

Carl Albert State College

Annual Student Assessment Report: 2013-2014

Section I -- Entry-Level Assessment

Administering Assessment

I-1. Carl Albert State College (CASC) Entry-level assessment instruments were administered with traditional paper and pen settings for both National and Residual American College Testing (ACT). The ACT Computer-adapted Placement Assessment and Support Services (COMPASS) test was offered to non-traditional students (age 21 or older) and for secondary placement testing, through computerized testing. The ACT Collegiate Assessment of Academic Proficiency (CAAP) Critical Thinking module is given as a paper and pencil test in Freshman Orientation.

I-2. All first-time entering freshmen were assessed with either the ACT and/or the COMPASS. The cut-off score for remediation on each of the four ACT subtests (Math, Reading, Writing, and Science) is 19. Traditional students (age 20 or younger) are required to participate in the ACT assessment, either national or residual. Students scoring below 19 on any of the four ACT subtests are required to either participate in secondary placement testing through COMPASS or enroll in the corresponding remedial course. Students who do not meet the cut-score after secondary placement testing are required to enroll in the corresponding remedial course. COMPASS does not test for science proficiency therefore students must meet the cut-score of both the math and reading modules of the COMPASS to be eligible for enrollment into a science course. For the 2013-2014 academic year first-time freshman and transfer students admitted required secondary testing.

I-3. CASC first-time entering students are assessed prior to and at enrollment with ACT, residual or national, and/or COMPASS; however, though the National ACT is preferred, CASC serves an ACT testing site for both the National and the Residual ACT test, and offers testing for both at published times during the year. Students must register online for the National ACT. Residual ACT registration is through the

Enrollment/Retention Center at CASC’s Poteau campus. COMPASS testing is offered at no charge in the CASC Learning Resource Center (LRC) of the Poteau campus and at the Sallisaw campus. Students can test as many times as they wish, but a \$5 fee is charged after the second test. COMPASS testing is available throughout the year without reservations at published times. Non-traditional students (age 21 or older) are eligible for admission through open door admission but are required to participate in COMPASS or the ACT assessment prior to enrollment. Those students who score below 19 on an ACT subtest or below the cut-score levels for COMPASS are required to enroll in the corresponding remedial course. The LRC also provides tutoring free of charge to CASC students. This tutoring is offered five days a week and ten hours a day from 8am to 6pm.

Analyses and Findings

I-4. CASC is reviewing current cut-scores. It is the recommendation of the assessment committee to review current practices and recommend new placement practices. In consultation with representatives from ACT, Carl Albert State College’s assessment committee will review and update, if necessary, current placement practices.

I-5. Student progress is tracked through the progression of coursework as long as the student enrolls at CASC. CASC complies with Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education policy # 3.20.3 listed in chapter three of the Policy and Procedures Manual.

2013-2014

I-6.

COMPASS

Year and Semester	Number of Testers from Sign in Sheets
Spring 2013	184
Summer 2013	166
Fall 2013	60
Spring 2014	146
Summer 2014	119

Fall 2014 (as of Sept. 9 th)	122
--	-----

COMPASS Placement Summary Report

Report includes sessions that meet ANY of these criteria sets (plus 0 manually selected sessions):

Sept 2013 - Sept 2014

General Recommendations: Algebra

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
0-29	Students scoring 0-29 may qualify for MATH 0113.	51	47.66
30-41	Students scoring 30-41 may qualify for MATH 0123.	39	36.45
42-100	Students scoring >42 may qualify for college level math.	17	15.89

General Recommendations: COMPASS Reading

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
0-80	Students scoring 0-80 may qualify for ENGL 0113	259	54.18
81-100	Students scoring >81 may qualify as college level Reading	219	45.82

General Recommendations: COMPASS Writing Skills

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
0-74	Students scoring 0-74 may qualify for ENGL 0123	325	63.6
75-100	Students scoring 75-100 may qualify for ENGL 1113	186	36.4

General Recommendations: College Algebra

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
0-100	Students scoring 0-100 may qualify for college level math.	1	100.0

General Recommendations: ESL Grammar/Usage

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
94-100	Level 4; ESL not required	1	100.0

General Recommendations: ESL Listening

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
42-66	Level 1; ESL Required	1	100.0

General Recommendations: ESL Reading

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
92-100	Level 4; ESL not required	1	100.0

General Recommendations: Pre Algebra

Score	Placement Message	Students	Percent
0-46	Students scoring 0-46 may qualify for MATH 0113	352	75.05
47-65	Students scoring 47-65 may qualify for MATH 0123	96	20.47
66-100	Students scoring >66 may qualify for college level math.	21	4.48

End of Report ©2004 ACT, Inc.

