Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
Carl Albert State College
Annual Student Assessment Report of 2019-2020 Activity

Section I – Entry Level Assessment and Course Placement

Activities

I-1. CASC's ASSESSMENT PLAN determines a student's college preparedness by evaluating testing results and high school performance measurements. Students are placed into freshman-level courses, or into a combination of college-level and remedial when tests scores fall below cut-off scores. The Office of Admissions evaluated credentials to provide students with a summary of entry requirements.

These placement testing criteria DO NOT apply to concurrent student enrollments.

COLLEGE LEVEL ENGLISH (ENGLISH 1113):
- ACT 19+;
- Accuplacer Writing 98+;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Writing 265+; or
- ACT 17-18 & HS GPA of 3.00+

COLLEGE LEVEL READING:
- ACT 19+;
- Accuplacer Reading 90+;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Reading Comprehension 260+; or
- ACT 17-18 & HS GPA of 3.00+

COLLEGE LEVEL MATH:
- ACT 19+;
- Accuplacer Arithmetic 103+ Accuplacer Elementary Algebra 97+;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Arithmetic 265+ Next-Gen Accuplacer Quantitative 264+

COLLEGE LEVEL SCIENCE:
- ACT 19+

I-2. CASC's ASSESSMENT PLAN determines a student's college preparedness by evaluating testing results and high school performance measurements. Students are placed into freshman-level courses, or into a combination of college-level and remedial when tests scores fall below cut-off scores. The Office of Admissions evaluated credentials to provide students with a summary of entry requirements.

These placement testing criteria DO NOT apply to concurrent student enrollments.

For Deficiency Guidelines, CASC adheres to Oklahoma State Regent policy stating that all students must be evaluated for placement into college-level courses and remediate identified deficiency(s) within the first 24 credit hours of college enrollment. CASC evaluates both standard testing tools (ACT, SAT, & NextGen Accuplacer) and high school GPA and

performance measurements to place students into college-level courses. The following guidelines apply.

- Deficiency courses should be completed in the student's first semester.
- A HOLD will be placed on student's 2nd term enrollment when student fails to complete/enroll in all deficiency course(s) in the 1st term and removed when the student is enrolled in final deficiency course(s).
- Successful completion of a deficiency course is "C" grade or higher.
- Students who earn a final grade of D, F, or W in any deficiency course have not met that deficiency requirement and will be administratively withdrawn from the following term's college-level equivalent. Student must repeat the deficiency class and earn an A, B, or C grade, or successfully repeat testing to advance to college-level course.
- CASC evaluates high school GPA and performance measurements to place students into college-level courses.
- "Fast-track" is designed to move students through the deficiency process faster with fewer zero-level credit hours. Fast-track students enroll in both a 1 credit hour study/personal instruction lab and college-level course placement in English 1113, Math 1513, or Math 1413.
- Fast-track course enrollments should be addressed to the Office of Admissions, English advisors or Math advisors.
- Students enrolling in MATH 0113 must also complete MATH 0123 in the next term and lastly, in MATH 1513 or 1413.

CO-REQUISITE LEVEL ENGLISH (ENGLISH 1113 + ENGL 0121):

- ACT 16-18;
- Accuplacer Writing 82-97;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Writing 250-264; or
- HS GPA of 3.00+;

CO-REQUISITE LEVEL READING (ENGL 1113 + ENGL 0111):

- ACT 11-18;
- Accuplacer Reading 28-89;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Reading Comprehension 220-259; or
- HS GPA of 3.00+

Math Pathways:

- Math Pathways is a statewide effort to tie relevant math to an expected major.
- Students should enroll in MATH 1413 Survey of Contemporary Math if their major is Child Development, Computer Information Technology, Enterprise Development, General Studies, HPER, Pre-Elementary Education, Pre-Law Criminal Justice, History and Political Science, and Sociology/Psychology.
- Students should enroll in MATH 1513 College Algebra (Pre-Calculus) if their major is Business Administration, Allied Health, Biological & Pre-Professional Sciences, Math Physical Science & Pre-Engineering.
- Students should consult transfer college for their Math Pathways requirement, and adjust CASC selection accordingly.

CO-REQUISITE LEVEL MATH (MATH 1513 + MATH 0111):

- ACT 17-18;
- Accuplacer Arithmetic 79-102 Accuplacer Elementary Algebra 63-96;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Arithmetic 255-264 Next-Gen Accuplacer Quantitative 249-263; AND
- HS GPA of 3.00+; AND
- HS Completion of Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry

CO-REQUISITE LEVEL MATH (MATH 1413 + MATH 0111):

- ACT 16-18;
- Accuplacer Arithmetic 59-102 Accuplacer Elementary Algebra 43-96;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Arithmetic 245-264 Next-Gen Accuplacer Quantitative 240-263; AND
- HS GPA of 3.00+; AND
- HS Completion of Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry

I-3. Tutoring and coaching were available for students through the Learning Resource Center, Native American Resource Center, Office of Student Support Services, and by appointment with instructors.

Multiple placement measures allowed students to gain access to credit-bearing, college-level coursework more quickly, and in many cases immediately upon enrollment.

Co-requisite remediation options allowed a significant number of students to access credit-bearing, college-level coursework.

I-4. CASC's ASSESSMENT PLAN determines a student's college preparedness by evaluating testing results and high school performance measurements. Students are placed into freshman-level courses, or into a combination of college-level and remedial when tests scores fall below cut-off scores. The Office of Admissions evaluates credentials to provide students with a summary of entry requirements.

These placement testing criteria DO NOT apply to concurrent student enrollments. For Deficiency Guidelines CASC adheres to Oklahoma State Regent policy stating that all students must be evaluated for placement into college-level courses and remediate identified deficiency(s) within the first 24 credit hours of college enrollment. CASC evaluates both standard testing tools (ACT, SAT, & NextGen Accuplacer) and high school GPA and performance measurements to place students into college-level courses. The following guidelines apply:

- Deficiency courses should be completed in the student's first semester.
- A HOLD will be placed on student's 2nd term enrollment when student fails to complete/enroll in all deficiency course(s) in the 1st term and removed when the student is enrolled in final deficiency course(s).
- Successful completion of a deficiency course is "C" grade or higher.
- Students who earn a final grade of D, F, or W in any deficiency course have not met that deficiency requirement and will be administratively withdrawn from the following term's college-level equivalent. Student must repeat the deficiency class and earn an A, B, or C grade, or successfully repeat testing to advance to college-level course.

