# ASSESSMENT PLAN
## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

---

## ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY
### Claremore, Oklahoma

---

## University Assessment Committee

Approved May 2003
Last Revised October 2018

**ROGERS STATE**
UNIVERSITY

# 1. ASSESSMENT AT ROGERS STATE UNIVERSITY

## 1.1 Purpose of assessment

The purpose of assessment is to measure student learning in a systematic fashion 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, 2) to assess student learning in order to determine whether learning has occurred, and 3) to increase the University's capacity to adapt to a rapidly changing environment in a planned and orderly fashion.

The principles of student learning assessment are:

a. The value of informed assessment and subsequent planning will serve as a basis for institutional and program effectiveness.

b. The assessment plan will provide a context for developing and reviewing institutional and departmental mission statements, goals, and objectives.

c. The plan will provide a useable body of knowledge to strengthen services, instruction, and institutional planning.

d. The plan will link assessment to program review, instructional and student support improvement, institutional strategic planning, and the budgeting process.

e. Departmental assessment plans will include multiple measures of cognitive skills, attitudes/values, and behaviors described in program outcomes.

f. Departments will use the information from assessment to enhance student academic achievement and to support student retention.

g. 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.

## 1.2 Oversight of assessment

Oversight of the assessment of student learning at Rogers State University is the shared responsibility of faculty and administration. Two faculty senate subcommittees and two administrative offices currently share responsibility for oversight of assessment.

a. University Assessment Committee

The University Assessment Committee (UAC) is the primary faculty committee tasked with oversight of the assessment of student learning among the institution's programs of study. This committee provides leadership on issues related to assessment, provides feedback on assessment findings for degree programs and developmental students, and evaluates the use of assessment by departments to improve student learning. Membership consists of a faculty representative from each academic department and the Assistant Vice President for Accountability and Academics (ex-officio member).  Smaller departments may be exempt from providing a representative with committee approval.

b. General Education Committee

The General Education Committee (GEC) is responsible for oversight of all issues

related to general education at the institution.  This committee assesses and evaluates the general education curriculum, recommends improvements, reviews general education proposals, and reports annually on the effectiveness of general education.  Membership consists of at least nine senate-appointed faculty, with at least two from each School.

c.  Office of Accountability and Academics

The Office for Accountability and Academics (OAA) is the primary administrative office responsible for oversight of the assessment of student learning at the institution.  This office manages internal institutional data, supports the assessment of learning outcomes, disseminates assessment data and findings to faculty, and reports to regulatory and accreditation agencies. This office is governed by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and the Assistant Vice President for Accountability and Academics.

d.  Office of Student Affairs

The Office of Student Affairs (OSA) is responsible for oversight of all aspects of co-curricular student learning at the institution.  Co-curricular learning provides avenues for personal enhancement, including leadership development, civic engagement, community service, critical thinking, social expression, organizational involvement, wellness programming, and cultural enrichment. This office is governed by the Vice President of Student Affairs.

1.3    Revising the RSU Assessment Plan Executive Summary

This plan will be reviewed in the spring semester of even years and revised if necessary.  The UAC are tasked with oversight of this process with appropriate contributions from the GEC, OAA, and OSA.  Revisions are forwarded to the University administration for review.

## 2.  ENTRY-LEVEL ASSESSMENT

2.3  Purpose

Entry-level assessment analyzes the college preparedness of all new students to ensure they have the best possible chance of success in attaining their academic goals. Assessment results are used in the placement and advising process to ensure students are enrolled 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 collaboration between the UAC, GEC, University Curriculum Committee (UCC), Enrollment Management Committee (EMC), and OSA.

The specific priorities for entry-level assessment are to:

a.  Ensure that entering students have basic skills adequate to succeed in college.

b.  Improve retention rates of entering students as they matriculate through the system.

c.  Provide entering students with experiences that will help them clarify their educational and personal goals.

d.  Evaluate the effectiveness of the entry-level assessment/placement process.

e. Provide university-wide student support services, activities, and resources which complement academic programs.

f. Strengthen the delivery of student services to improve access, placement, and advisement through integration of assessment and activities with emphasis on at-risk students.

g. Produce useable centralized, qualitative and quantitative information for use in institutional decision making.

