

ANNUAL STUDENT ASSESSMENT REPORT 2007-2008

ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY
Claremore, Oklahoma

Office of Institutional Research,
Planning, and Assessment



Rogers State University
Annual Student Assessment Report
2008-2009

Prepared by Linda D. Andrews
Assistant Vice President
Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment
December 2008

ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY
Annual Report to the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Student Assessment Activity
2007-2008

Section I – Entry Level

Administering Assessment

I-1 *How were instruments administered?*

The RSU Testing Center staff administers the ACT tests, COMPASS and other entry-level assessment tests. Students selecting the ACT National or ACT Residual test are charged \$31 and \$40 respectively. ACT scores of 19 or higher on each subtest are required for enrollment in collegiate level courses. Students who do not meet the cutscore of 19 on each ACT subtest are referred for secondary testing in the deficient content area. There is no charge for the COMPASS or other entry-level assessment tests.

I-2 *Which students were assessed?*

The ACT, the preliminary screening instrument for the analysis of college preparedness, is required of all first time entering freshmen or students transferring six credit hours or less. Based on their performance, students identified as at-risk in one or more basic skills areas are enrolled in appropriate developmental studies courses.

I-3 *Describe how and when they were assessed, including options for the students to seek retesting, tutoring, or other academic support.*

First-time entering students are assessed following application to RSU and prior to enrollment. Students who do not meet the cutscore of 19 on each ACT subtest are referred for secondary testing. The ACT COMPASS is the secondary test for English, reading and mathematics. The STASS test is the secondary test for science. With the exception of the STASS test, students who do not pass secondary testing on the first attempt may retake the test one time after a one-week waiting period.

In addition to the two maximum attempts to pass the ACT COMPASS, students also have an opportunity to clear any academic deficiencies through satisfactory performance on a secondary test administered on the first day of all developmental courses in mathematics and science. Students are encouraged to refresh their understanding of any content areas in which they are to be tested prior to taking secondary tests by visiting a tutor or reviewing a high school textbook. Students are also provided information on a variety of web-based tutorials, and ordering information for *ACT Study Guides*. Course placement is mandatory for all students who do not meet proficiency in one or more of the basic skills.

Analyses and Findings

I-4 *What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-2008 entry-level assessment?*

The average ACT subscores and composite scores have steadily increased. *Table 1 Average ACT Scores for All Entering RSU Students* provides a summary of the average ACT scores for students enrolled during

the fall 2007 semester indicating the admission of higher qualified students. For the first time average ACT subscores were above 19 for fall 2007.

Table 1: Average ACT Scores for All Entering RSU Students

	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
English	19.57	19.77	20.02	20.21
Math	18.39	18.66	18.96	19.01
Reading	20.83	21.00	21.35	21.47
Science	20.27	20.46	20.66	20.74
Composite	19.69	19.89	20.15	20.25

Source: Annual Fall Enrollment Reports

Seven hundred and twenty-three (723) academically deficient students accounted for 1047 enrollments in developmental courses during the fall 2007. This number of students represents a small increase of five students compared to fall 2006. However, the total enrollments in developmental courses have decreased from 1064 to 1047 indicating fewer students with multiple deficient areas. *Table 2 Enrollment in Developmental Courses* indicates the number of students enrolled in developmental coursework.

Table 2: Enrollment in Developmental Courses

	Fall 2004	Fall 2005	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
English	311	284	269	243
Math	667	648	607	611
Reading	104	144	142	123
Science	51	59	46	70
Total	1133	1135	1064	1047

Source: Annual Fall Enrollment Reports

I-5 *How was student progress tracked?*

The Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment staff tracked student progress in all developmental courses by earned letter grade and student progress in four college-level courses by letter grade and retention. Collegiate level courses earmarked for tracking are: ENGL 1113 Composition I (English), MATH 1315 College Algebra (math), POLS 1113 American Federal Government (reading) and BIOL 1114 General Biology/ BIOL 1144 General Cellular Biology (science).

I-6 *Describe analyses of student success in both remedial and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process as a result of findings.*

The success of RSU's Entry-level Assessment and Placement Program is measured by a number of factors, including validation of cutscores, retention levels, and success in both developmental and college level courses. The effectiveness of placement decisions and appropriateness of cutscores are evaluated on the basis of retention of students in each developmental course; student achievement in developmental courses; and student performance in subsequent college level coursework. No changes to existing cut-scores were made during the 2007-2008 academic year.