REMDIAL COURSE ENROLLMENT

Number of Students Enrolled in Remedial Courses	1402
Number of First Time Freshman Enrolled in Remedial Courses	962
Number of First Time Freshman passed remedial courses	645
Number of First Time Freshman failed remedial courses	234
Number of First Time Freshman did not complete remedial courses	83
Number of First Time Freshman enrolled in remedial Developmental Math	166
Number of First Time Freshman passed remedial Developmental Math	114
Number of First Time Freshman failed remedial Developmental Math	37
Number of First Time Freshman did not complete Developmental Math	15
Number of First Time Freshman enrolled in remedial Intermediate Algebra	377
Number of First Time Freshman passed remedial Intermediate Algebra	231
Number of First Time Freshman failed remedial Intermediate Algebra	109
Number of First Time Freshman did not complete Intermediate Algebra	37
Number of First Time Freshman enrolled in remedial Reading	171
Number of First Time Freshman passed remedial Reading	119
Number of First Time Freshman failed remedial Reading	37
Number of First Time Freshman did not complete remedial Reading	15
Number of First Time Freshman enrolled in remedial Writing	416
Number of First Time Freshman passed remedial Writing	297
Number of First Time Freshman failed remedial Writing	88
Number of First Time Freshman did not complete remedial Writing	31

Other Assessment Plans

I-7. During the 2012-2013 academic year CASC implemented the use of the WEAVEonline assessment tool to evaluate and track student learning outcomes. Program goals were defined by division chairs, in line with the HLC approved programs, the college’s mission statement, institutional priorities, and strategic plan course outcomes were lined up to meet the criteria established by the college, and approved by the HLC and Board of Regents. Each course had a minimum of four outcomes, and supported by the course syllabi. Instructors individually assessed each course, indicated the measures used, their expected target, and the followed up with findings as each outcome was assessed. Some outcomes had more than one measure. If a target was not met, an action plan was entered into WEAVEonline for follow-up and findings the next semester (or year, depending on the frequency of instruction).

We are using the 2014-2015 academic year to implement support in closing the assessment loop. Currently, faculty members, the assessment committee and the outcomes and assessment specialist are in the process of training, revising, and cleaning up data to provide consistent longitudinal data.

I-8. As shown in the following report retrieved from WEAVEonline the assessment loop is not being closed with consistency across campus. As of June 2nd 2014 CASC has employed an outcomes and assessment specialist to support faculty in staff in facilitating the process of using WEAVEonline to its full potential.

Carl Albert State College 2013-2014 Data Entry Status Overview

This report shows Data Entry Status based on Draft/ In-Progress vs. Final status determined by users.

Status Overview for All Entities

This report shows Data Entry Status based on Draft/In-Progress vs. Final status determined by users.

	Final	In-Progress	None
Mission/Purpose	164(39%)	54(13%)	206(49%)
Degree Outcomes	81(19%)	89(21%)	254(60%)
Outcomes/Objectives	112(26%)	96(23%)	216(51%)
Measures	65(15%)	110(26%)	249(59%)
Target	44(10%)	110(26%)	270(64%)
Finding	9(2%)	34(8%)	381(90%)

Action Plan	15(4%)	26(6%)	383(90%)
Analysis Question	0(0%)	0(0%)	424(100%)
Annual Report Section	0(0%)	0(0%)	424(100%)

2013-2014 Data Entry Status Overview

As of: 11/02/2014

I-9. We are using the data from 2013-2014 year to plan for the future implementation of WEAVEonline. CASC is currently cleaning up our data and constructing our formatting to be uniform institution-wide for better reporting purposes. The tool allows us to link student learning outcomes and objectives to institutional priorities, general education standards, and strategic planning. The use of this assessment tool allows the college to generate reports annually (and by semester) for review by the assessment committee, division chairs, administration, and internal and external stake holders, and maintain a level of transparency to continually strive to improve our student learning processes and services campus-wide. The gathering of this data will aid the assessment committee in review and deciding on relevant entry level assessment. This data will also provide the developmental committee with the knowledge to devise a course of action to up completion rates for remedial courses in turn increasing the institutions retention rates.