2.4 Assessment methodology

Student scores on the ACT or SAT are the primary indicators of academic readiness. Students with previous college credits are evaluated using ACT or SAT* scores and/or prior coursework. Students are assessed following application to RSU and prior to enrollment. Students who do not meet the cut scores or other readiness requirements in English, mathematics, reading, and science are referred for secondary testing. Students who successfully complete the College Career Math Ready (4550) course in high school with an A or B in every unit will be considered proficient in math.

| | ACT Sub-score | SAT* Sub-score |
|---|---|---|
| English | 19 | 480 Evidenced-based Reading & Writing |
| Reading | 19 | 530 Math |
| Math | 19 | 480 Evidenced-based Reading & Writing |
| Science | 19 | |

*Valid for SATs administered on or after March 5, 2016. These scores are based on College Board's Concordance Table published on May 9, 2016. It is subject to change.

The ACCUPLACER is currently the secondary test for English, reading, and mathematics. Scores from the ACT COMPASS test taken at RSU prior to 2017 will also be accepted for evaluation. The secondary test for science is the STASS test. All students admitted using SAT scores are required to complete the STASS prior to enrolling in a science course. 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 24-hour waiting period. After one year from the first test date has elapsed, students may start the testing process again. Once students begin the developmental course in a subject, they may no longer participate in secondary testing in that subject. 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.

Placement into the appropriate developmental studies (i.e. zero-level or remedial) course is mandatory for all students who do not meet proficiency in one or more of the basic skills needed for collegiate study. In these instances, zero-level courses may be required as stand-alone classes or supplemental zero-level courses may be required as co-requisites with college-level courses. First-time freshman must complete all required zero-level courses within the first 24 semester hours attempted. Transfer students must complete all required zero-level courses within the first 12 semester hours attempted.

Student achievement toward learning goals in developmental studies is assessed in two ways:

a. Course-embedded assessment

Developmental studies faculty have articulated student learning outcomes for each zero-level course that address the minimum skill proficiencies for entry-level college study. These outcomes address four skill areas: 1) basic writing, 2) reading comprehension, 3) mathematical reasoning, and 4) science proficiency. Student achievement towards these outcomes is assessed with a variety of course-embedded direct measures, such as exams and pre/post-tests.

b. Student progress in entry-level study

The Office for Accountability and Academics (OAA) tracks the progress of developmental students through their zero-level courses and into subsequent collegiate-level course work. For example, students who successfully complete Developmental Writing are followed into Composition I and Composition II. The success rate of these students is then compared with those students not required to enroll in zero-level courses. Beginning with the 2017-2018 academic year, co-requisite developmental studies are evaluated by the OAA as well. Co-requisite studies allow for students who score between 17-18 on the ACT subtests for math and/or writing to complete their developmental coursework in the same semester as the related college-level course(s) in math and/or writing. Student success in these courses are analyzed and compared with those of students completing traditional developmental studies and with students who place directly into college-level coursework.

2.5 Collecting and disseminating assessment findings

a. Admissions testing

The Admissions Office is responsible for collecting ACT and SAT scores and documentation of previous course work from incoming students. Students not meeting basic skills competencies are referred to the university Testing Center. Testing Center personnel are responsible for administering secondary tests and reporting results to Admissions and the OAA. In addition, this office inputs individual scores into the student information system for tracking purposes. The OAA analyzes entry-level assessment data and reports the results on an annual basis to the administration, Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education, and other accrediting agencies.

b. Developmental studies

Developmental Studies faculty submit two Student Learning Reports (SLR) to the OAA at the end of each Spring semester. These reports summarize and interpret course-embedded assessment data collected in all zero-level courses over the previous year. SLRs are subsequently subject to oral and written peer-review by the UAC. Data collected by the OAA on student progress in entry-level coursework are analyzed and reported in an annual Entry-Level Assessment Report. Electronic copies of the above reports are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

2.6 Using assessment to improve student learning

The OAA 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, UAC, GEC, and UCC recommend program or process changes to improve student academic achievement, and to enhance student development.

2.7   Modifying the assessment process

The Office of Admissions, the Academic Policy Committee, and the UAC are responsible for the evaluation and modification of entry-level assessment/placement processes. The Office of Academics will make decisions to maximize student success by: 1) assessing the validity of current cut-scores and placement procedures, 2) examining whether current assessment instruments are measuring skill competencies as determined for mastery of subsequent college-level work, and 3) evaluating the effectiveness of current measures of student satisfaction in regard to activities that impact students upon entry to the institution.