Success in Remedial Courses. During the 2007-2008 academic year, there were 1668 enrollments (duplicated headcount) in developmental studies courses, and 923 successful completions. A successful

completion is defined as one in which the student earns a grade of "A," "B," or "C." An unsuccessful completion is defined as one in which the student earns a grade of "W," "D," or "F." These data indicate that 55.34% of developmental studies students successfully completed the course. This percentage is comparable to the 2006-2007 academic year. *Table 3 Success Rate in Developmental Studies Courses 2007-2008* contains a summary of student enrollment and performance in developmental courses.

Table 3: Success Rate in Developmental Studies Courses 2007-2008

Course	Enrolled		Withdrew		Successful (A, B, C)		Unsuccessful (D, F, W)		Incomplete		Audit	
	N	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
Basic Writing (ENGL-0003)	333	37	11.11%	187	56.16%	146	43.84%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Reading I (READ-0223)	166	24	14.46%	90	54.22%	76	45.78%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Science Proficiency (BIOL- 0123)	111	10	9.01%	81	72.97%	30	27.03%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Elementary Algebra (MATH- 0114)	538	96	17.84%	262	48.70%	274	50.93%	2	0.37%	0	0.00%	
Intermediate Algebra (MATH- 0213)	520	98	18.85%	303	58.27%	217	41.73%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	
Total	1668	265	15.89%	923	55.34%	743	44.54%	2	0.12%	0	0.00%	

Source: RSU Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment. Note that the sum of the cell values is greater than 1668

because withdrawals are reported in a separate column as well as in the Unsuccessful column.

Success in College-level Courses: A key measure of the effectiveness of the placement decision process and related developmental program at RSU is the academic success of students who proceed into college-level courses. RSU tracks performance in college-level coursework of students who have completed developmental course(s). Again, a successful completion is defined as one in which the student earns a grade of "A," "B," or "C." An unsuccessful completion is defined as one in which the student earns a grade of "W," "D," or "F."

Table 4: Success Rates in General Education Courses Fall Semester Only shows student success in college level courses segregated by entry level placement. Of the sixty-three students enrolled in MATH 0213 Intermediate Algebra during fall 2007, 58 percent successfully completed MATH 1513 College Algebra. Only 49 percent (N-9) of the students placed into MATH 1513 College Algebra on the basis of their COMPASS math score were successful. By contrast, 61 percent (N-191) of the students placed on the basis of their ACT math subscore were successful.

Sixty-three (N-69) percent of the students successfully completing ENGL 0003 Basic Writing were successful in ENGL 1113 Composition I. Sixty-nine percent of the COMPASS placed students (N-53) were successful compared to 67 percent (N-301) of the ACT placed students.

Sixty-two percent of the reading deficient students (N-13) were successful in POLS 1113 American Federal Government. COMPASS placed student performance was comparable; however, 69 percent of the ACT placed students were successful. Students placed into HIST 2483 or HIST 2493 via the COMPASS or ACT again fared better than reading deficient students.

During fall 2007, only five science deficient students successfully completing BIOL 0123 were enrolled in BIOL 1114 or BIOL 1144. The success rates are 30 percent and 18 percent respectively; however, the numbers are too small to draw conclusions. By comparison, an average of 21.5 percent of COMPASS placed students successfully completed the courses. An average of 61 percent of the ACT placed students were successful.