Section II - Mid-Level Assessment Administering Assessment

II-1. The objectives of mid-level assessment are to assess all students who have attained 45+ hours in order to determine students' academic progress and learning competencies in the areas of reading, writing, mathematics, science reasoning, and critical thinking. The results from mid-level assessment will be used to evaluate, to improve, and to recommend any changes to the general education and academic program curricula.

General education standards have been entered into WEAVEonline and will be tied to individual courses.

II-2. During the fall and spring semesters of 2013-2014, all CASC students that had completed 45 or more hours toward their degree were notified about the CAAP testing and required to participate.

According to the CAAP Content Analysis Report results of the CAAP were compared to national norms and to the performance of CASC students who had tested with the ACT as entry-level assessment. Based on those results, CASC students performed at or close to national norm levels. CASC students scored higher than the national average in writing skills area of punctuation, organization, and style.

II-3. While participating in the CAAP test is voluntary. Students are notified at the beginning of each semester and then reminded of the dates of the testing by their capstone instructors. Students are encouraged to perform at their highest levels by verbally explaining the significance of findings on these tests; how the results help us to provide the best possible education in each of the areas tested.

II-4. The CASC assessment team and assessment committee are in the works of producing a survey that will encompass the data that is most relevant to our institution. CASC will use their own survey to gather appropriate information about our students and their opinions of their learning experience, student life, and courses.

Analyses and Findings

II-4. CASC continues to work with senior institutions that receive CASC students either upon completion of their associate degrees or early transfer in order to track student performance after transfer. CASC also participates in IPEDS and Clearing House in order to track students.

II-5. CAAP Content Analysis Report Findings indicate the following. The following paragraph offers a breakdown of how CASC students scored on the writing portion of the CAAP test compared with the national average. In the content area of punctuation CASC students have an average of 5% more correct answers than the national average. In the content area of basic grammar and usage CASC students have an average of 7% less correct answers than the national average. In the content area of sentence structure CASC students have an average of 3% less correct answers than the national average. In the content area of writing strategy CASC students have an average of 8% less correct answers than the national average. In the content area of writing organization CASC students had an average

of 2% more correct answers than the national average. In the content area of writing style CASC students had an average of 2% more correct answers than the national average.

The following paragraph offers a breakdown of how CASC students scored on the critical thinking portion of the CAAP test compared to the national average.

In the content area of analysis of arguments CASC students had an average of 2% less correct answers than the national average. In the content area of evaluation of arguments CASC students had an average of 7% less correct answers than the national average. In the content area of extension of arguments CASC students had an average of 4% less correct answers than the national average.

The following paragraph offers a breakdown of how CASC students scored on the math portion of the CAAP test compared to the national average:

In the content area of pre-algebra CASC students had an average of 2% fewer correct answers than the national average. CASC students who scored in the bottom 25% on average had 17% more correct answers than the national average of students scoring in the bottom 25%. In the content area of elementary algebra CASC students had an average of 10% fewer correct answers than the national average. In the content area of intermediate algebra CASC students had an average of 7% fewer correct answers than the national average. In the content area of coordinate geometry CASC students had an average of 12% fewer correct answers than the national average. In the content area of college algebra CASC students had an average of 2% fewer correct answers than the national average. In the content area of trigonometry CASC students had an average of 6% fewer correct answers than the national average.

Program Outcomes

Associate of Applied Science in Radiologic Technology (2013-2014)

III-1. Administering Assessment

Instruments used for evaluation: Standardized tests, case study presentation, competency portfolio, ARRT Registry results (American Registry of Radiologic Technologists).

