READING IS SIMPLY EVERYTHING THE QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PLAN FOR LAMAR STATE COLLEGE-ORANGE

3rd Annual Report:
2016-2017

RISE Team

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE-ORANGE

Table of Contents

I.   EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lamar State College-Orange Quality Enhancement Plan:
RISE (Reading Is Simply Everything)
QEP Director: Andrew B. Preslar (Andy.Preslar@lsco.edu)

RISE: Reading is Simply Everything is the Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) for Lamar State College-Orange (LSC-O). Data collected by the college shows that fewer than 50% of our incoming students read at a college level. This data informed our decision to select a QEP reading focus. RISE seeks to enhance student learning by improving reading and reading comprehension through the teaching of interdisciplinary reading strategies to students.

RISE focuses initially on improving critical and analytical reading skills of those students who have identified themselves as Pre-Licensed Vocational Nursing (Pre-LVN) majors. These students will receive embedded reading instruction from trained faculty at designated points in their course of study. Initial instruction will be embedded in designated sections of Education (EDUC) 1300 Learning Frameworks, LSC-O's freshman College Success course. Additional scaffolding enhancement will be administered in designated Pre-LVN support courses and in courses within the LVN program of study. Over a five-year period, the plan calls for expansion to include students from other programs, optimizing their chances for success by enhancing their critical and analytical reading skills where institutional data reveals a need.

Goals:
- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend college-level texts. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will read at college level, grade thirteen (13).

- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate an increase in the proficiency in comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college-level texts and materials. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

Student Learning Outcomes:
After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will:
- read and comprehend college-level materials for a variety of purposes;
  select and use reading strategies appropriate to content and purpose;
- monitor the effectiveness of their own comprehension strategies and adjust them as needed; and
- increase their proficiency of comprehension, fluency, and critical and analytical reading skills in college-level texts and materials.

II.   PURPOSE, GOALS, AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The purpose statement, goals, and student learning outcomes approved by the SACSCOC team were written as follows:

A.   Purpose

RISE seeks to enhance student learning by improving reading and reading comprehension through the teaching of interdisciplinary reading strategies to students.

B.   Goals

- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend college-level texts. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will read at college level, grade thirteen (13).

- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate an increase in the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college level texts and materials. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

C.   Student Learning Outcomes

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will:

- read and comprehend college-level materials for a variety of purposes;
- select and use reading strategies appropriate to content and purpose;
- monitor the effectiveness of their own comprehension strategies and adjust them as needed; and
- increase the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, and critical and analytical reading skills in college level texts and materials.

Assessments include pre- and post-testing using two nationally normed instruments—the Nelson-Denny Reading Test (NDRT) and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (GMRT)—performance assessments using two other nationally normed instruments—the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) and the National Council Licensure Exam (NCLEX)—and a pre-and post-instructional administration of the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI).

See **Appendix B** for details about the TEAS and NCLEX tests.

For the second (2015-2016) plan implementation year, the RISE team determined that no change in the Student Learning Outcomes was necessary. It further agreed that no change was necessary for the 70% benchmark in the goals for this first full year of implementation. However, as a result of preliminary data analysis for the third (2016-2017) plan implementation year, the RISE team is considering raising the threshold of the number of hours of enhancement instruction indicated in the goals from 20 contact hours to 24 contact hours. These discussions were initiated during the data analysis phase of 2014-15 implementation, but for the current plan year, the team did not feel that it had enough data to inform a decision of such impact. Further discussion of this potential change will be developed in the next section of this report.

III.   **COLLECTION, MANAGEMENT, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA**

The QEP Director is responsible for coordinating the plan's implementation and assessment activities, managing data collection, analysis and interpretation, facilitating communication within and between constituencies, and related duties as required. The Director is also responsible for the archiving of test and survey data housed in the Banner database in such a way as to facilitate management and extraction of assessment data collected during the academic year. A series of codes enables administrative personnel to properly store and retrieve information on vocabulary, comprehension, and reading grade level for the Nelson-Denny and Gates-MacGinitie Reading Tests, as well as global reading strategies, problem-solving strategies, and support reading strategies for the MARSI. Data pertaining to student performance on the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) was also collected and archived for Spring 2017. The archiving and extraction mechanisms functioned without incident during the 2016-17 plan year. One additional Banner code was created to facilitate improved management of control group data.

For additional details, please refer to **Appendix A**.