Table 4: Success Rates in General Education Courses Fall Semester Only

General Education Course	Successfully Completed Zero-Level Course		Scored High Enough on Compass to Waive Zero-Level		Scored High Enough on ACT to Waive Zero-Level	
	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2006	Fall 2007	Fall 2006	Fall 2007
MATH 1513 College Algebra	57.01% N-61	58.33% N-63	50.00% N-11	42.86% N-9	70.71% N-210	61.41% N-191
ENGL 1113 Composition 1	62.81% N-76	63.30% N-69	56.90% N-33	69.74% N-53	71.49% N-326	66.74% N-301
POLS 1113 American Federal Government	55.56% N-15	61.90% N-13	76.47% N-52	62.90% N-39	71.71% N-185	68.75% N-176
HIST 2483 American History to 1877	52.94% N-9	22.22% N-2	61.54% N-32	66.67% N-28	79.33% N-119	68.39% N-106
HIST 2493 American History since 1877	44.44% N-4	42.86% N-3	55.56% N-25	75.86% N-22	65.49% N-93	57.48% N-73
BIOL 1114 General Biology	25.00% N-1	30.00% N-3	62.50% N-35	57.89% N-22	69.09% N-76	74.59% N-91
BIOL 1144 General Cellular Biology	0.00% N-0	18.18% N-2	37.29% N-22	33.33% N-21	55.75% N-97	45.87% N-111

Source: RSU Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment

Other Assessment Plans

1-7 *What other studies of entry-level assessment have been conducted at the institution?*

All entry-level assessment methods were described in the previous sections.

1-6 *Describe the results.*

Not Applicable.

1-8 *What instructional changes occurred or are planned due to entry-level assessment?*

During the 2008-2009 year, the Assessment Committee will examine the student success rates in developmental and college level courses based on placement; collaborate with the new Developmental Studies Coordinator and departmental faculty; and make recommendations to the Academic Council as appropriate.

Section II – Mid-Level/General Education

Administering Assessment

II-1 *Describe how assessment activities were linked to the institutional general education program competencies.*

Mid-level assessment relies upon course-embedded assessment of student performance by faculty. This strategy has as its foundation in the nine General Education outcomes identified by RSU faculty. Faculty members also specify the core knowledge areas of each general education course and establish appropriate performance criteria and assessment procedures to measure student mastery of course content. During the 2007-2008 academic year, student performance satisfied faculty expectations on all nine General Education outcomes.

Reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, and other institutionally recognized general education competencies are addressed by the General Education outcomes described in the electronic portion of this report. Other existing course-embedded assessment practices are based on these outcomes. The responsibility for the related data collection rests with the faculty who teach the general education courses, as well as the departments whose courses are part of the General Education Program. The Assessment Committee is responsible for oversight of the mid-level assessment process and any curricular modifications that occur as a result of the assessment process.

The faculty and administration at RSU recognize that the mid-level assessment model has, in the past, tended to treat General Education as sub-components of the programs of the various academic departments rather than as an inter-disciplinary program that does not reside within individual departments, but instead crosses the entire curriculum. During the 2005-2006 academic year, a faculty position was established that serves as a liaison between the Developmental Studies Program and degree programs within the academic departments. This effort has resulted in greater collaboration between faculties to track developmental studies students into the appropriate collegiate level course, assess their performance, and make curricular modifications.

The departmental general education assessment report and plan forms have been revised in order to clarify, verify and amplify departmental assessment efforts. The Assessment Committee, as peer reviewers, will examine the 2008-2009 general education plans and provide feedback for improvement to the departments.

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

RSU's Mid-Level assessment is primarily course or program-embedded within the University's General Education and degree programs, at both the associate and baccalaureate levels. Most instruments are faculty developed and are administered during class periods. Standardized, external examination instruments are commonly administered outside class periods and may be Internet based.

The student selection process occurs through enrollment in core general education courses and matriculation toward a degree. The inclusion of formative assessment in the existing course structure serves to provide feedback to students, while making assessment meaningful to both students and faculty, and provides a mechanism for the ongoing improvement of teaching and learning.

II-3 *Describe strategies to motivate students to participate meaningfully.*

Because the mid-level assessment process relies primarily upon course-embedded assessment, students are motivated to perform well. Participation in surveys is voluntary; however, the key motivation is the

opportunity to express perceptions concerning the educational experiences at RSU. In some instances, faculty that utilize external standardized tests award bonus exam points based upon students' score as compared to regional and national averages.

Analysis and Findings

II-4 *How was student progress tracked into future semesters and what were the findings?*

Tracking student progress beyond the mid-level point is a complex issue for an institution that has recently undergone a transition to a four-year university, while continuing to offer associate degrees. In May 2008, one-third (51) of the 151 baccalaureate graduates also achieved an associate degree from RSU at some point during their educational experience. Forty-five of the associate degrees were in arts or science.