Number of participants: 10

Evaluation Results:

Evaluation Tool	Results
Standardized Tests	<p>All 10 of the students took a minimum of 4 practice exams during the fall semester of their second year. The following are the exam averages for the class of 2014:</p> <p>Radiation Protection = 68% Equipment Operation & Quality Control = 55% Image Production & Evaluation = 53% Radiographic Procedures = 64% Anatomy = 70% Patient Care = 74% Overall Scaled Score = 67%</p> <p>The students then progressed on to a computer based mock registry examination series that we will call Mock Registry (MR). This series had 4 forms. Students were required to make a 75 on one of these exams to pass the course. They were required to complete all 4 of these exams. One score serves as their mid-term exam score and one score serves as their final exam score. If they fail to score a 75% or better on 4 attempts they can repeat 1 exam. The average composite score for all students on this series of exams was a 70.15%. This was approximately 10% points above the composite score for the class of 2013.</p> <p>The average in each area for these MR exams was as follows: Radiation Protection – 66% Equipment Operation – 61% Image Production & Evaluation – 64% Radiographic Procedures – 74% Patient Care – 70% Average Scaled Score – 70%</p>

	<p>Nine of the ten students scored a 75% or better without having to repeat an exam. One student scored 75% or better on three of the mock exams while two additional students scored a 75% or better on two of the MR exams. To date, five graduates have passed the ARRT exam on one or more attempts.</p>
Case Study Presentations	<p>All of the students presented a case study on a patient of their choice. The presentation criteria required verbal and written reports supported by graphics and radiographic images. Students were evaluated on comprehensiveness, organization, clarity, time management, etc. The average score on these presentations was 83%, which was approximately 10% lower than last year's average score. The highest score was a 90% and the lowest score was a 78%.</p>
Competency Portfolios	<p>Clinical IV required each student to complete three examinations from two specific categories as specified in the clinical syllabus. The categories were derived from the master competency list requirements for the program. This master competency list is based upon the American Registry of Radiologic Technologists examination requirements which qualifies them to take the national certification examination.</p> <p>A copy of each of the three examinations per category was placed in a portfolio created by the student. A typed report for each examination accompanied the portfolio. The report included rationale for the examination, a description of the procedure (positioning factors, exposure factors and student critique of the examination), description of anatomy and pathology visualized as well as a written & paraphrased Radiologist's report and a written critique of the quality of the finished product. Students were evaluated on organization and clarity of the portfolio. The average score for this project was 97.8%. The highest score was a 100% and the lowest score was a 96%. This was the same as last year.</p>
ARRT Examination Results	<p>All 10 graduates have taken the ARRT registry examination. Two of the 10 graduates passed the examination on the first try for a 20% pass rate. The overall first time pass rate for the program over the past 5 years is 74%, down 14% over last year's 5 year average. We have a benchmark of 75% averaged over 5 years so we are currently not meeting the benchmark. The minimum mean scaled score required by the ARRT for passing the examination for the class of 2014 is 75%. The mean scaled</p>

score for the entire class was 72% on the first exam attempt. This was down in excess of 10% over last year's average score.

The examination is divided into 5 sections. The mean section scaled score for each section is as follows:

Section A, Radiation Protection, score of 70%; (16% lower than 2013)

Section B, Equipment Operation and Quality Control, score of 69%; (down 9% from 2013)

Section C, Image Production and Evaluation, score of 65%; (down 10% from 2013)

Section D, Radiographic Procedures, score of 83%; (up 1% from 2013)

Section E, Patient Care and Education, score of 83%. (down 4% from 2013)

III-2. Analyses and Findings

Conclusions:

1. The students' basic cumulative knowledge related to the curriculum is down by at least 10% over the past few years as expressed in the ARRT exam results.
2. The students' radiographic skills are at the level considered appropriate for entry level radiographers as demonstrated by their portfolios and completion of their terminal competencies.
3. The practice exams continue to aid the students in their preparation to take the certification exams even if this is not validated in this one year.
4. The mock registry exams continue aid the students in their successful completion the ARRT certification exam even though not validated in 2014.
5. The registry results have dropped dramatically for the class of 2014. The scaled score for 2010 was 86%, 2011 was 81%, and 2014 was 72%. (Our average for accreditation reporting is based

upon the most recent 5 years.) The subset scores have primarily improved. The scores in the subset areas for all graduating classes since the program began are as follows:

Year	Rad. Prot.	E Q & A	IP & E	Rad. Proc.	Pt. Care	Mean Score
2005	74	69	67	72	83	72
2006	83	75	80	80	87	81
2007	85	80	80	81	89	83
2008	85	81	81	78	85	82
2009	85	77	83	85	88	84
2010	88	81	83	85	91	86
2011	85	79	77	80	89	81
2012	85	79	80	81	86	82
2013	86	78	75	82	87	81
2014	70	69	65	75	83	72

6. Scores on the practice exams for students graduating in May 2014 increased over the class of 2013.
7. The guest lecturers continue to be beneficial to the students so we will continue to utilize this strategy.
8. The class of 2014 participated in a Kettering Review course on the Poteau campus.