- CASC evaluates high school GPA and performance measurements to place students into college-level courses.
- "Fast-track" is designed to move students through the deficiency process faster with fewer zero-level credit hours. Fast-track students enroll in both a 1 credit hour study/personal instruction lab and college-level course placement in English 1113, Math 1513, or Math 1413.
- Fast-track course enrollments should be addressed to the Office of Admissions, English advisors or Math advisors.
- Students enrolling in MATH 0113 must also complete MATH 0123 in the next term and lastly, in MATH 1513 or 1413.

REMEDIAL LEVEL ENGLISH (ENGLISH 1113 + ENGL 0123):

- ACT 0-15;
- Accuplacer Writing 0-81;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Writing 200-249; and
- HS GPA below 3.00;

REMEDIAL LEVEL READING (ENGL 1113 + ENGL 0113):

- ACT 0-10;
- Accuplacer Reading 0-27;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Reading Comprehension 200-219; and
- HS GPA below 3.00

REMEDIAL LEVEL MATH (MATH 0123):

- ACT 13-15;
- Accuplacer Arithmetic 30-58 Accuplacer Elementary Algebra 28-42;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Arithmetic 230-244 Next-Gen Accuplacer Quantitative 233-239

REMEDIAL LEVEL MATH (MATH 0123 & MATH 0111):

- ACT 0-12;
- Accuplacer Arithmetic 0-29 Accuplacer Elementary Algebra 0-27;
- Next-Gen Accuplacer Arithmetic 200-229 Next-Gen Accuplacer Quantitative 200-232

1-5. Carl Albert State College encourages all incoming students to take the ACT/SAT since some programs require ACT scores for admission. However, if an adult student is not seeking admission into one of the special programs, the student is then given Accuplacer in order to assess the need for developmental courses. If the adult student's scores indicate proficiency, he/she is immediately placed in credit-bearing classes. If the adult student is unable to obtain the set cut-off score, he/she is placed in the appropriate developmental course whether that be a one-credit hour lab or three-credit hour course. The adult student is also enrolled in the co-requisite, credit-bearing course.

Analysis and Findings

1-6. Carl Albert State College fully implemented co-requisite remediation in the Fall of 2018, especially concerning students with English and reading deficiencies. All students are able, with varying degrees of co-requisite remediation, to enroll in ENGL 1113 upon admission to the college. Data collected by the administration is focused on the success of students in both the 0-level courses and, more importantly, in the credit-bearing courses. Also of particular interest is the delivery method of the courses: traditional delivery vs. online delivery. In the past, CASC has experimented with cohort groups enrolled in a section of 0-level and credit-bearing, and this is still the case in MATH; however, this academic year that restriction was lifted from ENGL courses, meaning that students can enroll in any section of 0-level and any section of ENGL 1113.

After several semesters of analysis and adjustment, placement levels are, for the most part, satisfactory. Data indicates that ENGL 0113 may be an unnecessary class, as both enrollment and success rates are low. This is most likely associated with the extreme lack of preparation indicated by placement scores. Plans are being made to combine ENGL 0123 and ENGL 0113 into an Introduction to College Reading and Writing course.

Table Set 1: Developmental Grade Distributions Separated by Campus (Table 1)

The initial set of tables indicate the grade distributions of students enrolled in 0-level English and Math courses for the 19-20 academic year, separated by campus. The separation by campus was requested by administration to evaluate the effectiveness of online remediation courses in comparison to traditional courses.

For Fall 2019 in ENGL 0123, 27 of 45 students (60%) enrolled in Poteau passed with a C or better; 5 of 6 Sallisaw students (83%) passed with a C or better; and 10 of 25 online students passed with a C or better. In Spring 2020, 1 of 11 in Poteau (0.09%) passed with a C or better; and 11 of 18 Online students (61%) passed with a C or better. No sections were offered at the Sallisaw campus. Overall for ENGL 0123 in AY 19-20, 72 of 105 students completed with a C or better (66%).

For Fall 2019 in ENGL 0121, 27 of 45 students (60%) enrolled in Poteau passed with a C or better; 10 of 11 Sallisaw students (90.9%) passed with a C or better; and 34 of 50 Online students (68%) passed with a C or better. In Spring 2020, 10 of 15 in Poteau (66.6%) passed with a C or better; and 12 of 17 Online students (70.5%) passed with a C or better. There were no sections of ENGL 0121 offered on the Sallisaw campus. Overall, for ENGL 0121 in AY 19-20, 108 of 147 students completed with a C or better (73.4%).

For Fall 2019 in ENGL 0113, 5 of 7 students (71.4%) enrolled Online passed with a C or better; no sections were offered on the Poteau or Sallisaw campuses. In Spring 2020, 3 of 5 students enrolled Online passed with a C or better (60%); no sections were offered on the Poteau or Sallisaw campuses. Overall, for ENGL 0113 in AY 19-20, 8 of 12 students completed with a C or better (66.6%).

For Fall 2019 in ENGL 0111, 36 of 55 students (65.4%) enrolled in Poteau passed with a C or better; 13 of 14 Sallisaw students (92.8%) passed with a C or better; and 32 of 51 Online students (62.7%) passed with a C or better. In Spring 2020, 6 of 18 in Poteau (33.3%) passed with a C or better; and 9 of 14 Online students (64.2%) passed with a C or better. There were no sections offered on the Sallisaw campus. Overall, for ENGL 0111 in AY 19-20, 96 of 152 students completed with a C or better (59%).

Table 1:

Fall 2019

ENGL 0123	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	10	3	6	25
B	10	1	3	18
C	7	1	1	12
D	2	0	1	4
F	6	1	12	25
W	10	0	2	16
Total: 76	45	6	25	

ENGL 0121	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	24	4	21	43
B	12	3	9	21
C	6	3	4	11
D	2	0	0	2
F	3	1	11	13
W	7	0	5	10
Total: 115	54	11	50	

ENGL 0113	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	No sections of ENGL 0113 were offered on the Poteau or Sallisaw campuses in Fall 2019.		2	28
B			0	
C			3	44
D			0	
F			2	28
W			0	
Total: 7			7	

ENGL 0111	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	15	4	16	29
B	13	5	7	21
C	8	4	9	18
D	1	0	3	3
F	7	0	12	16
W	11	1	4	13
Total: 120	55	14	51	

Spring 2020

ENGL 0123	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A		No section offered	7	24
B	1		2	10
C			2	7
D				
F	5		4	31
W	2		2	14
NP	3		1	14
Total: 29	11		18	

ENGL 0121	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	5	No section offered	3	25
B	2		3	16
C	3		6	28
D				
F	1		2	9
W	4		3	22
Total: 32	15		17	

ENGL 0113	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	No sections of ENGL 0113 were offered on the Poteau or Sallisaw campuses in Spring 2020.		1	20
B				
C			1	20
D				
F			1	20
W			1	20
NP			1	20
Total: 5			5	

ENGL 0111	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online	%
A	3	No section offered	6	28
B	2		1	9
C	1		2	9
D				
F	5		3	26
W	6		1	22
NP	1		1	6
Total: 32	18		14	

Table Set 2: Success of ENGL Students in Co-requisite and Credit-Bearing Courses (Tables 2-5)

This set of tables indicates the grade distribution of students enrolled in Co-requisite English courses for the 19-20 academic year. Administration requested this matrix to determine and compare success in credit bearing courses of students enrolled in both 3-hour and 1-hour co-requisite courses.