Priorities:

a.   Determine the effectiveness of current cut-scores and assessment instruments

b.   Coordinate assessment initiatives with The College Experience (ORIE 1151) course to provide a means of gathering important entry-level assessment data.

c.   Assess the effectiveness of basic skills courses in preparing students for more advanced course work.

d.   Use entry-level assessment and placement to build a strong foundation for student success at all levels of assessment.

## 3.   GENERAL EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

3.1   Purpose

General education assessment (i.e., mid-level assessment) measures student achievement toward five general education student learning outcomes (identified below) and in five core curriculum areas: 1) communications, 2) social and behavioral sciences, 3) science and mathematics, 4) humanities, and 5) global studies.  The general education program at RSU integrates a broad foundation of knowledge and skills with the study of contemporary concerns. The five general education student learning outcomes are reflective of those capabilities essential for all college-educated adults living and working in the twenty-first century:

a.   Think critically and creatively.

b.   Acquire, analyze, and evaluate knowledge of human cultures and the physical and natural world.

c.   Use written, oral, and visual communication effectively.

d.   Develop an individual perspective on the human experience, and demonstrate an understanding of diverse perspectives and values.

e.   Demonstrate civic knowledge and engagement, ethical reasoning, and skills for lifelong learning.

3.2 Assessment methodology

Assessing Student achievement toward learning goals in RSU's general education program is carried out in three ways:

a. Course-embedded assessment

   Primary assessment of student learning in general education has relied largely on course-embedded measures. The University currently offers over 40 general education courses within the five core curriculum areas (per 3.1). All of these courses, including those using blended and online teaching modes, are subject to regular assessment. While no single course is expected to address all five student learning outcomes, faculty are encouraged to address at least two outcomes in every course. Departmental faculty are charged with devising and implementing appropriate measures for assessing student achievement cover one or more of the general education learning outcomes. Measures used by faculty consist of pre/post-tests, examinations, oral and written student presentations, and other student assignments. Performance standards for each measure are set by the faculty and serve as the basis for evaluating student achievement.

b. Institutional assessment

   i. Cognitive and direct measures

      RSU uses a criterion-referenced instrument to assess students' critical thinking, reading, writing, and mathematics skills. The instrument currently in use is the *Proficiency Profile*, which is published by the Education Testing Service (ETS) and is approved by the Voluntary System of Accountability (VSA). ETS provides test results together with comparative data of student performance at peer institutions. These data can help RSU identify areas of strength and opportunities for curriculum improvement. Three cohorts of bachelor degree-seeking students at RSU are tested annually to assess student learning in these skill areas.

      Cohort 1: First-time freshmen who have not completed general education courses or have not taken general education courses at other institutions.

      Cohort 2: Sophomores with 31-60 credit hours completed at RSU. Students with concurrent or transferred general education courses are excluded.

      Cohort 3: Seniors within one semester of graduation.

      A measure of student learning is obtained by contrasting skill proficiency levels for the cohorts. This approach offers a global perspective on the effectiveness of the general education program and provides actionable score reports to pinpoint strengths and areas of improvement.

   ii. Indirect measures

      Student evaluation of instruction is routinely conducted at RSU. Between 2009 and 2018, the institution utilized the IDEA Center® Student Ratings of Instruction (See 6.2). One component of this instrument measures student self-reported progress against twelve standard course-related objectives. As these objectives comprise a conceptual subset of the five RSU general education

learning outcomes (see Section 3.1), these data are used as an additional measure of student achievement in their general education. Note: A new instrument for student evaluations of instruction is being developed at this time.

3.3   Collecting and disseminating assessment findings

The GEC, UCC, academic departments, and the OAA share responsibility for creation, implementation, and assessment of the general education program at the institutional level.  These constituencies recommend and evaluate curricular and assessment changes to strengthen programs on a continuing basis. The processes followed by the departments and committees reinforce the linkage between the institutional mission and the five general education learning outcomes of Section 3.1.