Mid-level assessment at RSU serves the dual functions of measuring the outcomes of the two-year programs while simultaneously measuring the general education outcomes of four-year students entering the upper-level phase of their baccalaureate study. Measurement of student progress occurs within the academic departments for those students who proceed as bachelor degree seeking students. Faculty members monitor individual student progress through their advising processes, and by evaluating student preparedness for upper-level courses by students who have completed the prerequisite and preparatory courses.

II-5 *What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-2008 mid-level/general education assessment?*

Table 5 General Education Performance Measures shows the number of performance measures identified for each general education outcome, and how many of those measures were satisfied during 2007-2008. Faculty in the academic departments establishes the criteria for measuring the general education objectives.

Table 5: General Education Performance Measures

General Education Outcome	Measures	Satisfied	Met
1. Use and analyze written and spoken English effectively.	13	12	YES
2. Demonstrate knowledge of and application of scientific principles and recognize the role of science in our society.	6	6	YES
3. Apply mathematics and logic to problem solving.	4	1	YES
4. Gain a perspective on the humanities and recognize their value to individuals and society.	7	7	YES
5. Demonstrate proficiency in use of computers and other technologies.	2	2	YES
6. Demonstrate knowledge of the history and functions of social institutions.	8	7	YES
7. Demonstrate knowledge of diverse human values, beliefs, and behaviors.	20	16	YES
8. Demonstrate knowledge of the meaning and purpose of the arts.	4	4	YES
9. Demonstrate knowledge of the relationship among people and their physical and social environments.	5	5	YES

These data provide evidence that RSU students have demonstrated mastery of their general education coursework by meeting or exceeding the expectations of the faculty who teach those courses.

Section III – Program Outcomes

Administering Assessment

III-1 *List, in table format, assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for each major field of study.*

Table 6: Program Outcome Performance Measures

<i>Department</i>	<i>Degree Program</i>	<i>Number of Measures</i>	<i>Number of Individuals</i>
Applied Technology	BS Business Information Technology	7	131
	BT Applied Technology	4	96
	AS Computer Science	4	98
	AAS Applied Technology	3	33
Business	BS Business Administration	10	189
	AA Accounting	8	112
	AA Business Administration	7	99
Communications	BA Communications	9	68
English-Humanities	BA Liberal Arts	3	14
	AA Liberal Arts	1	143
Fine Arts	AA Art	6	20
History-Political Science	BS Social Science	5	23
	AA Secondary Education	1	0
	AA Social Science	2	44
	BS Justice Administration	3	14
Psychology-Sociology-Criminal Justice	AA Criminal Justice Studies	3	26
	AA Elementary Education	1	16
	AA Legal Assisting	1	5
	AA Social Science	2	9
	BS Biology	4	10
Biology	AS Biology	3	206
	AAS Nursing	4	13
Health Science	AAS Emergency Medical Services	4	52
	AS Physical Science	4	52
Math-Physical Science			

Analyses and Findings

III-2 *What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-2008 program outcomes assessment?*

The departmental faculty has direct responsibility for assessing individual program goals, and has implemented a variety of assessment methodologies to assess student academic achievement and student satisfaction. Methods for assessment of program goals/learning outcomes include portfolios, capstone projects, licensure and certification exams, pretest/posttests, standardized exams, and surveys of students, graduates, alumni, and employers.

The academic units of RSU are divided into three schools: the School of Mathematics, Science, and Health Sciences; the School of Business and Technology; and the School of Liberal Arts. Each school is divided into three or five academic departments. The faculty of each department has established expected outcomes for each of their respective programs. The following section outlines RSU's expectations and aspirations for its students with the ultimate goal of improving student academic achievement and program quality. A summary of analyses and findings resulting from program outcomes assessment is presented for

ten degree programs with the largest number of graduates. These programs account for 74% of the total number of graduates during 2007-2008.