Recommendations:

1. Continue with the Case Study Presentations as a tool for evaluating their comprehensive knowledge base of radiologic technology.
2. Continue with the Competency Portfolios as a demonstration of student expertise in radiographic imaging.

3. Continue utilizing the four practice exams in the fall semester for the graduating class even though the scores for this group of students were low.
4. Continue with the MR exams in the spring semester for the graduation even though the scores for this group were low.
5. Continue to require students to apply for the registry examination midway through the last semester in the program and to schedule their ARRT registry examination within 1 week after graduation.
6. Continue utilizing outside guest lecturers to provide the review lectures in the RADT 2222 Seminar course.
7. Utilize Professorship funds as received by the program faculty to underwrite the costs of the students taking a registry review course.
8. Monitor the progress in meeting the Programs benchmarks and continue the current curriculum and assessment activities.
9. Secure new mock registry exams for the class of 2015 in the event the current exams have been compromised.

III-3. Other Assessment Plans

No other assessment plans were in place during this academic year for this program.

Associate of Applied Science Physical Therapist Assistant (2013-2014)

III-1. Administering Assessment

Instruments used for Evaluation: FSBPT NPTAE (National Physical Therapist Assistant Exam) for PTA’s Test Results; PTA CPI, Clinical Performance Instrument/PHTA 2534 Clinical Experience III; All course comprehensive finals; PTAEXAM Computer based exit examination.

Number of Participants: 2013, 18 graduates
2014, 17 graduates

Evaluation Results:

Test	Results
Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy (FSBPT) National Physical Therapy Assistant Exam (NPTAE)	The Federation of State Boards of Physical Therapy (FSBPT) NPTE consists of 150 multiple-choice questions. “The physical therapist assistant (PTA) examination is intended to assess basic entry-level competence of the candidate for licensure or registration who has graduated from an accredited program for physical therapist assistants or has met equivalent requirements set by a licensing authority for physical therapist assistants.” – www.fsbt.org The Department of PTA Education relies upon self-reporting by each graduate for the status of pass/fail

**EVALUATIVE CRITERIA FOR
ACCREDITATION OF EDUCATION
PROGRAMS FOR THE
PREPARATION OF PHYSICAL
THERAPIST ASSISTANTS**

(Commission on Accreditation in Physical
Therapy Education (CAPTE))

4.1.7. performance of recent graduates

The program gathers information related to graduate performance on the licensure examination and is expected to demonstrate that a pass rate, averaged over two years, of at least 80% has been achieved by the program graduates.

**2 year overall pass/fail results for
CASC:**

CASC 2012 Graduates

16 Graduates

14 Passing Scores – 87.5%

2 Failing Scores – 12.5%

CASC 2013 Graduates

18 Graduates

16 Passing Scores – 88.9%

2 Failing Scores – 11.2%

CASC 2014 Graduates

17 Graduates

13 Passing Scores – 86.7%

2 Failing Scores – 13.4%

2 Did Not Test

2 year average pass rate: **87.8%**

All Course Comprehensive Finals	All Course Comprehensive finals have been given by the program since the Spring of 2008. Most recently graduates, 2013 graduates, 16 of 16 students have passed the all course comprehensive finals with a score of 74% or higher.
PHTA 2534/2536 Clinical Experience III/PTA CPI	Clinical Experience III consists of two-five week full time (40 hours/week) clinical rotations that the student must successfully pass with a minimum of a “C” grade in order to graduate. During 10 weeks of clinical rotation the student must complete 33 different skills ranging from professional conduct issues to technical skills. This course is the culmination of 2 years didactic and clinical education for the student. Each student is required to treat patients and function as part of the rehabilitation team and is guided through and graded by a clinical instructor utilizing a standardized tool called the “CPI”. Of the 16 students who completed the course in 2013, 16 students successfully completed the course with the minimum grade criteria. CASC PTA education program had a 100% pass rate for the Clinical Experience III course.
PTAEXAM Exit Exam	The PTAEXAM exit exam is a computer based mock licensure examination that is administered at the end of the second year after all clinical affiliations are complete (see Conclusions). The exam was purchased for the students through the use of Perkins funds and the PTA general budget. Results: 14 of 16 students passed

	the exam on the first attempt, 1 of 2 passed on the second attempt while the second 1 st time failure has yet to retest.
--	---