In Fall 2019, those students identified as most underprepared and requiring the 3-hour co-requisite course (ENGL 0123) (Table 2) demonstrated the following success rates: 22 of 45 Poteau students (48.8%) completed both courses with a C or better; 3 of 6 Sallisaw students (50%) completed both courses with a C or better; and 7 of 25 Online students (28%) completed both courses with a C or better.

In Spring 2020, those students identified as most underprepared and requiring the 3-hour co-requisite course (ENGL 0123) demonstrated the following success rates: 0 of 11 Poteau students (0%) completed both courses with a C or better; no sections of ENGL 0123 were offered in Sallisaw; and 5 of 18 Online students (27.7%) completed both courses with a C or better.

Overall, 37 of 105 students (35.2%) successfully completed both ENGL 0123 and ENGL 1113. 9 students (8.5%) successfully completed ENGL 1113, but failed to complete ENGL 0123; however, their success in the credit-bearing has demonstrated ability to complete college-level coursework and the deficiency has been removed.

In Fall 2019, those students identified as less underprepared and requiring the 1-hour co-requisite course (ENGL 0121) (Table 3) demonstrated the following success rates: 38 of 54 Poteau students (70.3%) completed both courses with a C or better; 10 of 11 Sallisaw students (90.9%) completed both courses with a C or better; and 32 of 50 Online students (64%) completed both courses with a C or better.

In Spring 2020, those students identified as less underprepared and requiring the 1-hour co-requisite course (ENGL 0121) demonstrated the following success rates: 7 of 15 Poteau students (46.6%) completed both courses with a C or better; and 8 of 17 Online students (47%) completed both courses with a C or better (Table 3). There were no sections of ENGL 0121 offered in the Sallisaw campus in Spring 2020.

Overall, 95 of 147 students (64.6%) successfully completed both ENGL 0121and ENGL 1113. 8 students (5.4%) successfully completed ENGL 1113, but failed to complete ENGL 0121; however, their success in the credit-bearing course has demonstrated ability to complete college-level coursework and the deficiency has been removed.

In Fall 2019, those students identified as most underprepared and requiring the 3-hour co-requisite course (ENGL 0113) (Table 4) demonstrated the following success rates: 1 of 7 Online students (14.2%) completed both courses with a C or better; no sections were offered at Poteau or Sallisaw.

In Spring 2020, those students identified as most underprepared and requiring the 3-hour co-requisite course (ENGL0113) (Table 4) demonstrated the following success rates: 1 of 5 Online students (20%) completed both courses with a C or better; no sections were offered at Poteau or Sallisaw.

Overall, 2 of 12 students (16.6%) successfully completed both ENGL 0113 and ENGL 1113.
In Fall 2019 those students identified as less underprepared and requiring the 1-hour co-requisite course (ENGL0111) (Table 5) demonstrated the following success rates: 33 of 55 Poteau students (60%) completed both courses with a C or better; 10 of 14 Sallisaw students (71.4%) completed both courses with a C or better; and 31 of 51 Online students (58.8%) completed both courses with a C or better.

In Spring 2020, those students identified as less underprepared and requiring the 1-hour co-requisite course (ENGL0111) demonstrated the following success rates: 6 of 18 Poteau students (33.3%) completed both courses with a C or better; and 8 of 14 Online students (57.1%) completed both courses with a C or better. No sections were offered at the Sallisaw campus. Overall, 88 of 152 students (57.8%) successfully completed both ENGL 0111 and ENGL 1113.

Table 2: Students enrolled in ENGL 0123 & ENGL 1113

The following tables indicate how students fared in the co-requisite English course of ENGL 0123 and ENGL 1113.

Fall 2019

Poteau

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0123	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	4	6				
B	3	5	1			1
C		1	2	1		2
D	1				1	
F			1	2	3	
W						9

Sallisaw

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0123	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	3					
B						
C				1		
D						
F				1		
W						

Online

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0123	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	3	1				
B	1	1	1			
C					1	
D			1			
F		1	2	1	4	
W						2

Spring 2020

Poteau

ENGL 0123 / ENGL 1113

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A						
B					1	
C						
D						
F					5	
NP	1					1
W						2

Online

ENGL 0123 / ENGL 1113

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	1	2				
B						
C	1	1				
D						
F		1			1	
W						

Table 3: Students enrolled in ENGL 0121 & ENGL 1113

The following tables indicate how students fared in the co-requisite English course of ENGL 0121 and ENGL 1113.

Fall 2019

Poteau

ENGL 0121 \ ENGL 1113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	8	10	6			
B	2	5	2		3	
C		3	2	1		
D			1	1		
F					3	
W					1	6

Sallisaw

ENGL 0121 \ ENGL 1113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	4					
B	2	1				
C	1	1	1			
D						
F					1	
W						

Online

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0121	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	11	7	2		1	
B	3	4	2			
C		2	1	1		
D						
F	2	1	3		5	
W						5

Spring 2020

Poteau

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0121	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	2	2	1			
B	1			1		
C			1		1	
D						
F					1	
W						3

Online

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0121	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	3					
B	2	1				
C		1	1		2	
D						
F					2	
W						3

Table 4: Students enrolled in ENGL 0113 & ENGL 1113

The following tables indicate how students fared in the co-requisite Reading courses of ENGL 0113 and ENGL 1113.

Fall 2019

Online

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	1					
B						
C				1		
D						
F						
W						

Spring 2020: Students enrolled in ENGL 0113 & ENGL 1113

Online

ENGL 0113 \ ENGL 1113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A						
B						
C		1				
D						
F					1	

Table 5: Students enrolled in ENGL 0111 & ENGL 1113

The following tables indicate how students fared in the co-requisite Reading course of ENGL 0111 and ENGL 1113.

