessment Findings/Interpretations/Conclusions

Each department offering general education courses is involved in a loop of collecting and disseminating assessment information and in reviewing the processes involved in that collection. The departments are responsible for creating assessment instruments and collecting information from those instruments. This assessment process and the information it produces are reported to the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment and to the Assessment Committee. Interpretations and conclusions are relayed back to the department for possible program revisions. Faculty are involved at several levels: (1) constructing and administrating the process in which assessment data is collected and reported at the departmental level; (2) each department is represented on the committee by a faculty member; and (3) the committee's recommendations are sent back to the departments where faculty are involved in making curricular decisions.

4.3 Plan for Academic Modification to Improve Student Academic Achievement General Education

All departments have created plans that loop the collection and analysis of assessment data to those who are responsible for making program changes at the departmental level and who might better invest intellectual and physical resources for the enhancement of student achievement. In some departments this is done via formal report by supervisory committees that assess student achievement and recommend program modifications to department chairs. In other departments, this is accomplished via collection of data from various sources such as test scores or surveys by faculty who then recommend programmatic changes.

4.4 Plan for Assessment Plan Modification

Evaluation of assessment activities and processes occurs at several levels: (1) faculty evaluate student learning through assessment processes within their respective departments; (2) the Curriculum Committee and the Assessment Committee periodically review course objectives and assessment processes at the institutional level to ensure linkage with the nine program outcomes of General Education; and (3) the Assessment Committee reviews departmental assessment plans and makes recommendations for possible modification.

4.5 New Assessment Efforts

All academic departments submit assessment reports. The Assessment Committee reviews these reports and offers suggestions for improvement. The committee also offers analyses and recommendations for assessment relative to the declared departmental outcomes. The Assessment Committee completes a General Education Assessment Report Analysis for each department. The Assessment Committee sends a copy of its analysis reports to the individual departments that have created the assessment reports and plans.

4.6 Budgeting for Mid-level Assessment

As outlined in the Strategic Planning Process (Section 3.6.), assessment, planning, and budgeting are cyclical processes linking departmental and institutional processes. Documentation of the linkages between assessment and budget decisions is provided through the Capital Request Form, Budget Requests, Assessment Plans, and Assessment Reports. Moreover, the importance of linking these processes is evident in the Analysis Forms used by the Assessment Committee in the review process. The Assessment Committee will continue to keep the question of budgeting for mid-level assessment in the focus of its review of the department programs and general education.

5.0 Program Outcomes Assessment (Exit-Level)

Departmental faculty are directly responsible for assessing individual program goals, and have implemented a variety of assessment methodologies to assess student academic achievement and student satisfaction. Methods being used for assessment of program goals include portfolios, capstone projects, licensure/certification exams, pre/post testing, standardized exams, and surveys of students, graduates, alumni, and employers.

5.1 Methodology

Faculty within each department has developed assessment reports under the direction of the department heads and with support from deans and the Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment. The departmental assessment reports, are forwarded to the IRPA Assistant Vice President and the Vice President for Academic Affairs. Each report is then provided to the Assessment Committee for review and feedback. The annual assessment results are then summarized in the Annual Assessment Report, submitted to OSRHE each fall. The faculty in each department have developed goals for the department and for each program. These goals support the University's mission and purposes. Required courses have published learning objectives, which support program goals. A wide variety of assessment methods have been selected by each department to best evaluate mastery of objectives. Examples of outcomes assessments

used at RSU include portfolios prepared by Fine Arts students and pass rates on the NCLEX-RN for nursing students. External advisory boards assist departments and programs in modifying courses, programs, and/or selected outcomes.

5.2 Responsibility for Collecting and Disseminating Program/Department-Level Assessment Findings/Interpretations/Conclusions

The deans have the administrative responsibility for program outcomes assessment which is coordinated through the department heads and supported by the Assistant Vice President of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment. Annual assessment reports are prepared by the faculty and department head of each department and forwarded to their dean. These plans and reports are reviewed and critiqued by each dean, and then forwarded as described in the previous section. Department faculty interpret all program-related assessment findings and determine how academic achievement might be improved. The department faculty is responsible for writing the annual assessment report and summarizing results for programs in the academic unit. Department heads recommend program or course changes and budgeting to support those changes.

5.3 Plan for Academic Modification to Improve Student Academic Achievement

The framework of each program outcomes plan is based on mission, curriculum design, assessment of program goals and objectives, evaluation of assessment data, and program improvement. Department assessment reports are reviewed by the dean, department head, faculty, and the assessment committee. The assessment committee examines the data for any notable trends, identifies strengths and weaknesses of reports, and provides recommendations to academic departments. Department conclusions and recommendations are examined within the context of the University's strategic plan, budgets, and the Assessment Committee's review. Assessment program evaluation should examine a number of factors: (1) valid student outcome goals should be developed in order to design an appropriate assessment program; (2) the measures used should be valid ones, consistent with the standards of professional practice; (3) there should be evidence that assessment data are being used by faculty to make adjustments in academic programs; and (4) there should be evidence that changes are being implemented in courses and programs to support continuous improvement.