III-2. Analyses and Findings

Findings:

1. Based upon the Capstone evaluations utilized by the PTA education department, the program graduates are being adequately prepared to obtain licensure and join the healthcare workforce.
2. In 2012, the FSBPT began fixed date testing. Prior to this date the federation allowed continuous testing for the licensing exam. This allowed the exit exam to be given the week following the completion of Clinical Experience III on July 31, 2013. Fixed dates were set in July and October, 2013. In order to keep its graduates competitive for available employment opportunities, the program allowed the completion of the exit exam at the end of the spring semester (prior to completion of the final 10 week clinical experience), so that the graduates would be able to test in July and not have to wait until the October testing date. An assessment of the outcomes of the exit exam, Clinical Experience III (10 weeks), and the licensing exam for the class of 2013 to be lower than the previous five years of graduates completing the same evaluations shows a correlation between the amount of time the graduates were allowed to prepare for Clinical Experience III, the exit exam, and the licensing exam.
3. Upon interview with the four students failing the NPTE exam on the first attempt in 2012, it was determined that one student had a previously undisclosed learning disability, one student was involved in an unexpected divorce three days prior to setting for the licensing exam, and the other two failed the exit exam on the first attempt. For the graduates of 2013, the two graduates that failed NPTE exam on the first attempt failed with a scale score of

598/600. Each graduate responded that they felt they did not have time to adequately prepare for the licensing exam.

4. It is also observed for the Class of 2013, of the two students that failed the NPTAE, those two students, one had also failed the Exit Exam on the first attempt.
5. The program began to accept 2 more students into the program for the class entering in 2011 (Class of 2013). Previously the program accepted 16 students per semester.

Recommendations: The faculty recommends the following measures:

1. Currently the PTA Education program sends out follow-up surveys at 6 months to gain insight into current employment and program strengths/weaknesses. Because of the difficulty in tracking each graduate after leaving the program, the department needs to find a more efficient manner in which to disperse the surveys to the graduates in order to get a more representative sampling of the program's graduates. Beginning in fall 2004, the PTA education program began giving graduates the opportunity to complete the graduate questionnaires online as well as hard copy. This has marginally increased the return rate. Additional means for gathering the information from graduates needs to be assessed.
2. The PTAEXAM will continue to be given as an exit exam and used as a guide to determine weaknesses in the programs curriculum and to motivate student self-preparation during the final clinical rotation. Beginning in 2009, the passing score set for the exit exam has been set at the national level for all students taking the same exit exam used by the program. This score varies slightly from year to year and is has historically been in the 69%-70% (approximately 104/150) range.
3. The effect of the increase in the number of students admitted to the program has shown to be somewhat detrimental to the overall learning process.
4. The faculty will meet as a group in spring 2014 to determine strategies that will keep the students competitive in job attainment

while allowing them to adequately prepare for the exit exam and the licensing exam and will implement one or more of the strategies for the graduating class of 2014.

5. Currently the PTA Education program sends out follow up surveys at 6 months to gain insight into current employment and program strengths/weaknesses. Because of the difficulty in tracking each graduate after leaving the program, the department needs to find a more efficient manner in which to disperse the surveys to the graduates in order to get a more representative sampling of the program's graduates. Beginning in fall 2004, the PTA education program began giving graduates the opportunity to complete the graduate questionnaires online as well as hard copy. This has marginally increased the return rate. Additional means for gathering the information from graduates needs were assessed, and it was determined that the ACCE would carry assessment forms with her to clinical visits and personally interview previous graduates that were available during clinical visits.
6. The PTAEXAM will continue to be given as an exit exam and used as a guide to determine weaknesses in the programs curriculum and to motivate student self-preparation during the final clinical rotation. Beginning in 2009, the passing score set for the exit exam has been set at the national level for all students taking the same exit exam used by the program. This score varies slightly from year to year and is has historically been in the 69%-70% (approximately 104/150) range.
7. The effect of the increase in the number of students admitted to the program has been determined to be detrimental.