Fall 2019

Poteau

ENGL 0111 \ ENGL 1113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	9	5	1			
B	4	6	2	1		
C	2	2	2	1	1	
D			1			
F					7	
W					1	10

Sallisaw

ENGL 0111 \ ENGL 1113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	3			1		
B	3	1	1			
C	2			1	1	
D						
F						
W					1	

Online

ENGL 0111 \ ENGL 1113	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	8	5	2			
B	1	4	2			
C	1	5	2		1	
D	1		1		1	
F			4		8	
W						4

Spring 2020

Poteau

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0111	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	2	1				
B		1	1			
C			1			
D						
F					5	
W					5	
NP	1					

Online

ENGL 1113

ENGL 0111	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	4	2				
B	1					
C			1			
D						
F					3	
W						1

Table Set 3: Success of Math Students in Co-requisite and Credit-Bearing Courses

In Fall 2019, those students identified as most underprepared and requiring the 1-hour co-requisite course (MATH 0111) demonstrated the following success rates: 15 of 24 Poteau students (62.5%) completed both courses with a C or better; 10 of 11 Sallisaw students (90.9%) completed both courses with a C or better.

In Spring 2020, those students identified as most underprepared and requiring the 1-hour co-requisite course (MATH 0111) demonstrated the following success rates: 16 of 23 Poteau students (69.6%) completed both courses with a C or better; 9 of 11 Sallisaw students (81.8%) completed both courses with a C or better.

Overall, 50 of 69 students (72.5%) successfully completed both MATH 0111 and either MATH 0123, MATH 1413, or MATH 1513.

For Fall 2019 in MATH 0111, 17 of 24 students (70.8%) enrolled in Poteau passed with a C or better; 10 of 11 Sallisaw students (90.9%) passed with a C or better. In Spring 2020, 19 of 23 Poteau students (82.6%) passed with a C or better; 9 of 11 Sallisaw students (81.8%) passed with a C or better. Overall, for MATH 0111 in AY 19-20, 55 of 69 students completed with a C or better (79.7%).

Fall 2019

Math 0111	Poteau	Sallisaw	%
A	15	5	57
B	2	5	20
C	0	0	0
D	0	0	0
F	1	0	3
W	6	1	20
Total	24	11	100

Spring 2020

Math 0111	Poteau	Sallisaw	%
A	15	7	64.7
B	3	2	14.7
C	1	0	2.9
D	0	0	0
F	1	2	8.8
W	3	0	8.8
Total	23	11	~99.9

Students Enrolled in Fast-track Lab

Math 0111 – Math 1413
Poteau Campus Fall 2019

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	2	2	3			
B						
C						
D						
F					1	
W						2

Math 0111 – Math 1413
Sallisaw Campus Fall 2019

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	1	1				
B			3			
C						
D						
F						
W						

Math 0111 – Math 1513
Poteau Campus Fall 2019

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	1	4	1	1	1	
B		1	1			
C						
D						
F						
W						4

Math 0111 – Math 1513
Sallisaw Campus Fall 2019

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A		1	2			
B	1	1				
C						
D						
F						
W						1

Math 0111 – Math 0123
Poteau Campus Spring 2020

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	1	2				
B						
C						
D						
F						
W						1

Math 0111 – Math 0123 Not offered on Sallisaw Campus Spring 2020

Math 0111 – Math 1413
Poteau Campus Spring 2020

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A		1	3			
B			1	2		
C				1		
D						
F					1	
W						

Math 0111 – Math 1413 Not Offered on Sallisaw Campus Spring 2020

Math 0111 – Math 1513
Poteau Campus Spring 2020

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	3	4	1			
B						
C						
D						
F						
W						2

Math 0111 – Math 1513
Sallisaw Campus Spring 2020

	A	B	C	D	F	W
A	2	3	2			
B			2			
C						
D						
F					2	
W						

Table Set 4: Overview of Student Success Rates in both Math and ENGL Co-requisite and Credit-Bearing Courses

Table 7: Co-requisite Success Rates at CASC Fall 2019/ Spring 2020

ENGL 0123/ 1113	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online
Fall	48.8%	50%	28.1%
Spring	0%	NA	27.7%
ENGL 0121/ 1113	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online
Fall	70.3%	90.9%	64%
Spring	46.6%	NA	47%
ENGL 0113/ 1113	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online
Fall	NA	NA	14.2%
Spring	NA	NA	20%
ENGL 0111/ 1113	Poteau	Sallisaw	Online
Fall	60.00%	71.4%	58.8%
Spring	33.3%	NA	57.1%
MATH 0111/ 1413	Poteau	Sallisaw	

Fall	70%	100%	
Spring	56%	NA	
MATH 0111/ 1513	Poteau	Sallisaw	
Fall	57%	83%	
Spring	80%	82%	

Summary of Actions

Continual improvement of developmental placement and curriculum has been a priority at CASC with a Developmental Education Committee that meets on a regular basis. In order to develop the best plan of action for the institution, the committee has invited individuals from other colleges to share their plans. CASC has incorporated many ideas from other institutions while constantly looking for what best suits the student population.

Many changes have been made in the developmental placement and curriculum at CASC in the past years. As a result of the placement test changes and implementation of co-requisite courses, a significant number of students are given earlier access to credit in college-level courses. Working with small pilot groups in curricular concentrations, beginning with writing in 2015, then reading, then math, CASC develops models that guide a "scaling-up" process. Currently, CASC is full "at scale" with placement and co-requisite remediation.

A review of pass rates indicates that the co-requisite model currently in place is working fairly well on campus. While it certainly offers a greater level of flexibility, online co-requisites continue to struggle with material. This was especially true in Spring 2020. Pass rates remained consistent with last year's numbers for those who were enrolled as online students from the beginning; however, a noticeable difference occurred with those who were initially attending classes on campus and were switched to online because of the pandemic. In addition to offering English and Reading courses online, CASC now offers MATH 0123 Intermediate Algebra online. Experiments in online co-requisites continues to be an agenda topic of the committee.

Math co-requisites were initially "married" to individual sections, keeping students together as a cohort. No significant advantages appeared to arise from linking courses; as a result, math co-requisite courses were untied beginning Spring 2020. This simplified the enrollment process and provided more flexibility for students' schedules.

In an effort to reduce the amount of time a student spends in developmental courses, math faculty created a 1-hour co-requisite to replace MATH 0113 as a stand-alone course which was paired with MATH 0123. This worked well and will be continued in future semesters.