A. Pre-, Post-Test Results: Interpretation and Analysis

In her discussions with peers, the RISE Curriculum and Instruction Specialist (CIS) continues to perceive general opposition to the Nelson-Denney Reading Test, much of it arising from the temporal constraints it imposes on students being tested. However, after discussion following the analysis of data from the 2015-2016 plan year, the RISE team again agreed to continue using the Nelson-Denney Reading Test as an assessment measure in EDUC 1300 for the 2016-2017 plan implementation year. In addition to the fact that its outputs match the plan's goals and outcomes well, other practical reasons for continuing to employ the Nelson-Denney include the low cost, the availability of institution-specific baseline data, the testing coordinator's familiarity with administering and interpreting the results, and the availability of national norming data.

The team noted the following points:
- the other reading assessment the plan employs also involves time constraints
- the instrument used to determine entry into the Vocational Nursing program (the TEAS) involves time constraints
- the instrument used to determine licensure eligibility (NCLEX) also involves time constraints

Since the purpose of the plan is ultimately to increase student success by increasing the number of students qualifying for the program and for licensure, the team determined that the timed testing that students in the cohort would undergo as part of the RISE data collection process would also give those students additional practice at timed testing and self-management, thus having a beneficial impact on their ultimate success. The team chose to continue use of the Nelson-Denney as one of the plan's assessment measures for 2016-2017.

The second (2015-2016) year of the plan's implementation also called for expanding the list of courses that include reading enhancement instruction. The RISE team chose the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, which provides data similar to that yielded by the Nelson Denney and which permits pre- and post-instructional testing and national norming. These courses include Nutrition (BIOL 1322), Anatomy and Physiology labs (BIOL 2101 and BIOL 2102), Anatomy and Physiology lectures (BIOL 2301 and BIOL 2302), and Lifespan (PSYC 2314). For Spring 2016, RISE faculty and other faculty volunteers who teach many of these support courses modified their course curricula and schedules to include 2 contact hours of instruction on reading enhancement and pre-and post-instructional testing and administration of the reading skills inventory. Students in multiple sections of each course and in control sections were assessed.

Analysis of the results of these assessments indicated that the assessment strategy employed did not adequately incent students to optimum performance. After discussions, the RISE team agreed to introduce modifications in the testing strategies and timetables for 2016-2017. Pre-instructional tests and inventory surveys were completed within two weeks of the semester start dates, and post-instructional assessments completed within two weeks of the semester end dates. Testing was tied to course credit according to a mechanism devised by each instructor. Assessment results were completed by the Director and by the Testing Center personnel and distributed to instructors in time to be included in compiling course grades.

1. **Sampling and Data Pool Considerations**

   For 2016-2017, a total of twenty-five (25) students were tested using the pre-instructional Nelson-Denney Reading Test. Thirty-three (33) students in control sections completed testing. Twenty-one (21) students in the cohort sections completed post-instructional testing, and thirty-three (33) students in the control sections completed post-instructional testing.

   For the same period, a total of two hundred thirty-four (234) students in the cohort sections and thirteen (13) students in control sections were tested using the pre-instructional Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test. One hundred thirty-two (132) students in cohort sections and nine (9) students in control sections completed post-instructional testing.

   Forty-five (45) students having received some quantity of reading enhancement instruction during the course of their program of study completed the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) in Spring 2017 as part of the requirement for applying to the LVN program. Of those, only three (3) were members of the plan cohort (having completed 20 hours of reading enhancement instruction in a designated section of EDUC 1300), while the rest received reading enhancement instruction in their support courses. This was the first group of students taking the TEAS that included members of the plan cohort.

   A subcommittee of the RISE team performed statistical analysis of the test results for the three (3) cohort sections of EDUC 1300, the two (2) designated control sections of EDUC 1300, the eighteen (18) cohort sections of the support courses, the two (2) control sections of the support courses, and those completing the TEAS assessment.

2. Analysis of Student Performance Data

The data indicated mixed results. At the analysis meeting, the members of the data analysis team met to identify which data would best address each of the plan's goals and outcomes and agreed that the same paradigm and codes would be employed for 2016-17 as for the previous plan year. A Banner report was prepared using the test codes correlating to the data needed, and information archived there was extracted into a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet distinguished between cohort and control groups, with students in both groups being removed for the purposes of analysis. The analysis focused on students receiving 20 hours of reading enhancement training in EDUC 1300 and taking the Nelson-Denney tests, and on students in the support course group taking the Gates-MacGinitie tests. A third pool addressed students receiving any reading enhancement training. Results of pre- and post-instructional administrations of the MARSI for all groups were also extracted. Results of the analysis by goal and outcome are listed below:

GOAL 1:

70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend college-level texts. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will read at college level, grade thirteen (13).