   a.   Course-embedded assessment

All academic departments with one or more general education courses are required to submit a General Education SLR at the end of the spring semester.  These annual reports compile and interpret assessment data collected from general education courses taught by the respective departments over the preceding academic year. They represent a collaborative product of course-related faculty with distributed duties of data collection, data tabulation and analysis, and interpretation of findings. SLRs are reviewed by the department head and school dean and forwarded to the OAA and GEC.  General Education SLRs are subject to regular peer-review by the GEC.  Electronic copies of all SLRs are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

   b.   Institutional Assessment

      i.   Cognitive and direct measures

The Proficiency Profile is coordinated by the OAA with the support of RSU Testing Center staff. The exam is taken online at one of the three campus testing centers.  Student scores, together with comparisons of RSU student to peer institutions, are obtained through a secure data portal at the ETS website. These results exam are shared with the faculty at large by the OAA.

      ii.   Indirect measures

See Section 6.3 within Student Satisfaction Assessment for a description of the indirect measures, including student evaluations of instruction, used in reviewing, evaluating, and informing the process to improve student learning outcomes. All assessments are included in the Annual Student Assessment Report, which is shared with the University community and reported to Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education by the OAA.  Electronic copies of these reports are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

3.4   Using assessment to improve student learning

All RSU departments associated with the general education program are charged with using course-embedded assessment data to improve student achievement toward the general education learning outcomes in their respective courses.  Assessment can help instructors identify student strengths and weaknesses, monitor student learning and progress, plan and shape instruction, and monitor teaching effectiveness.  The GEC and

UAC play key oversight roles in this process.

3.5   Modifying assessment procedures

Evaluation and modification of assessment procedures and methodologies occur at several levels:

a. Faculty evaluate student learning through assessment processes within their respective departments.

b. The GEC, UCC and UAC periodically review course objectives and assessment processes at the institutional level to ensure linkage with the five general education learning outcomes.

c. The UAC and GEC review departmental student learning reports and provide recommendations for the assessment process.

## 4.  PROGRAM-LEVEL ASSESSMENT

4.1   Purpose

Program-level assessment measures student achievement toward the learning goals established by the institution's degree-granting undergraduate and graduate programs. Major fields of study give students the opportunity for in-depth study of the theories, knowledge, and methods of an academic discipline. Snapshots of student achievement in these areas can be captured through the assessment of program learning outcomes. Continuous program-level assessment provides faculty with an understanding of how their program is meeting its objectives, with the ultimate goal to foster student learning.

4.2   Assessment methodology

Departmental faculty, with the oversight of the respective chair and dean, are responsible for the assessment of each degree program.  Program assessment plans are developed collaboratively by the faculty associated with each program.

Each program assessment plan will:

a. Review institutional, school, departmental, and program missions/goals and establish the desired levels of assessment.

b. Identify student learning outcomes in relation to the planned level of assessment. Outcomes define the knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes that a student can expect to acquire in completing the degree.

c. Determine methods and tools for assessing student performance for each learning outcome.  Such measures include portfolios, capstone projects, licensure and certification exams, course-embedded tests and assignments, standardized exams, student surveys, focus groups, exit interviews, and employer surveys.  Additionally, other degree programs, such as the BS in Nursing program, also assess student learning outcomes in this way.  Measures and methodology must be sufficiently rigorous to ensure confidence in the findings.

d. Establish criteria for determining the degree to which students have achieved the established learning outcomes.

e. Decide how results will be gathered, analyzed, and disseminated.

     f.   Establish timelines for implementing elements of an assessment plan.

4.3   Collecting and disseminating assessment findings

Academic departments submit an annual Degree Program SLR for each degree-granting program under their purview at the end of each spring semester. These annual reports present the compilation and interpretation of the assessment data collected over the preceding academic year.  They are a collaborative product of program-related faculty, who distribute duties of data collection, data tabulation and analysis, and interpretation of findings.  Each report is reviewed by the respective department head and school dean and forwarded to the OAA.  All Degree Program SLRs are subject to biennial oral and written peer-review by the UAC.   The UAC examines the assessment data for any notable trends, identifies strengths and weaknesses of the report, and provides recommendations to academic departments.  Electronic copies of all annual SLRs are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

4.4   Using assessment to improve student learning

Program-level assessment focuses on what and how an academic program is contributing to the learning, growth, and development of students as a group. Findings should then be used to inform, confirm, and support program-level change and facilitate continual program-level improvement. Such assessment helps programs:

   a.   Provide empirical evidence of what students are learning

   b.   Identify gaps in student learning areas

   c.   Inform teaching pedagogy by aligning best practices with learner needs

   d.   Make informed decisions to guide curriculum growth and revision

   e.   Demonstrate overall program effectiveness and showcase student learning

The annual Degree Program SLR (see Section 4.3) provides program faculty with the ability to: 1) make written proposals for changes to their program curriculum and/or assessment plan, 2) provide feedback to reviewer comments from the previous peer-review, and 3) follow up on proposed changes made in earlier assessment cycles.