English and Reading faculty collaborated about the content of ENGL 0123 Introduction to College Writing and ENGL 0113 Introduction to College Reading. It was determined that these two courses could be combined and required only for those significantly underprepared as determined by test scores and HS GPA. Under the current model, some of these students were

taking six hours of developmental reading and writing courses in addition to or before Freshman Composition I. The new course, ENGL 0133 Introduction to College Reading and Writing, will be piloted in Summer 2021. Students enrolled in ENGL 0133 will also be enrolled in the co-requisite ENGL 1113 Freshman Composition course.

Section II – General Education Assessment

Administering Assessment

II-1. The four general education outcomes reflect the purpose of the general education curriculum, which is to:

- Emphasize the broad knowledge and skills characteristic of a lifelong learner
- Serve as the foundation of the education experience
- Equip graduates with transferable skills required to adapt, respond, and contribute to an ever-changing workforce and diverse world
- Provide a shared foundation, regardless of specialization, that unites recipients of higher education.

Demonstrate Technologic & Information Literacy

a. Effectively and ethically locate, evaluate, and communicate relevant information from diverse sources
b. Determine scope (extent) of information needed
c. Judge the reliability of sources and evidence
d. Apply an understanding of technology to solve problems

Think Critically

a. Examine connections between ideas
b. Solve problems systematically
c. Assess relevance of important ideas
d. Analyze information from credible sources

Communicate Effectively

a. Use writing, speech, performance, or project to communicate a thought
b. Organize ideas in an understandable, suitable manner
c. Employ the appropriate verbal and nonverbal skills within context
d. Communicate with correct use of grammar, syntax, and punctuation

Practice Global and Civil Awareness

a. Recognize the impact of different cultural beliefs and behaviors
b. Identify local, national, and global topics
c. Recognize the potential impact of decisions on individuals, groups, situations, and the environment
d. Practice social and civic engagement

General education outcomes (GEOs)/indicators are mapped to specific courses with related student learning outcomes (SLOs). Each associated course/SLO features a course-embedded activity for data collection. Level of instruction of these associations are noted through the mapping process. Since course level assessment is currently conducted on a predetermined yearly schedule of course rotation with a three-year-cycle focusing on the assessment of even numbered SLOs, only select associations are assessed throughout the academic year semesters. Course- embedded findings from all sections of the data collection points featuring the GEO/SLO associations are aggregated to assess student learning, which encompasses online, hybrid, and traditional courses. The Faculty General Education Assessment Committee provides analysis and plans of improvement based upon the findings.

II-2. CASC utilizes the direct measure of course-embedded assessment. Therefore, general education outcomes are assessed through the mapping of core general education courses with associated student learning outcomes. These SLOs are assessed with activities and metrics that are embedded into the course work. This ensures that all students in core general education courses have the opportunity to be assessed on all GEOs over their course of study.

II-3. Student motivation is reinforced in the curriculum through course-embedded assessment. Course syllabi state the general education outcomes along with the student learning outcomes for each course. Instructors emphasize general education assessment throughout the course to inform students on the purpose and importance of general education.

II-4. During the academic year, findings are collected through course-embedded assessment. Based upon the findings, faculty provide analysis to initiate action plans, which detail instructional improvements. Therefore, modifications and enhancements are made in real-time on the course level throughout the academic year. However, this methodology does not assess the outcomes on the overall curriculum level. Instructional changes occur within individual courses, but not holistically. The Faculty General Education Assessment Committee confirmed that the trajectory of general education outcome of assessment was still in pilot mode and began the transition to mission-based assessment during the spring 2020 semester.

Analyses and Findings

II-5. Based upon the aggregation of findings, all four of the GEOs with related indicators surpassed the threshold of 70%. The 2019-2020 general education assessment results are displayed below:

General Education Outcome Assessment Results
2019 – 2020 Academic Year

General Ed. Outcomes	Measure	Indicators	SLOs Measured	Students Assessed	Students Meeting Target	% Success
Demonstrate Technologic & Information Literacy	Course-Embedded					
		A	12	1270	1086	86%
		B	1	29	29	100%
		C	2	733	623	85%
		D	3	806	715	89%
		Total	25	4100	3481	85%
Think Critically	Course-Embedded					
		A	26	1801	1614	90%
		B	15	1362	1131	83%
		C	3	537	443	83%
		D	3	522	429	82%
		Total	47	4222	3617	86%
Communicate Effectively	Course-Embedded					
		A	19	2532	2114	84%
		B	11	1026	831	81%
		C	9	1655	1463	88%
		D	4	441	363	82%
		Total	43	5654	4771	84%
Practice Global & Civil Awareness	Course-Embedded					
		A	5	378	316	84%
		B	6	513	494	96%
		C	6	590	530	90%
		D	4	766	684	89%
		Total	21	2247	2024	90%

II-6. Since CASC utilizes course-embedded assessment, student performance is tracked continuously throughout the academic year as demonstrated in the 2019-2020 aggregated findings. Once again, instructional changes are made in real-time as those associated general education outcomes and SLOs are assessed and evaluated.

II-7. The Faculty General Education Assessment Committee is comprised of a division chair and designated full-time instructors who represent the general education faculty body in all stages of the assessment process and cycle:

- Development of general education mission, goals, and outcomes
- Development and implementation of practices/methods to measure the outcomes for actionable results
- Analysis and reflection of assessment results
- Reporting of findings and action plans
- Implementation of systemic program improvements
- Ongoing assessment of processes

During the 2019-2020 academic year, the committee played an active role in the CASC Higher Learning Commission Assessment Academy Project, which focuses upon academic assessment improvements, and in the HLC Interim Monitoring Report on student outcomes assessment, which was submitted May 2020. Also, action plans based upon 2018-2019 analysis were centered upon improvements in outcomes/indicators and methodology. Assessment modifications included changes in methodology by starting at the beginning with mission-driven assessment:

- A framework was created with curricular goals and general education student learning outcomes derived from the mission statement.
- Performance indicators were revised to define achievement of outcomes for all stakeholders.
- Also, the curriculum map was revised to serve as a visual representation of skill development of each outcome in the core curriculum.

General education faculty will pilot the new process in 2020-2021. In order to move away from grade-based methods of assessment, the committee will develop an outcome rubric using performance indicators as criteria to evaluate evidence of student learning. Although the direct measure of assessment is still course-embedded, the curriculum map will determine data collection points within the general education curriculum.

Section III – Program Outcomes

Administering Assessment

III-1.