Applicable Measures:

- Pre- and post-instructional NDRT Comprehension Grade Level and Total Score
- Pre- and post-instructional GMRT Comprehension Grade Level and Total Score
- TEAS

Reading level (Nelson-Denny) for 2016-2017

- 52.9% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 40.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 48.0% of support course group read at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 44.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Reading level (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 41.0% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 27.4% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 45.2% of support course group read at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 33.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

> Performance on this Goal 1 assessment trended upwards in all categories, but the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (12.6%) was in the cohort group.

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for 2016-2017

- 47.1% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 38.1% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 60.0% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 50.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for all years
- 41.0% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 25.4% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 58.1% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 36.2% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13

Performance on this goal trended upwards in all categories, but the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (13.8%) was in the group receiving some form of reading enhancement instruction, while the second highest increase (12.7%) was in the cohort group.

Reading Level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-17

- 55.6% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 75.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 76.3% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 76.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Reading level, all years:
- 50.0% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 50.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 75.6% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 73.9% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Performance on this goal trended up in all categories as well, but by far the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (25.0%) was in the cohort group, while the control group's performance only improved 5.6%.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-17

- 62.5% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 75.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 84.1% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.8% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Comprehension level, all years:

- 64.7% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 85.7% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 82.9% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

> Performance on this goal did not change significantly except for the cohort group, whose decrease in performance this year over previous years was 10.7%

Total score (Nelson-Denny) 2016-2017

- 52.9% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 40.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 48.0% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 44.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Total score, all years

- 41.0% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 27.4% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 45.2% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 33.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

> Performance on this goal trended up in all categories, with the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (12.6%) occurring in the cohort group.

Total score (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-17
- 55.6% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 75.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 76.3% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 76.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Total score, all years

- 64.7% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 85.7% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 82.9% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

> Performance on this goal trended downward over previous years, with the smallest performance decrease occurring in the group receiving any combination of reading enhancement instruction, and the largest decrease occurring in the control group.

Reading level (TEAS)

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 100% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 83.3% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 84.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Baseline: data from 3 previous years' testing excluding all students with reading enhancement instruction

- 88.1% of all students scored 50 or above on a first attempt (616 of 699)

> The TEAS cannot be directly correlated to reading level, according to the vendor. In addition, the 2016-2017 TEAS data samples for the cohort and control groups are too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Goal 1 was partially met, as members of the cohort group (having received 20 or more hours' reading enhancement instruction) and testing in support courses using the GMRT post-instructional form did meet the 70% standard for reading comprehension grade level and total score grade level. However, the data analysis committee agrees that data for other cohorts may be seen as contradicting this interpretation.

Goal 2:

70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate an increase in the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college-level texts and materials. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

NOTE: SLO 4 information is also included in this section as the same testing assessment instruments were utilized.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 4:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will increase the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, and critical and analytical reading skills in college-level texts and materials.

Comprehension Levels

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) 2016-2017 only

- 70.6% of control group showed improvement
- 80.0% of cohort group showed improvement
- 70.8% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 75.0% of all students receiving enhancement instruction showed improvement

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) all years

- 63.8% of control group showed improvement
- 78.3% of cohort group showed improvement
- 70.0% of support course group showed improvement
- 75.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Performance trended upwards slightly in 3 of the 4 groups.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-2017

- 25.0% of control group showed improvement
- 33.3% of cohort group showed improvement
- 37.1% of support course group showed improvement
- 37.0% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) all years

- 23.5% of control group showed improvement
- 33.3% of cohort group showed improvement
- 34.3% of support course group showed improvement
- 34.2% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Performance trended upwards slightly in 3 of the 4 groups.

Comprehension level (TEAS)

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 100% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 83.3% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 84.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Baseline: data from 3 previous years' testing excluding all students with reading enhancement instruction

- 88.1% of all students scored 50 or above on a first attempt (616 of 699)

The 2016-2017 TEAS data samples for the cohort and control groups are too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Fluency

Fluency (Nelson-Denny) 2016-2017

- 64.7% of control group showed improvement
- 57.1% of cohort group showed improvement
- 62.5% of support course group (for this test, a subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 60% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Fluency (Nelson-Denny) all years

- 63.8% of control group showed improvement
- 60.7% of cohort group showed improvement
- 66.7% of support course group (for this test, a subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 62.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Performance for all groups except the control group trended downward slightly, from 2.6% to 4.2%.