4.5   Modifying assessment procedures

Evaluation of assessment activities and processes occurs at several levels:

   a.   Faculty evaluate student learning through assessment processes within their respective departments.

   b.   The UCC and the UAC periodically review course objectives and assessment processes at the institutional level.

   c.   The UAC peer reviews departmental student learning reports and provides recommendations for the assessment process.

## 5. CO-CURRICULAR ASSESSMENT

5.1   Purpose

It is widely acknowledged by numerous scholarly associations within higher education that student learning and development occurs both inside and outside of the classroom. This learning takes shape across several critical domains: knowledge acquisition,

construction, integration and application; cognitive complexity; intrapersonal development; interpersonal competence; humanitarianism and civic engagement; and practical competence. Furthermore, student learning and development can occur through both formal and informal activities during the collegiate experience. While it is not possible to capture and document every instance where students make progress across all of these domains, it is possible to ascertain instances of such growth in order to evaluate program effectiveness that can inform future enhancements. In addition to measuring student learning and development, co-curricular assessment also entails tracking student engagement to understand the ways in which, and extent to which, students take advantage of various resources offered on campus.

The Division of Student Affairs annually implements an assessment cycle to measure student engagement in co-curricular activities and certain campus resources, and to understand how students are learning and developing through their experiences. These assessment activities help the university to meet post-secondary educational mandates and better understand the student experience with an eye toward continual improvement.

Various assessment methods are used to help administrators and staff pinpoint strengths and identify areas for improvement. Data gleaned from the instruments are used to:

a. Improve university programs and services

b. Guide future program development

c. Support student retention initiatives

d. Meet accreditation requirements

e. Identify areas of strength for institutional marketing and promotion

5.2  Assessment methodology

Multiple measures with different student populations are deployed to gather student feedback and ascertain educational impact.

a. Hillcamp Evaluation

This locally-developed survey is administered each year immediately following the conclusion of Hillcamp, which is RSU's four-day new student orientation program held in August just prior to the beginning of the semester. Students are asked to complete a survey in which they rate numerous aspects of the program and reflect on their learning and development. Opportunity for personal written comments is also provided.

b. Residential Life Annual Student Survey

This locally-developed survey is administered each spring semester to residential students living in the University Village complex. Students are invited to complete a multi-item survey in which they rate numerous features of campus living and reflect on their learning and development. Personal written comments are also encouraged.

c. Event & Leadership Role Assessments

The Division of Student Affairs annually offers several events designed to engage students in meaningful ways that will foster learning and development and provide a rich opportunity for assessment. Examples of such events include the annual Student Organization Leadership Retreat (SOLR) which attracts newly elected student

organization leaders for various breakout sessions. A multi-item evaluation solicits student feedback about the program and their leadership development.

The semi-annual Career, Internship, and Graduate School Fairs represent another opportunity to evaluate the student experience and measure student learning. A multi-item survey solicits participants to reflect on their experience of the fair events and on topics of career development.

The 9-member Campus Activities Team (CAT) is a premier leadership opportunity on campus, through which selected students work together to plan numerous campus events throughout the academic year. The team is advised by the Student Activities Coordinator, who invests considerable training with CAT members and empowers them with significant responsibilities. Upon completion, each member completes a multi-item evaluation that solicits feedback about their involvement and learning/development.

d. Attendance and Point of Use Surveys

The Student Activities Coordinator tracks attendance at each event sponsored by the Campus Activities Team, typically by asking students to sign in using their student ID number. Attendance data helps the Coordinator to evaluate popularity of events, and to calculate cost per person to ensure that student fee funds are expended as effectively as possible.

Point of use surveys are administered in several offices, such as Counseling Services and Student Health Services. These brief surveys generate immediate feedback regarding students' satisfaction and overall experience with the services provided. Staff members in service operations also keep track of student appointments (e.g., number, duration, topic, etc.) that can provide valuable summative data.