Academic Program Outcome Assessment Results
Chart I

Program	Measure	Program Outcomes	SLOs Measured	Students Assessed	Students Meeting Threshold	% Success
Allied Health AS	Course-Embedded	1	9	695	554	83%
		2	6	307	289	94%
		3	2	147	136	93%
		4	2	218	187	86%
		Total	19	1367	1166	85%
Biological and Pre-Professional Sciences AS	Course-Embedded	1	9	71	52	73%
		2	9	350	230	66%
		3	4	34	24	71%
		Total	22	455	306	67%
Business Administration AA	Course-Embedded	1	10	160	143	89%
		2	9	154	131	86%
		3	5	44	40	91%
		4	10	89	73	82%
		Total	34	447	387	87%
Child Development AA/AAS	Course-Embedded	1	22	357	320	90%
		2	14	306	270	88%
		3	6	120	109	91%
		4	7	163	142	87%
		Total	49	946	841	89%
Child Development Directors Certificate	Course-Embedded	1	11	184	167	91%
		2	9	227	198	87%
		3	2	45	40	89%
		4	4	116	100	86%
		Total	26	572	505	88%
Child Development Infant/Tod Certificate	Course-Embedded	1	18	305	280	92%
		2	13	293	260	89%
		3	7	133	122	92%
		4	5	137	119	87%
		Total	43	868	781	90%

Computer Information Systems AA	Course-Embedded	1	3	66	55	83%
		2	6	69	65	94%
		3	3	47	43	92%
		Total	12	182	163	90%
Computer Technology AAS	Course-Embedded	1				%
		2	5	61	57	93%
		3				%
		4				%
		Total	5	61	57	93%
Health, Physical Ed. & Recreation AA	Course-Embedded	1	2	68	61	90%
		2	5	120	113	94%
		3	4	105	98	93%
		4	5	99	95	96%
		Total	16	392	367	94%
Math, Physical Science, & Pre-Engineering AS	Course-Embedded	1	13	95	70	74%
		2	8	59	42	71%
		3	7	52	37	71%
		Total	28	206	149	72%
Occupational Health & Safety AAS	Course-Embedded	1	4	50	50	100%
		2	4	50	44	88%
		3	3	36	30	83%
		4	6	72	56	78%
		Total	17	208	180	87%
Nursing AAS	Course-Embedded	1	2	99	86	87%
		2	2	99	90	91%
		3	2	91	91	100%
		4	2	91	91	100%
		5	2	91	90	99%
		Total	10	471	448	95%
Pre-Law/Criminal Justice AA	Course-Embedded	1	12	297	257	87%
		2	4	129	110	85%
		3	6	187	166	89%
		4	10	253	216	85%
		Total	32	866	749	86%
History/Political Science AA	Course-Embedded	1	4	334	299	90%
		2	8	1121	988	88%
		3	5	220	188	85%
		4	10	935	817	87%
		Total	27	2610	2292	88%

Sociology/Psychology AA	Course-Embedded	1	2	341	278	82%
		2				%
		3	2	309	241	78%
		Total	4	650	519	80%

HPER Program Pilot of Mission-Based Program Assessment Results
Chart II

HPER Program Pilot	Measure	Program Outcomes	Curriculum Map Level of Instruction	Students Assessed	Met Rubric Threshold
Course	Course-Embedded				
HPER 1103 Intro to HPER	Demonstration	1	Introduced	4 out of 12	Yes
HPER 2103 Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries	Report	3	Reinforced	5 out of 12	No

Analyses and Findings

III-2. During the 2019-2020 academic year, academic program outcome assessment began the shift in methodology from course-level to program level through a mission based focus. By using a fundamental framework of program assessment and curriculum mapping, the goal is to employ a process that can actually improve student learning instead of one that only proves student learning has taken place.

At the fall 2019 HLC Assessment Academy Midpoint Conference, the CASC Assessment Academy Team presented a proposal to pilot this new mission-based assessment. After receiving a favorable response, the HPER program implemented the new process while the other academic programs worked on creating mission-based frameworks and revised curriculum maps in preparation to pilot during the 2020-2021 academic year.

Chart I reflects the findings using the current methodology. The aggregated results of all academic programs surpassed the 70% threshold with 86%. As with the past years of assessment results, the assessment process and related data didn't provide a viable means to improve student learning.

Chart II displays the HPER pilot components. Below are the findings and analysis:

Program Outcome 1

PO #1A:

The sample of students evaluated exceeded the rubric (see attached) threshold score of "3" on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes "Beginning," 4 denotes "Advanced") with a mean score of ***3.5/3.0***

PO #1C:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3

on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes "Beginning," 4 denotes "Advanced") with a mean score of ***2.8/3.0***

Mean Score (A & C) = ***3.15 (Above set threshold)***

Discussion: *The evaluators felt the students performed well with the signature assignment for the measure used for PO #1A "Physical Education Assignment and Demonstration." The assignment asks the student to develop and conduct a 30-minute activity to their peers. Faculty members felt the motivation of the students is high for this assignment since the majority of HPER majors' career choice is to be a coach and/or physical education instructor at some level. The instructors feel this is an enjoyable section of the course to teach because the motivation level of the students is so high. The faculty is satisfied that this key indicator is being instructed and received well by the students. Judging by the consistent quality of the demonstrations produced and the enthusiasm of the students, the faculty feel quality learning is taking place, especially given the introductory nature of this course.*

Conclusion*: The evaluators recommend keeping this signature assignment and continuing to instruct it at the same level. It is also recommended that the instructors place more emphasis on the importance of the assignment to possibly motivate the lower achieving students.*

The evaluators were not satisfied with the level of learning for the signature assignment for the measure PO #1C "Presentation of HPER Career Fields & Salaries." This signature assignment requires students to give a presentation over 12 general career fields presented in the textbook, such as physical education, exercise science, sports medicine, etc. The presentation is to include defining the career field and the education level required for each and giving an approximate salary for each discipline. The faculty feel that students are having a difficult time grasping and/or assigning importance to the more advanced disciplines, especially given the generalized nature of the fields outlined in the textbook. Also at this stage of education, most of the students have "tunnel vision" to want to be coaches only. Since this is a relatively new course for the instructor to teach, she feels she is "teaching too much from the text book" without adding much of her own expertise to the course and is only recently beginning to personalize the course to make it more meaningful to the audience.

Program Outcome 3

PO #3A:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes "Beginning,"4 denotes "Advanced") with a mean score of ***2.3/3.0***

Discussion: The evaluators did not feel the students and instructor performed well on the measures of signature assignment "Ankle Injury Verbal Demonstration," which asks the student to provide a verbal report to the instructor of the different types of ankle injury and the mechanisms of injury that cause different ankle problems. Because of the interrelatedness of PO #3A and PO #3B, the evaluators feel that the PO #3B "Discussion" applies to both.