Fluency (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-2017

- 0% of control group showed improvement (1 participant)
- 50% of cohort group showed improvement (2 participants)
- 47.6% of support course group showed improvement
- 47.7% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Fluency (Gates-MacGinitie) all years

- 22.2% of control group showed improvement (only 1 participant)
- 36.4% of cohort group showed improvement (2 participants)
- 46.7% of support course group showed improvement
- 46.1% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Bullet items one and two for 2016-17 are not informed by a large enough data set to provide meaningful comparison.

Fluency (TEAS)

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 100% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 83.3% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 84.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Baseline: data from 3 previous years' testing excluding all students with reading enhancement instruction

- 88.1% of all students scored 50 or above on a first attempt (616 of 699)

The 2016-2017 TEAS data samples for the cohort and control groups are too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (MARSI), 2016-17

- 62.5% of control group showed improvement
- 93.3% of cohort group showed improvement
- 52.6% of support course group showed improvement
- 57.4% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

All years

- 68.8% of control group showed improvement
- 84.9% of cohort group showed improvement
- 52.7% of support course group showed improvement
- 61.1% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Performance for all groups except the support course group trended downward slightly, from 0.1% to 8.4% (cohort group).

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (TEAS), 2016-17

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 100% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 83.3% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 84.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Baseline: data from 3 previous years' testing excluding all students with reading enhancement instruction

- 88.1% of all students scored 50 or above on a first attempt (616 of 699)

> The 2016-2017 TEAS data samples for the cohort and control groups are too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Goal 2 and SLO 4 were partially met.

The 70% standard for improvement was met in Nelson-Denny data sets for comprehension and in MARSI for critical and analytical reading skills, but student performance in fluency assessments failed to meet the standard for all assessments and cohorts for which relevant data were available. The failure of students taking the Gates-MacGinitie test to show desired or even expected levels of improvement (note that one group had no students showing improvement between pre- and post-instructional testing) was surprising and disappointing, and prompted the data analysis subcommittee to perform a preliminary causal analysis and propose changes to the testing paradigm. The full RISE team will take up these discussions and consider proposals in its Fall 2017 meetings.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 1:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will read and comprehend college-level materials for a variety of purposes.

Grade-Level Comprehension (Nelson Denny) 2016-2017

- 47.1% of control group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 38.1% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 60.0% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 50.0% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

Grade-Level Comprehension (Nelson Denny) all years

- 41.0% of control group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 25.4% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 58.1% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 36.2% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

Performance on this goal trended upwards in all categories, but the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (13.8%) was in the group receiving some form of reading enhancement instruction, while the second highest increase (12.7%) was in the cohort group.

Grade-level Comprehension (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-17

- 62.5% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 75.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 84.1% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.8% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Grade-level Comprehension (Gates-MacGinitie) all years:

- 64.7% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 85.7% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 82.9% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level

Performance on this goal did not change significantly except for the cohort group, whose decrease in performance this year over previous years was 10.7%.

Grade-Level Reading (Nelson Denny total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels) 2016-17

- 52.9% of control group demonstrated college-level overall reading ability
- 40.0% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 48.0% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 44.4% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

Grade-Level Reading (Nelson Denny total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels) all years

- 41.0% of control group demonstrated college-level overall reading ability
- 27.4% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 45.2% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 33.3% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

Performance on this goal trended upwards in all categories, but the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (12.6%) was in the cohort group.

Grade-Level Reading (Gates-MacGinitie total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels) 2016-17

- 55.6% of control group demonstrated college-level overall reading ability
- 75.0% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 76.3% of support course group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 73.3% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

Grade-Level Reading (Gates-MacGinitie total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels) all years

- 50.0% of control group demonstrated college-level overall reading ability
- 50.0% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 75.6% of support course group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 73.9% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

Performance on this goal trended up in all categories, but by far the largest increase in performance this year over previous years (25.0%) was in the cohort group, while the control group's performance only improved 5.6%.

Grade-level Reading (TEAS), 2016-2017

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 100% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 83.3% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 84.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Baseline: data from 3 previous years' testing excluding all students with reading enhancement instruction

- 88.1% of all students scored 50 or above on a first attempt (616 of 699)

The 2016-2017 TEAS data samples for the cohort and control groups are too small to provide statistically relevant information.