5.3 Collecting and disseminating assessment findings

a. Hillcamp Evaluation

This survey is coordinated by the Vice President for Student Affairs (VPSA) and results are stored in a network folder available to staff members on the Student Affairs Council. Selected highlights are included in the annual Student Affairs Assessment Report, which is published on the RSU website.

b. Residential Life Annual Student Survey

This survey is coordinated by the Director of Residential Life and results are stored in a network folder available to staff members on the Student Affairs Council. Selected highlights are included in the annual Student Affairs Assessment Report, which is published on the RSU website.

c. Event & Leadership Role Assessments

All data from these assessments are stored and archived electronically by OSA staff members overseeing the events. Selected highlights are included in the annual Student Affairs Assessment Report, which is published on the RSU website.

d. Attendance and Point of Use Surveys

Data from these assessments are stored as departmental files maintained by the coordinator/director in charge of the operations. Selected highlights are included in the annual Student Affairs Assessment Report, which is published on the RSU

website.

Results from these indirect assessments are included in the annual Student Affairs Assessment Report, which is shared with the University community and reported to Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education by the OAA. Electronic copies of the annual report are   archived on the institutional website and publicly accessible.

5.4   Modifying the assessment procedures

The process for evaluating student engagement, learning, and development includes ongoing review and programmatic adjustments to continually enhance the student experience. Student Affairs staff members annually develop assessment plans while intentionally designing opportunities for students that appropriately align with co-curricular learning outcomes.

# 6.   STUDENT SATISFACTION ASSESSMENT

6.1   Purpose

Understanding students' experiences and satisfaction is important to the University's efforts to enrich the student collegiate experience and to make RSU a more student-centered university. RSU undertakes student satisfaction surveys to elicit student opinion and viewpoints regarding university programs and services, to gauge student perspectives regarding the institution generally, to meet post-secondary educational mandates, and to expand the institution's overall effort.  These instruments serve as diagnostic tools to help faculty and administrators pinpoint strengths and identify areas for improvement. Data gleaned from student satisfaction surveys are used to:

    a.   Improve university programs and services

    b.   Guide strategic action planning

    c.   Strengthen student retention initiatives

    d.   Meet accreditation requirements

    e.   Identify areas of strength for institutional marketing and promotion

6.2   Assessment methodology

Multiple measures with different student populations are performed to gauge satisfaction.

    a.   Student Satisfaction Survey

This is a locally-developed survey in which respondents are asked to rate the importance of and satisfaction with university operations and services using a 5-point Likert scale. The survey consists of 42 items addressing instruction, support services, and general day-to-day educational experience.  The instrument 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.

    b.   National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)

The NSSE is a national survey instrument that measures the quality of students' educational experiences at RSU in four broad areas: academic challenge, learning with peers, experiences with faculty, and campus environment.  This standardized

norm-referenced instrument is used to compare RSU student responses to external benchmarks. The survey is published by Indiana University School of Education Center for Postsecondary Research. The NSSE is administered at RSU on a regular three-year cycle.  Cluster sampling is used to select a representative sample of RSU freshmen and seniors at each of the three RSU campuses.

c.  Student Evaluation of Instruction

Student evaluation of instruction is routinely conducted at RSU.  Between 2009 and 2018, the institution utilized the IDEA Center® Student Ratings for this purpose. This measure is a fee-based instrument that measures student opinion on the quality of course instruction.  Quality of instruction is measured using three overall outcomes: a) student progress on relevant course objectives, b) the excellence of the teacher, and c) the excellence of the course.  A summary evaluation is a weighted average of these three outcomes.  This evaluation of instruction results in individual class reports, department summary reports, and an institutional summary report. Every fall semester all courses taught by full-time and part-time faculty are rated.  In the spring semester, a class is evaluated if requested by any faculty member or administrator, if taught by a part-time faculty member, or if the course was not taught and evaluated during the previous fall semester. This system has been used for all course delivery formats.  Note: A new instrument for student evaluation of instruction is being prepared for adoption in Fall 2018.

d.  Graduating Senior Survey

The University uses a locally-developed survey in which graduating seniors are asked to rate their satisfaction on 13 items relating to their RSU experiences and outcomes.  This instrument is designed to measure satisfaction with teaching and instruction, faculty, courses, advising, and student learning outcomes. Additional items collect information regarding continuing educational objectives and employment status. This survey is emailed to all graduating students during their last semester prior to graduation.  Participation is voluntary.

e.  Alumni and employer surveys

The OAA has developed an instrument, in conjunction with the Alumni Office, to measure perceptions of recent alumni on experiences at RSU and their progress in their general and degree program education. Students are asked for consent to contact their employers for a follow-up survey regarding employer satisfaction with student academic preparation for employment.