1. *Business Administration BS, 51 graduates*
Student test performance on the ETS Field Test in Business increased to 88 percent, a 5 percent increase from last year. All graduating student portfolios were rated (by three business faculty and an external faculty) above the benchmark according to an established rubric. Ninety-eight percent of the graduates successfully completed the capstone case study.
2. *Nursing AAS, 51 graduates*
The faculty changed testing service providers (for external standardized tests) in order to gain formative assessment information about student progress.
3. *Business Administration AA, 30 graduates*
All curriculum objectives were met in the associate degree Business Administration program. The faculty is exploring additional ways to measure student learning in the areas of diversity and program satisfaction.
4. *Social Science BS, 23 graduates*
They found that the two research methods courses contained redundant content and discipline specific methods and research options are necessary. Students indicated a need for additional instruction in writing styles as preparation for the capstone project.
5. *Biology BS, 22 graduates*
Expected outcomes measured by student portfolios, evaluation of written research papers, and research presentations were successfully met. Students achieved the established benchmark associated with the major field test in biology.
6. *Applied Technology BT, 22 graduates*
Expected outcomes measured by exit exams, student surveys, and presentations were successfully met.
7. *Education – Elementary/Early Childhood Option AA, 19 graduates*
Expected outcomes measured by course grades were successfully met.
8. *Liberal Arts BA, 16 graduates*
The faculty continue to rate the student capstone projects as superior.
9. *Liberal Arts – General AA, 16 graduates*
The faculty believe the assessment results did not accurately reflect the learning outcomes of the program majors.
10. *EMS Paramedic AAS, 14 Graduates*
Expected outcomes measured by comprehensive exams, communication components, synthesis projects, and capstone paper were successfully met.

Other Assessment Plans

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

Faculty report a range of changes related to assessment analysis. Occasionally the faculty determines a change is not necessary due to the achievement of a program outcome. A sample of planned changes is reported.

1. *Business Administration BS.* The faculty will select and use a new validated instrument to measure diversity.
2. *Nursing AAS.* Other than rearranging the placement of external standardized assessment tests, the faculty elects not to make instructional changes in light of the continuing high pass rate of first time writers on the NCLEX-RN examination.

3. *Business Administration AA*. The faculty determined that the survey instrument measuring tolerance of multicultural diversity and program satisfaction is inadequate. As a result, a focus group comprised of eight to twelve members consisting of graduating students and alumni will be established to participate in outcome assessment.
4. *Social Science BS*. Faculty will introduce curricular changes to both research methods courses to include revision of objectives, methods, and learning strategies including written and oral presentations.
5. *Biology, BS*. The major field test in biology will be administered during the spring semester rather than fall. Lab manuals associated with CHEM 1315 and 1413 will be revised to include additional learning experiences and use web-based practice exercises.
6. *Applied Technology BT*. No changes.
7. *Education – Elementary/Early Childhood Option AA*. Student expectations associated with the humanities seminar will be revised.
8. *Liberal Arts BA*. Student proposal guidelines for the humanities seminar will be significantly revised. Faculty will compare student learning outcomes beginning in HUM 2223 and concluding in HUM 4993.
9. *Liberal Arts AA*. Assessment strategies will focus on program majors in two selected humanities courses (Humanities I and Humanities II).
10. *EMS Paramedic AAS*. No changes.

Section V – Student Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

V-1 How were the students selected?

Student satisfaction assessments target those dimensions in the RSU Mission and Purposes from a multi-faceted standpoint and provide valuable information for an evolving new regional university in maintaining its effectiveness in the student educational experience. Four surveys were administered during 2007-2008. They were the Student Opinion Survey, the Course Evaluations of Instruction, the Graduate Survey and the National Survey of Student Engagement.

During the spring 2008 semester, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning, and Assessment conducted a Student Opinion Survey to assess both the level of importance students attach to certain academic and non-academic components of their educational experience, as well as their satisfaction with those components. The spring 2008 survey used the same data collection instrument designed in 2004 and revised in spring 2007. A random sample of 80 on-ground classes, stratified by campus, was selected for participation in the survey. Nearly 1400 students were enrolled in those classes, but it was necessary to avoid receiving duplicate responses from students enrolled in more than one sampled class. To avoid duplicate responses, faculty was asked to instruct students not complete the survey if they had already completed it in another class. Of the 80 sampled classes, 51 returned packets of completed surveys. Those packets contained responses from 424 students.

At the end of each semester, RSU students are asked to complete an evaluation of instruction survey. Student responses are anonymous and the form is completed during classes during the week twelve of the semester. A student representative delivers the completed surveys to the respective department for

compilation. Faculty members receive student feedback after final grades have been issued. During the fall 2007 and spring 2008 semesters, 6,951 and 6,444 surveys were returned respectively.