Conclusions:

1. Based upon the Capstone evaluations utilized by the PTA education department, the program graduates are being adequately prepared to obtain licensure and join the healthcare workforce.
2. Students and Clinical Instructors are required to make comments on the CPI that help guide the PTA program in making changes to

the curriculum. Thus far from 1996-2013 the CASC PTA Education program has had all students pass Clinical Experience III.

3. It is also observed for the Class of 2013, of the one of the students that has failed the NPTAE, that student had also failed the Exit Exam on the first attempt. Another graduate failed the exit exam on the first attempt, but as of November 2013 has not attempted the licensing exam.
4. The program began to accept 2 additional students into the program for the class entering in 2011 (Class of 2013). Previously the program accepted 16 students per semester. The PTA Admissions Committee voted during its 2013 meeting to return to accepting 16 students per class.

III-3. Other Assessment Plans

No other assessment plans were in place during this academic year for this program.

Business/Technology (2012-2013)

III-1. Administering Assessment

The Business/Technology Division was using a capstone. These were administered online in our business capstone class. In addition the division requires a portfolio to be completed and for our students to complete a division based satisfaction online exit interview. We utilize results of the exit interview to make overall departmental adjustments.

34 Students completed the capstone in spring of 2014

We look for trends and analyze based on test scores and general feedback from students both verbal and written. This information is shared with stakeholders and discussions are conducted for possible solutions when improvement can be made.

III-2. Analyses and Findings

Program outcomes indicated that our incoming students were not prepared for Financial Accounting due to a lack of basic accounting skills. Feedback indicated a steep learning curve for students with little or no accounting experience. Typically we had allowed students to enroll in Financial Accounting without taking Fundamentals of Accounting if they had some high school accounting experience. What we are doing is changing the Financial Accounting class to include a prerequisite of Fundamentals of Accounting to try and solve this problem. We were able to change our enrollment software to prevent this from happening.

III-3. Future Assessment Model

Assessment is currently under review to address ways to gather useful departmental and course specific data. Carl Albert State College made the decision in the fall of 2012 to implement the WEAVE assessment tool and currently the institution is in the implementing and retooling phase of its WEAVE usage. To insure success the institution has hired a full time outcomes and assessment specialist to facilitate the process of gathering useful data.

Section IV – Student Satisfaction

Administration of Assessment

IV-1. The CASC assessment team and assessment committee are in the works of producing a survey that will encompass the data that is most relevant to our institution. CASC will use their own survey to gather appropriate information about our students and their opinions of their learning experience, student life, and courses.

IV-2. CASC continues to grow and enhance services at both of its campuses. Focusing on the needs of students, improving student services

and activities in an effort to improve the campuses will be done through the development of a new student survey. The new Deanna Reed Math and Science Center is a state-of-the-art facility and has received positive reactions from our students, impacting their opinion of our classrooms and lab facilities. CASC also opened the new Enrollment/Retention Center at the Poteau campus which focuses on evaluation, orientation, and enrollment of our new students after they have completed the admissions process. This has reduced the wait time in the admissions office for students, aiding in streamlining multiple processes in various offices. We have seen a positive response from our students with the addition of this new department.

IV-3. Results from the Student Evaluation of their courses indicate students are extremely satisfied with their CASC especially with the classrooms, faculty and facilities. Students expressed overall positive attitudes toward the institution in general.

The assessment committee is currently in the process of redesigning course evaluation tools to closely monitor information that is relevant to our particular institution.

Student’s Evaluation of Teaching Results

Demographic Information	Course Evaluation
Age: 17 to 24- 66 % 25 to 40- 22% 40 and up- 8%	1. The Classroom was well maintained. Strongly Agree- 74% Agree- 22% Neutral- 3% Disagree- 1% Strongly Disagree- 0%
Student Level: Freshman- 40% Sophomore- 35% Other- 8%	2. The classroom equipment used was functional and well maintained. Strongly Agree- 68% Agree- 25%