6.3  Collecting and disseminating assessment findings

a.  Student Satisfaction Survey

This survey is coordinated by the OAA.  An annual summary report of survey results is made available to faculty and departments.  Copies are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

b.  National Survey of Student Engagement

This survey is coordinated by the OAA.  A summary report is made available to faculty and departments.  Copies are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

c. Student Evaluation of Instruction

This survey is coordinated by the OAA. Survey packets for each course being evaluated are sent to instructors for implementation after the course is 75% complete, which allows students ample exposure to the course before evaluation. Each packet includes individual student survey forms, a faculty/course information form, and detailed directions for the student proctors, who administer the survey according to the directions provided. For confidentiality, faculty may not be present in the room during implementation. Completed surveys are returned to the OAA and sent to the IDEA Center for processing and analysis. IDEA Center survey results are returned to the OAA for distribution to the individual departments and instructors. Handwritten student comments are typed by OAA so the instructor cannot identify students by their handwriting; consequently, student anonymity is preserved. The institutional summary reports for all survey years are archived on the university server website and are publicly accessible.

d. Graduating Senior Survey

This survey is coordinated by the OAA. An annual summary report of survey results is made available to faculty and departments. Copies are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

e. Alumni and employer surveys

This survey is coordinated by the OAA. An annual summary report of survey results is made available to faculty and departments. Copies are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

Results from these indirect assessments are included in the Annual Student Assessment Report, which is shared with the University community and reported to Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education by the OAA. Electronic copies of these reports are archived on the institutional website and are publicly accessible.

6.4 Modifying the assessment plan

The process for evaluating student satisfaction includes ongoing review of self-referenced (i.e.ipsative) and norm-referenced (i.e. normative) outcomes. Results are analyzed for identification of strengths and areas for improvement. They are shared with academic departments, student services, and staff for clarity and use in decision making processes.

# APPENDIX:  Common Assessment Terms[1]

**Course competency** – A course competency is a general statement that describes the desired knowledge, skills and/or behaviors required to satisfactorily achieve a specific outcome of a course. It is written to describe the learning gained by students in individual courses, and can be disaggregated into unit, module, or chapter sub-competencies.

**Course-embedded assessment** – Course-embedded measurements are those which are integrated into the teaching-learning process and are part of the course environment. Results can be used to assess individual student performance or they can be aggregated to provide information about the course or program. As such, they can be formative or summative, quantitative or qualitative.

*Example: as part of a Capstone course, a final project is evaluated for evidence of a specific student learning outcome, would be a course-embedded assessment.*

**Direct assessment of learning** – Direct assessment is based on student performance or demonstrates the learning itself.  Performance on cognitive measures such as tests, term papers, or the execution of lab skills, would all be examples of direct assessment of learning. Direct assessment of learning can occur within a course (e.g., performance on a series of tests) as with a cross-sectional analysis, and it may occur longitudinally, such as comparing writing scores from sophomore to senior year.

**Formative assessment** – Formative assessment refers to the gathering of information or data about student learning during a course or degree program that is used to guide improvements in teaching and learning. Formative assessment activities are usually low-stakes or no-stakes; they do not contribute substantially to the final evaluation or grade of the student or may not even be assessed at the individual student level. They are formative because they provide for feedback to the instructor before the end of a course or degree program so that an instructor can modify delivery during the learning process.

*Example: posing a question in class and asking for a show of hands in support of different response options would be a formative assessment at the class level.  Observing how many students responded incorrectly would be used to guide further teaching.*

**Indirect assessment of learning** – Indirect assessment uses perceptions, reflections or secondary evidence to make inferences about student learning.

*Example: student satisfaction surveys and student evaluations of instruction are indirect evidence of learning.*

**Individual assessment** – Individual assessment refers to the individual student, and his/her learning, as the level of analysis. Such evaluations can be quantitative or qualitative, formative or summative, standards-based or value added, and used for improvement. Most of the student assessment conducted in higher education is focused on the individual. Student test scores, improvement in writing during a course, or a student's improvement presentation skills over their

---

[1] Adapted from *Assessment Glossary* compiled by American Public University System, 2005 www.apus.edu/Learning-Outcomes-Assessment/Resources/Glossary/Assessment-Glossary.htm

undergraduate career are all examples of individual assessment.