Shortly before commencement, the Office of Institutional Research, Planning and Assessment conducted a survey to assess the level of importance graduates attach to academic and non-academic components of their educational experience and to identify student post-graduation plans. A convenience sample of 173 graduates was selected for participation. The survey instrument was considerably shorter than that used for the Student Opinion Survey.

The National Survey of Student Engagement was conducted during December 2007 to collect information from samples of first-year and senior students about the nature and quality of their undergraduate experience at RSU. Thirty-one first-year students and sixty-five seniors participated in this survey.

V-2 *What were the analyses and findings from the 2007-2008 student satisfaction assessment?*

Student Opinion Survey

The results of the Student Opinion Survey indicate that, overall, RSU students are satisfied with their educational experience at RSU. A summary of 434 student responses to the Student Opinion Survey reveals the following demographics.

- Freshmen represent 33% of the respondents
- Seniors represent 19% of the respondents
- Sixty-six percent of the respondents are white, non-Hispanic
- Twenty-four percent of the respondents are Native American or Alaska Native
- Sixty-five percent of the respondents are female
- Thirty-four percent of the respondents are 18-20 years of age.
- Twenty-four percent of the respondents are 25-29 years of age
- Native English speakers represent 98% of the respondents.
- Six percent of the respondents live on campus
- Forty-one percent of the respondents commute less than 15 minutes to campus
- Sixty-six percent of the respondents were enrolled in 12 or more credit hours
- Fifty percent of the respondents report an overall "B" grade average
- Fifty-four percent of the respondents report that neither parent holds a college degree

Analysis of student responses to the Student Opinion Survey reveals areas with low satisfaction scores and high importance scores. Specific student concerns are cited under each topic area. The areas are:

- Financial Aid Office (Convenient times; Answers and assistance, Timely services, Attitude toward students)
- Computer lab availability (Convenient times; Inadequate number of stations; Inadequate hardware and software)
- Bookstore (Assists students in timely manner; Stocking books and materials needed for class)
- Academic Advising (Advisors understanding of requirements for major; Lack of advisor recommendations that are helpful)
- Parking (Adequate Parking)

Evaluation of Instruction Surveys

Table 7 Summary of Fall 2007 Evaluation of Instruction shows a summary of the responses and *Table 8* shows the summary for spring 2008. As can be seen in the tables, most students reported that they agreed or strongly agreed with each statement in the questionnaire. The full data from this survey are also analyzed at the department level and reported to deans and department heads. In comparison, there was no notable change in the percentages of students who agreed or strongly agreed with each survey item.

Fall 2007 Evaluation of Instruction
 RSU Overall
 N = 6951

Overall Agreement: 88.7 %
 Overall Mean: 4.5

Item	Percentage of Responses							Mean
	SA	A	N	D	SD	M	SA+A	
1. Consistently met and concluded class on time	69.2%	23.9%	4.1%	1.7%	0.8%	0.3%	93.1%	4.6
2. Spoke clearly	65.7%	24.0%	6.1%	2.5%	1.5%	0.2%	89.7%	4.5
3. Was available for assistance during scheduled office hours	57.9%	22.8%	14.0%	1.4%	0.8%	3.1%	80.7%	4.4
4. Was well organized	59.2%	27.7%	7.8%	3.3%	1.6%	0.4%	86.9%	4.4
5. Communicated expectations at the beginning of the course	65.1%	25.7%	6.2%	1.6%	0.9%	0.5%	90.8%	4.5
6. Returned tests promptly	60.6%	25.7%	7.7%	2.7%	1.3%	2.0%	86.3%	4.4
7. Explained how the course grade would be determined	64.5%	26.3%	6.2%	1.8%	0.8%	0.5%	90.8%	4.5
8. Appeared to know his/her subject	75.1%	18.9%	4.1%	1.0%	0.7%	0.2%	94.0%	4.7
9. Was well prepared	65.1%	24.7%	6.4%	2.4%	1.2%	0.2%	89.8%	4.5
10. Used examples and illustrations which made the materials clearer	63.9%	23.5%	7.5%	3.0%	1.5%	0.5%	87.4%	4.5
11. Presented the material coherently, emphasizing major points and clarifying relationships	63.2%	24.2%	7.2%	3.4%	1.6%	0.3%	87.4%	4.4
12. Ensured lecture content and discussions were relevant to course objectives	64.2%	25.1%	6.8%	2.1%	1.3%	0.4%	89.3%	4.5
13. Challenged student's abilities	62.7%	25.7%	7.9%	1.9%	1.0%	0.8%	88.4%	4.5
14. Had sufficient evidence, class participation, written work, or tests to evaluate student's achievement	63.7%	24.5%	7.2%	2.7%	1.4%	0.5%	88.2%	4.5
15. Showed enthusiasm and interest in teaching the course	70.4%	21.1%	5.8%	1.4%	1.0%	0.3%	91.5%	4.6
16. Attempted to determine whether students understood discussions or lecture topics	60.5%	25.7%	8.4%	3.4%	1.7%	0.4%	86.2%	4.4
17. Encouraged students to ask questions and express opinions	65.4%	24.4%	6.7%	2.0%	1.2%	0.3%	89.8%	4.5
18. Was fair and impartial in dealing with students	65.5%	24.4%	6.5%	1.8%	1.4%	0.4%	89.9%	4.5
19. Encouraged students to think for themselves	64.8%	25.7%	6.8%	1.2%	0.9%	0.6%	90.5%	4.5
20. Was concerned with students progress in class	59.5%	24.4%	10.8%	2.7%	2.0%	0.6%	83.9%	4.4