	<p>Neutral- 6%</p> <p>Disagree- 1%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 0%</p>
<p>Expected Grade:</p> <p>A- 32%</p> <p>B- 48%</p> <p>C- 11%</p> <p>D- 0%</p>	<p>3. I had the appropriate academic preparation or other background to take this course.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 55%</p> <p>Agree- 32%</p> <p>Neutral- 11%</p> <p>Disagree- 2%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 0%</p>
<p>Required for Degree:</p> <p>Yes- 63%</p> <p>No- 11%</p>	<p>4. The syllabus clearly described course objectives and requirements.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 71%</p> <p>Agree- 25%</p> <p>Neutral- 3%</p> <p>Disagree- 1%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 0%</p>
<p>Student Interest:</p> <p>Accounting- 4%</p> <p>Art- 4%</p> <p>Biology/ Zoology- 4%</p> <p>Business Administration- 4%</p> <p>Business Education- 5%</p> <p>Child Development- 2%</p> <p>Computer Science- 4%</p> <p>Electronics- 2%</p> <p>Education- 4%</p> <p>English- 2%</p> <p>HPER- 4%</p> <p>HRTM- 0%</p> <p>Journalism- 1%</p> <p>Manufacturing Tech- 1%</p> <p>Math- 3%</p>	<p>5. The instructor followed the schedule in the syllabus.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 64%</p> <p>Agree- 29%</p> <p>Neutral- 6%</p> <p>Disagree- 1%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 0%</p>

<p>Music- 3% Nursing-AAS- 21% Office Administration- 1% Physical Science- 3% PTA- 9% Pre-Law- 4% Pre-Medicine- 9% Pre-Nursing- 8% Secondary Education- 1% Social Science- 2% Sociology/Psychology- 8% Speech- 1% Undecided- 7% Non-degree seeking- 0%</p>	
<p>Summary- While CASC students have a wide variety of interest, Nursing is the program that most students were interested in. Follow by interest in the Physical Therapy Assistant program.</p>	<p>6. Required assignments contributed to what I learned in the course. Strongly Agree- 63% Agree- 28% Neutral- 8% Disagree- 1% Strongly Disagree- 1%</p>
	<p>7. Grade evaluation feedback was given at timely intervals during the semester. Strongly Agree- 52% Agree- 33% Neutral- 9% Disagree- 3% Strongly Disagree- 0%</p>

	<p>8. Grade evaluation feedback was impartial and fair. Strongly Agree- 58% Agree- 29% Neutral- 9% Disagree- 2% Strongly Disagree- 2%</p>
	<p>9. Examinations tested my understanding of course materials. Strongly Agree- 61% Agree- 29% Neutral- 8% Disagree- 1% Strongly Disagree- 1%</p>
	<p>10. This course was a valuable educational experience. Strongly Agree- 57% Agree- 31% Disagree- 2% Strongly Disagree- 1%</p>
	<p>11. Compared to my expectations at the beginning of the course, my interest in this subject has increased. Strongly Agree- 42% Agree- 28% Neutral- 21% Disagree- 6% Strongly Disagree- 4%</p>

	<p>12. I would recommend this course to other students.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 49%</p> <p>Agree- 25%</p> <p>Neutral- 15%</p> <p>Disagree- 4%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 3%</p>
	<p>13. The instructor was enthusiastic about the course.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 65%</p> <p>Agree- 25%</p> <p>Neutral- 8%</p> <p>Disagree- 2%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 1%</p>
	<p>14. The instructor was well prepared for each class.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 68%</p> <p>Agree- 25%</p> <p>Neutral- 5%</p> <p>Disagree- 2%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 1%</p>
	<p>15. The instructor treated students with respect and courtesy.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 72%</p> <p>Agree- 21%</p> <p>Neutral- 5%</p> <p>Disagree- 1%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 0%</p>
	<p>16. The instructor posted and kept adequate office hours.</p> <p>Strongly Agree- 61%</p> <p>Agree- 27%</p> <p>Neutral- 11%</p> <p>Disagree- 1%</p> <p>Strongly Disagree- 3%</p>

	<p>17. I would take another course from this instructor. Strongly Agree- 60% Agree- 21% Neutral- 12% Disagree- 4% Strongly Disagree- 3%</p>
	<p>18. I would recommend this instructor for a teaching excellence award. Strongly Agree- 55% Agree- 24% Neutral- 15% Disagree- 4% Strongly Agree- 3%</p>
	<p>19. Instructional materials were clearly written and aided by understanding of the course. Strongly Agree- 55% Agree- 32% Neutral- 11% Disagree- 2% Strongly Disagree- 1%</p>
	<p>20. Laboratory sessions increased my understanding of material presented in lecture sessions. Strongly Agree- 42% Agree- 27% Neutral- 27% Disagree- 2% Strongly Disagree-2%</p>