**Institutional assessment** – Institutional assessment is generally conducted through a college or university office and evaluates an institutions' overall effectiveness in achieving its mission, goals, and its compliance with accreditation standards. Institutional assessment can be quantitative or qualitative, formative or summative, standards-based or value added, and used for improvement or for accountability. Ideally, institution-wide goals and objectives would serve as a basis for the assessment.

*Example: to measure the institutional goal of developing collaboration skills, an instructor and peer assessment tool could be used to measure how well seniors across the institution work in multi-cultural teams.*

**Local assessment** – Means and methods that are developed by an institution's faculty based on their teaching approaches, students, and learning goals are local assessments.

*Example: an English Department's construction and use of a writing rubric to assess incoming freshmen's writing samples, which might then be used assign students to appropriate writing courses, or might be compared to senior writing samples to get a measure of value-added.*

**Program assessment** – Program or Degree Program Assessment uses the department or program as the level of analysis. Course competencies aggregate into program outcomes, and program assessment is designed these student learning outcomes. A program assessment can be dual purpose; it can be used as evidence of achievement of a program-level student learning outcome *and* as evidence of course competency if the competency is a congruous with the program-level outcome.  Program assessments can be quantitative or qualitative, formative or summative, standards-based or value added, and they can be used for improvement or for accountability.  Ideally, program goals and objectives would serve as a basis for the assessment.

*Example: A capstone project may be selected for evidence of a program-level assessment (this would be summative rather than formative) by combining performance data from multiple senior level courses, collecting ratings from internship employers, etc.  If a goal is to assess value added, some comparison of the performance to newly declared majors would be included.*

**Qualitative assessment** – Qualitative measures collect data that are descriptive and/or subjective rather than objective and empirical "hard" data. Qualitative assessment lends itself towards interpretive criteria but can be just as meaningful as quantitative data.

*Example: focus group feedback categorized into constructs is representative of qualitative data.*

**Quantitative assessment** – Quantitative measures collect data that are numerical and can be analyzed using objective, empirical methods. These data are less vulnerable to interpretation and conform to specific levels of measurement. Quantitative data can be collected for both direct and indirect assessment measures.

*Example: student ratings of a faculty member's quality of instruction over a semester (indirect assessment) collected using a Likert-type preference scale represent quantitative data.*

**Rubric** – A rubric is a scoring tool that explicitly represents the performance expectations for an assignment or piece of work. A rubric divides the assigned work into component parts and provides clear descriptions of the characteristics of the work associated with each component, at varying levels of mastery. Rubrics can be used for a wide array of assignments: papers, projects, oral

presentations, artistic performances, group projects, etc. Rubrics can be used as scoring or grading guides, to provide formative feedback to support and guide ongoing learning efforts, or both.

**Standards** – Standards refer to an established level of accomplishment that all students are expected to meet or exceed. Standards do not imply standardization of a program or of testing. Performance or learning standards may be met through multiple pathways and demonstrated in various ways.

*Example: instruction designed to meet a standard for verbal foreign language competency may include classroom conversations, one-on-one interactions with a faculty member, or the use of computer software. Assessing competence may be done by carrying on a conversation about daily activities or a common scenario, such as eating in a restaurant, or using a standardized test, using a rubric or grading key to score correct grammar and comprehensible pronunciation.*

**Student learning outcome or student learning objective** – Student learning outcomes (SLOs) are statements that specify what students will know, be able to do or able to demonstrate when they have completed or participated in a program. Outcomes are usually expressed as knowledge, skills attitudes or values. Generally degree programs can be described by a set 4-12 SLOs.

**Summative assessment** – The gathering of information at the conclusion of a course, program, or undergraduate career to improve learning or to meet accountability demands. When used for improvement, summative results can impact the next cohort of students taking the course or program.

*Example: examining student final exams in a course to see if certain specific areas of the curriculum were understood less well than others.*

**Value added** – As the name implies, "value added" is the increase in learning that occurs during a course, program, or undergraduate education. It can either focus on the individual student (how much better a student can write, for example, at the end than at the beginning) or on a cohort of students (whether senior papers demonstrate more sophisticated writing skills-in the aggregate-than freshmen papers). To measure value-added, a baseline or benchmark measurement is needed for comparison. The baseline measure can be from the same sample of students (longitudinal design) or from a different sample (cross-sectional).