SA = Strongly Agree
 A = Agree
 N = Neutral
 D = Disagree
 SD = Strongly Disagree
 M = Missing

Spring 2008 Evaluation of Instruction
 RSU Overall
 N = 6444

Overall Agreement: 90.1 %
 Overall Mean: 4.6

Item	Percentage of Responses							Mean
	SA	A	N	D	SD	M	SA+A	
1. Consistently met and concluded class on time	70.0%	23.0%	4.0%	2.2%	0.7%	0.2%	93.0%	4.6
2. Spoke clearly	67.7%	23.6%	5.5%	2.0%	1.0%	0.3%	91.3%	4.6
3. Was available for assistance during scheduled office hours	59.9%	22.4%	12.2%	1.3%	0.7%	3.5%	82.3%	4.4
4. Was well organized	62.6%	26.2%	6.8%	2.8%	1.1%	0.5%	88.8%	4.5
5. Communicated expectations at the beginning of the course	67.4%	24.5%	5.3%	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	91.9%	4.6
6. Returned tests promptly	62.4%	24.0%	7.4%	2.7%	1.4%	2.0%	86.4%	4.5
7. Explained how the course grade would be determined	66.3%	25.7%	5.1%	1.5%	0.8%	0.7%	92.0%	4.6
8. Appeared to know his/her subject	77.0%	18.0%	3.2%	1.0%	0.6%	0.2%	95.0%	4.7
9. Was well prepared	68.0%	23.4%	5.6%	2.0%	0.7%	0.2%	91.4%	4.6
10. Used examples and illustrations which made the materials clearer	66.5%	22.7%	6.7%	2.5%	1.1%	0.5%	89.2%	4.5
11. Presented the material coherently, emphasizing major points and clarifying relationships	65.7%	23.6%	6.0%	3.2%	1.2%	0.3%	89.3%	4.5
12. Ensured lecture content and discussions were relevant to course objectives	66.7%	24.1%	5.8%	1.8%	0.9%	0.6%	90.8%	4.5
13. Challenged student's abilities	66.4%	24.7%	5.9%	1.4%	0.8%	0.7%	91.1%	4.6
14. Had sufficient evidence, class participation, written work, or tests to evaluate student's achievement	67.0%	23.4%	5.5%	2.3%	1.0%	0.9%	90.4%	4.5
15. Showed enthusiasm and interest in teaching the course	73.6%	19.8%	4.3%	1.2%	0.7%	0.3%	93.4%	4.7
16. Attempted to determine whether students understood discussions or lecture topics	63.2%	25.0%	7.0%	3.0%	1.4%	0.4%	88.2%	4.5
17. Encouraged students to ask questions and express opinions	67.6%	23.1%	6.0%	1.8%	1.1%	0.5%	90.7%	4.6
18. Was fair and impartial in dealing with students	67.7%	23.0%	5.8%	1.8%	1.2%	0.5%	90.7%	4.6
19. Encouraged students to think for themselves	68.1%	23.5%	6.0%	1.1%	0.7%	0.6%	91.6%	4.6
20. Was concerned with students progress in class	62.0%	23.3%	9.3%	3.3%	1.4%	0.6%	85.3%	4.4