5.4 Plan for Assessment Plan Modification

The department assessment plans are included in the annual report. The report, and plans, are reviewed annually by the Assessment Committee, who identifies the strengths and weaknesses recommends changes. Those recommended changes may be accepted and/or modified by departments. RSU evaluates the assessment program in each major field both annually and at least once every five years as an integral part of the Academic Program Review process. The five-year program review process builds upon the results of annual assessments of student achievement. The self-study process, reflected by academic program review at RSU occurs at the programmatic, department, school, and university levels at regular intervals. Program review involves a self-study process to verify that each program is achieving its stated goals and to reaffirm that those goals are appropriate. Program review also provides an opportunity to identify needed improvements in programs and the strategies to make such improvements. Program review is the culmination of assessment and planning processes that facilitate improvements in courses, curricula, and instructional methodology. It also provides an opportunity to evaluate and revise the assessment program itself for the next program review cycle.

5.5 New Assessment Efforts

As assessment activities are conducted, questions arise about the relative merits of various approaches and methods. No single instrument is adequate to capture all facets of student achievement, so faculty continually seek information about alternative measures of student performance.

5.6 Budget

As illustrated in the Strategic Planning Process in Section 3.6, the review process serves as a foundation for establishing department plans and objectives, linking planning and decision making to assessment data and analysis, building budget priorities, and integrating program review recommendations and assessment results.

6.0 Student Satisfaction Assessment

The assessment of student satisfaction at Rogers State University is based in its stated mission and purposes. Student satisfaction assessment targets these dimensions from a multi-faceted standpoint and provides valuable information for an evolving new regional university in maintaining its effectiveness in the student educational experience. **The University's Strategic Plan addresses student satisfaction within its commitment to academic innovation and integrity. "Rogers State University will operate on the basis of a strong institutional effectiveness process." To operate a continuous quality improvement process that evaluates and assures that the institution is achieving its mission, RSU will track and analyze student achievement, progress in learning, and satisfaction with institutional processes to determine alignment with expectations and student choices and performance.**

6.1 Methodology of Assessment Activities

Multiple measures with multiple populations are assessed to help triangulate findings.

1. A locally developed student opinion survey is administered to a cluster sample of students attending courses at peak enrollment times during the day and evening. Additional courses are identified to ensure a sampling of students who may only take courses meeting once a week. The purpose of this survey is to assess student satisfaction with the instruction, support services, and general day-to-day educational experiences of current students.
2. Periodically, RSU will use a standardized norm-referenced instrument to compare student responses to external benchmarks. The National Survey of Student Engagement was administered during 2005 and 2008 and will be administered during even years, i.e., 2010, 2012, etc.
3. Beginning fall 2009, course evaluation of instruction will be conducted in association with an external vendor, The IDEA Center, in order to focus on learning and provide timely, useful feedback to faculty. The new system will be used for all course delivery formats. Each course offered during a fall or spring semester will be evaluated one time.
4. A graduate survey is administered to all graduating students immediately prior to the commencement ceremony. This questionnaire was designed to measure student satisfaction with instruction, faculty, and courses. Additional items collect information regarding continuing educational objectives and employment status.
5. In order to assess the reasons why students withdraw from courses, a locally developed survey is administered to students as they formally withdraw.

6.2 Responsibility for collecting and disseminating Student Satisfaction Assessment Finding/Interpretations/Conclusions

Assessment of student satisfaction is the responsibility of each unit within the institution. Administrative responsibility is assigned to Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, and Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment (IRPA). All institutional assessment activities are coordinated through IRPA. The IRPA Assistant Vice President works with other academic officers to address reliability and validity of methodologies. IRPA will provide feedback regarding the effectiveness of RSU's academic and support programs. All student satisfaction assessment data is collected at the institutional level, and by each academic and service unit. Reports are forwarded to IRPA and the findings are then summarized in the Annual Assessment Report.

6.3 Plan for modification of the student satisfaction assessment process

The process for evaluating student satisfaction includes ongoing review of attrition and retention of students to identify how the institution contributes to student success. The first step in modification of the student satisfaction assessment process is to identify benchmarks from comparable institutions known for promoting total student development. In addition, as factors that contribute to student success or failure are identified through the assessment process, the Assessment Committee works with all institutional units to improve the institution's ability to promote professional development.

6.4 Plan for Assessment Plan Modification

The Assessment Committee will review the University Assessment Plan biannually during the spring semester of even years to determine if revision is necessary to improve the monitoring process. Plan modifications are forwarded to the University administration for review.

6.5 New Assessment Efforts

The academic assessment plans and reports demonstrate increased use of student, alumni and employer surveys. Most of these plans include questions concerning student satisfaction in both academic and service areas. As new programs and services are developed the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment will work closely with faculty and staff to establish an assessment agenda to include student satisfaction.

6.6 Budget

Budget needs are considered from an institutional perspective as described in Section 3.6.

Approved May 30, 2003

Edited, 2007

Edited, July 22, 2009