PO #3B:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes "Beginning," 4 denotes "Advanced") with a mean score of ***2.5/3.0***

Discussion*: The evaluators did not feel the students and instructor performed well on the measures of signature assignment "Ankle Injury Verbal Demonstration," which asks the student to provide a verbal report to the instructor of the different types of ankle injury and the mechanisms of injury that cause different ankle problems. Because of the interrelatedness of PO #3A and PO #3B, the evaluators feel that the PO #3B "Discussion" applies to both.*

PO #3B:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes "Beginning," 4 denotes "Advanced") with a mean score of ***2.5/3.0***

Discussion*: The measure used for the signature assignment for PO #3B is "Ankle Evaluation Verbal Demonstration" where each student is required to give a verbal report to the instructor over the steps of evaluating a lateral ankle sprain. The evaluators did not feel the students or the instructor performed well on the measure's signature assignment. Both signature assignments ask the student to demonstrate an understanding of ankle anatomy (bones, tendons, and ligaments) and medical terminology related to the ankle. The evaluators feel that since most students enter the course without human anatomy and medical terminology (neither are part of the HPER degree plan).This is a weakness in the educational process. The evaluators feel that most students had a good grasp of the mechanism of injury for a lateral ankle sprain; it was their unfamiliarity with ankle anatomy and medical terminology that was lacking. It was also reported by the faculty that approximately 1/3 of the students lacked the necessary motivation to seriously complete the assignment with one student even remarking "This isn't the coach's job; it is the trainer's job." These students are not perceiving the importance of the assignment. It is also noted by the evaluators that some students do not perform well giving a verbal report in a one-on-one setting with the instructor.*

Conclusion: *The evaluators recommend that since there is an identified weakness with anatomy and medical terminology and even though the instructor allocates time in the teaching process for these subjects, the instructor needs to spend additional time and possibly make assignments over the related anatomy and medical terminology of the ankle. Also, the instructor needs to emphasize the importance of these assignments to the students more and possibly find new ways to get the importance across to the students.*

PO #3C:

The sample of students evaluated did not reach the rubric threshold score of 3 on a scale of 1-4 (1 denotes "Beginning," 4 denotes "Advanced") with a mean score of ***2.5/3.0***
Mean Score (A, B, &C) = ***2.43 (below set threshold)***

Discussion: *The evaluators did not feel the students and instructor performed well on the measures of signature assignment "Ankle Taping Demonstration." The assignment requires the students to use athletic tape to tape the ankle with prescribed steps. It is the opinion of the instructor that the skills to tape an ankle to a "competent" standard are lacking in the students.*

Because this is the first time students are introduced to athletic taping and since taping an ankle is a psychomotor skill that requires a lot of practice and repetition, the instructor feels that if it is possible, more practice time is needed prior to completion of the assignment. Because of the abbreviated amount of time allocated during the semester to cover ankle mechanism of injury, ankle evaluation, and perform an ankle taping demonstration, additional time to complete the signature assignments for PO #3 may not be available.

Conclusion: *The evaluators recommend that the instructor look at other aspects of the course that students grasp readily, ascertain if instructional time could be shortened for these readily grasped aspects, and devote the extra time to the signature assignment. Additionally, since ankle injury, evaluation, and ankle taping are the first injury introduced to in the semester and taping an ankle is one of the more difficult psychomotor skills introduced in the course, the evaluators recommend sequencing the taping skills in a different order to allow for practice with easier psychomotor skills first.*
In addition, the evaluators recommend that the HPER assessment committee reevaluate the thresholds set for PO #3, as they may have been set too high for an introductory course in sports medicine that is mostly taken by students desiring to be coaches.

Overall HPER Program Analysis – Big Takeaways about Student Learning

- *While student learning is taking place, it is not at the level of satisfaction for the evaluators or faculty members.*
- *Learning is not a student or faculty problem, but there are multifactorial reasons for the lower satisfaction level of student learning.*
- *Student learning is not bad, but the process identified areas of weakness.*
- *Two of the main themes noticed are students not assigning importance to assignments and faculty management of class time during the semester.*
- *Students are not learning PO#3 at the level of satisfaction to the HPER faculty. This came somewhat as a surprise for the faculty members concerning the signature assignments that were developed.*
- *Since the data centered on one section of the course with a relatively small sample size, one data point does not make a trend.*

III-3. The HPER program's response to program outcomes assessment included instructional changes along with process improvements:

PO #1A: HPER 1103 Introduction to HPER
Keep the signature assignment and continue to instruct it at the same level Instructors place more emphasis on the importance of the assignment
PO #1C: HPER 1103 Introduction to HPER Keep signature assignment
Faculty members continue to personalize the course
Instructors make the signature assignment more meaningful to the students
PO #3A & PO #3B: HPER 2103 Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries
Keep signature assignment
Instructors need to spend additional time instructing anatomy and medical terminology related to the ankle

Make assignments over the related anatomy and medical terminology of the ankle
Emphasize the importance of these assignments

PO #3C: HPER 2103 Care & Prevention of Athletic Injuries

Keep signature assignment
Look at other aspects of the course that students grasp readily Ascertain if instructional time could be shortened for these readily grasped aspects
Devote the extra time to the signature assignments
Sequencing the taping skills in a different order to allow for practice with easier psychomotor skills first
HPER assessment committee reevaluates the thresholds set for PO #3

Additional conclusions

In addition, it is noted that the student sample size evaluated per course may be too low. With such a small sample size, a single outlier could easily skew the outcomes.
Re-evaluate the "threshold" to possibly match the Level of Instruction Criteria.
Additional data points need to be gathered in the future to establish a data trend.
The faculty may need to consider some instructional changes.

Concerning program improvements and action plans, those initiatives are detailed below:

- *Develop more "signature assignments" that cover multiple performance indicators per program outcomes.*
- *Instruct all HPER faculty in the use of the "Program Scoring Rubric"*
- *Educate all HPER faculty in the interpretation of the data gathered by the rubric*
- *Advise all HPER faculty to not use only "course embedded assignments"*
- *Change the mentality of HPER faculty that test scores are not necessarily good indicators of knowledge acquisition*
- *Inform HPER faculty that qualitative findings are as important as quantitative findings*
- *Develop ways to teach adjunct faculty all of the above*
- *Remember to consult the Curriculum Map and Level of Instruction Criteria for each course to be sure the program is being assessed at the proper level*
- *Begin to use more sections of courses for the assessment process*
  - *Multiple sections taught by an individual instructor*
  - *Multiple sections of same course taught by different instructors*
- *Consider changing the sample size of students evaluated*
- *Use the previous semester's data instead of the current semester's data*
  - *Some "signature assignments" may have not been completed prior to assessment deadline if using the current semester.*
- *Try not to "do too much" therefore making the assessment process not meaningful*
- *Break up the assessment process into more stages for ease of planning, gathering and interpretation of the process*
- *Consider assessing each Level of Instruction (I, R, A) at different times*
- *Develop a more efficient Assessment Reporting Form with "guiding questions"*
- *Develop a definitive threshold score represented on the rubric for each Performance Indicator*