SA = Strongly Agree
 A = Agree
 N = Neutral
 D = Disagree
 SD = Strongly Disagree
 M = Missing

Graduate Survey

The results of the Graduate Survey responses are trended over several years. A high average benchmark of 85% was established because of the institution's mission to provide excellence in education. The results suggest that most students are satisfied with their educational experience at RSU, especially with the quality of instruction. Responses also suggest that 90 percent of graduates believe RSU meets the educational needs of Northeast Oklahoma and its students; helps them to meet their educational goals, helps develop the skills necessary to continue their education, and enables them to make better life and career decisions. Almost 90% of graduates believe that RSU faculty show a high degree of interest in student learning and made learning enjoyable.

Comparing the May 2008 Graduation Survey to the survey of May 2007, RSU has shown a 2% improvement in the average overall graduate approval. The most significant increase was found in RSU's ability to prepare students for continuing their education. This means RSU students believe they are better prepared for pursuing a master's degree than they were the previous year. Overall, RSU met the benchmark in most areas. The number of students currently employed full-time continues to decrease. This implies that RSU's student population is becoming more traditional and students are gaining full-time employment after graduation.

The high benchmark of 85% was met in most areas. Topic areas below 85% are:

- Meeting needs of students
- Greater appreciation of diversity
- Scheduling classes to meet needs of students
- Using appropriate instructional media
- Comparison of quality of education to other colleges
- How likely to attend RSU again
- Satisfaction with advising

National Survey of Student Engagement

A summary of some key findings from the institution's performance on the 2008 National Survey of Student Engagement includes the following:

- Highest Performing Areas
 - First Year Students
 - Read more than 10 assigned books or book-length packs of reading
 - Wrote more than 4 papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages
 - Wrote more than 10 papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages
 - Asked questions/contributed to class discussions
 - Participated in community service or volunteer work
 - Seniors
 - Wrote at least one paper or report of 20 pages or more
 - Wrote more than 4 papers or reports between 5 and 19 pages
 - Wrote more than 10 papers or reports of fewer than 5 pages
 - Discussed grades or assignments with an instructor
 - Used an electronic medium to discuss or complete an assignment
- Lowest Performing Areas
 - First Year Students
 - Said courses emphasized synthesizing ideas into new complex relationships
 - Made a class presentation
 - Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
 - Discussed ideas from classes with faculty outside of class

- Said the institution substantially encourages contacts among diverse peers
- Seniors
 - Worked with other students on projects during class
 - Worked with classmates outside of class to prepare class assignments
 - Discussed ideas from classes with faculty outside of class
 - Said the institution provides substantial support for academic success
 - Said the institution provides substantial support for students' social needs

IV-3 What changes occurred or are planned due to the student satisfaction assessment?

A significant campus environmental change will be the new 55,000 square foot Student Services Center scheduled for opening during January 2009. The Center will house a greatly expanded bookstore, student affairs offices, food court, meeting rooms, conference rooms, 500 seat ballroom, student game room, extensive patios/courtyards and student computer lab that will be open 24 hours per day. An additional parking lot will be available that is located adjacent to the Center to relieve parking congestion. This attractive, centrally located facility will provide activities designed to substantially increase student satisfaction, faculty-student interaction, student-student interaction, student access to state-of-the-art computers and civic engagement.

The Office of Enrollment Management has been restructured and activities have been segregated into three departments that include the Admissions Office, Registrar's Office, and Financial Aid Office. Improved student service, advisement and productivity are the major expected outcomes.

Beginning spring 2009, nine academic disciplines will offer twenty-three "blended courses" providing the advantages of live in-person instruction and the convenience of learning online. At least half of the course will be conducted in the classroom in the traditional manner and the remainder on-line. This type of course provides for the student greater flexibility, benefits of individual instruction and decreased travel time and fuel costs.

V. Graduate Student Assessment

Not Applicable