All academic programs began implementing their plans of action based upon 2018-2019 assessment analyses after the HPER pilot plan received constructive criticism and favorable reviews at the HLC Academy Midpoint Event in November 2019. All academic programs were provided step-by-step instructions and deadlines for framework and map completion during the spring 2020 semester as preparation to implement the new process during the 2020-2021 academic year. The last major project task planned for spring 2020 was creation of program assessment plans detailing where and how student achievement would be measured in the upcoming year. Safety guidelines for the COVID-19 virus had required all courses to be moved online and all faculty and staff to work from home. Although project work was temporarily interrupted, programs are on a clear path to implement their pilots during the 2020-2021 academic year.

Section IV – Student Engagement and Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

IV-1. The RNL Student Satisfactory Inventory 2-Year Form A was administered via student email March 2 – 14, 2020, to all currently enrolled students except for the concurrent population. The completion rate was 26%, which was 11% higher than the previous year. A total of 340 students out of 1,324 possible completed the survey.

IV-2.

2019-2020 Findings
Chart I

Institutional Choice – Why CASC?		
	2020	2019
1st Choice	76%	76%
2nd Choice	17%	20%
2020 Top Three Factors Influencing Enrollment		
	2020	2019
Cost	90%	86%
Financial Aid	86%	86%
Academic Reputation	81%	82%
Summary Satisfaction		
	2020	2019
Satisfied/Very Satisfied	80%	82%
Summary Re-Enrollment		
	2020	2019
Probably/Definitely	85%	87%

CASC has consistently been the first institution of choice for 76% of the population for the past two years. In addition, CASC's top three factors of enrollment and high overall satisfaction percentages reflect the college's mission "to provide affordable, accessible, and exceptional education."

Chart II - 2020 Overall Strengths	Higher than National Comparison
1. Campus item: I know the courses I need to graduate.	
2. The campus is safe and secure for all students. (#7 2019)	Yes
3. Computer labs are adequate and accessible. (#3 2019)	Yes
4. My academic advisor is approachable.	Yes
5. Program requirements are clear and reasonable.	Yes
6. I am able to experience intellectual growth here. (#2 2019)	Yes
7. Students are made to feel welcome on this campus. (#6 2019)	Yes
8. Nearly all of the faculty are knowledgeable in their fields. (#1 2019)	Yes
9. Campus item: My academic advisor is available when I need help.	
10. Faculty are usually available after class and during office hours. (#12 2019)	Yes
11. Campus item: The Financial Aid staff is available, accessible, and helpful to students.	
12. Admissions staff are knowledgeable.	Yes
13. On the whole, the campus is well-maintained. (#9 2019)	Yes
14. Class change (drop/add) policies are reasonable. (#4 2019)	Yes
15. Tutoring services are readily available.	Yes

Concerning Chart II, statements in bold reflect strengths that were in the top percentile for 2018-2019. All items except for campus specific received higher satisfaction than the national comparison.

Six of the items listed as challenges in Chart III were on the 2018-2019 list. All items except for the statements specific to CASC received higher satisfaction than the national comparison.

Chart III - 2020 Challenges	Higher than National Comparison
1. The quality of instruction I receive in most of my classes is excellent. (#7 2019)	Yes
2. Faculty provide timely feedback about student progress in a course. (#6 2019)	Yes
3. This school does whatever it can to help me reach my educational goals.	Yes
4. Campus item: The campus website is user-friendly.	
5. Financial aid counselors are helpful. (#8 2019)	Yes
6. Classes are scheduled at times that are convenient for me.	Yes
7. Faculty are understanding of students' unique life circumstances.	Yes
8. My academic advisor is knowledgeable about the transfer requirements of other schools. (#3 2019)	Yes
9. Financial aid awards are announced to students in time to be helpful in college planning.	Yes
10. There are adequate services to help me decide upon a career. (#9 2019)	Yes
11. Faculty take into consideration student differences as they teach a course. (#10 2019)	Yes

The Office of Institutional Effectiveness & Assessment presented the 2020 findings to the Presidential Cabinet for analysis during the fall 2020 semester. Analysis focused on two questions: What did we find from the data? What did we learn from the data?

Concerning strengths, cabinet members noted the areas that have improved from 2019. The Vice President of Student Affairs was not surprised that the second highest strength was related to campus security. The data was in direct correlation with internal data from 2019-2020. Many factors have contributed to a safe and secure environment:

- Student-friendly trained and certified CLEET Officers
- Student-friendly trained residential life staff and RAs
- CASC officer location across the street from campus housing
- Adequate options for students to report safety and security concerns
- Adequate campus security cameras
- Adequate campus outside lighting
- Adequate student safety and security information and training options (including COVID-19) offered live through multiple mediums

Although these items along with the other challenges are above the national benchmark, the consensus is that there is always room for improvement as the institution continually asks the most important question: How can we do this better?

IV-3. After administrative reflection on the findings, immediate and long term actions are below:

- During the fall 2020 semester, administration engaged in an open dialogue with all departments by providing an overview of the Noel Levitz results to faculty and staff via an interactive Zoom presentation. Making assessment meaningful and useful and changing the opinion that assessment is punitive have been two important goals for the institution. The presentation featured possible methods for departments to utilize the data as a tool for continuous improvement.

- On an administrative level, the survey results will be a component of the SWOT analysis for strategic planning.

- Marketing and Community Relations will implement immediate and long term improvements to make the website more user-friendly.

- Marketing and Community Relations will work with the IE & Assessment Office to enhance the IE portion of the website to ensure all necessary information is included.

- The institution will use the data for marketing and promotion purposes.

- During spring 2021 faculty in-service, the VP of AA will work with faculty to develop steps for improvement in four specific areas as a focus of the next academic year.

- CASC will conduct the Community College Survey of Student Engagement (CCSSE) in spring 2021 as an additional tool to identify ways to improve the student experience. The CCSSE features "Impact of COVID" and "Students in Need" sections that will provide useful insight for future planning.

Section V – Assessment Budgets

2019-2020 Assessment Fees & Expenditures

Assessment fees	0
Assessment salaries	$49,148
Distributed to other departments	$7,993
Operational costs	$56,507
Total Expenditures	$113,648