SLO 1 was partially met, as students in the cohort met the 70% performance standard on the GMRT for grade-level reading comprehension and total scores, but other data from other cohorts tested may be seen to indicate failure to meet the standard as written. However, the data analysis subcommittee noted that, as written, the SLO applies to students who have finished their course of study. Only the TEAS and NCLEX measures would yield data reflecting end-of-program performance. The RISE team will reconsider the implications of the SLO's verbiage when it discusses the proposed changes to the other goals, outcomes, and testing strategies. Any such changes will be reflected in the 2017-2018 Annual Report.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 2:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will select and use reading strategies appropriate to content and purpose.

Reading strategy mastery (MARSI) 2016-17

- Control group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.89 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.98 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.69 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.72 (of 5)

Reading strategy mastery (MARSI) all years

- Control group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.66 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.98 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.65 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.72 (of 5)

Student mastery trended upward slightly in the control group but showed little or no change from previous years in other groups.

Reading strategies (TEAS), 2016-17

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 100% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 83.3% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 84.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Baseline: data from 3 previous years' testing excluding all students with reading enhancement instruction

- 88.1% of all students scored 50 or above on a first attempt (616 of 699)

The 2016-2017 TEAS data samples for the cohort and control groups are too small to provide statistically relevant information.

SLO 2 was met; students in the cohort group met or exceeded a 3.5 on the MARSI (TEAS results were unrevealing).

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 3:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will monitor the effectiveness of their own comprehension strategies and adjust them as needed.

Self-monitoring, adaptive ability, metacognitive reflection (MARSI) 2016-2017

- Control group: overall mean strategies: 3.89 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 4.06 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.71 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.74 (of 5)

Self-monitoring, adaptive ability, metacognitive reflection (MARSI) all years

- Control group: overall mean strategies: 3.72 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 4.02 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.68 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.75(of 5)

> Student mastery trended upward slightly in the control group but showed little or no change from previous years in other groups.

SLO 3 was met; students in the cohort group met or exceeded a 3.5 on the MARSI (TEAS results were unrevealing).

Overview: Despite yielding mixed results, these analyses suggest that the plan is having some positive impact and that students in the cohort classes are improving more than those in the control groups. However, the plan is still falling short of achieving its goals and failing to deliver on some of its student learning outcomes. The members present discussed one observed phenomenon, the fact that pre-instructional test scores are frequently higher than post-instructional scores, noting that one possible cause is likely to be testing fatigue. See section VII for further discussion.

Discussion of these analyses and of the annual report when completed will inform changes to take place in 2018.

See **Appendix A** for the data analysis subcommittee's full report.

B. Pre-, Post-Survey Results: Interpretation and Analysis

3. Selection of the MARSI to replace the survey originally employed

A locally developed survey was first employed in Spring 2015 to gauge students' awareness of their own reading strategies and approaches to reading, and was initially chosen as an assessment measure for its relevance to the plan's learning outcomes (two and three) and for its practical expediency. However, the RISE CIS, in consultation with her network of collaborating reading specialists, also reviewed the MARSI, which is in widespread use across the country and offers advantages over the current instrument. At its Sept. 10, 2015 meeting, the RISE Team elected to add pre- and post-instructional administration of the MARSI as an assessment measure for the plan's second and third Student Learning Outcomes, and discontinued use of the survey originally approved as a formative assessment measure.

The MARSI indicates relative metacognitive awareness and the ability to interpret one's reading situation and apply appropriate strategies, identifying three levels of proficiency: Low (2.4 or lower), Medium (2.5 to 3.4) and High (3.5 or more).

The CIS created an enhanced form of the survey and composed an instruction sheet to facilitate administration and student self-assessment. These innovations were successful in streamlining use of the inventory instrument.

4. Analysis of Skills Inventory Results

The plan calls for pre- and post-instructional surveys of both the plan cohort and control sections of EDUC 1300 and for cohort and control sections of support courses serving as pre- and co-requisites taken by students seeking admission to the Licensed Vocational Nursing (LVN) program, using an instrument recommended by the CIS and approved by the RISE team. For Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, this instrument was the MARSI (see item II.A.2 above). The following is a synopsis of results reported in more detail in the previous section of the report.

Goal 2:

70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate an increase in the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college-level texts and materials. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 4:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will increase the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, and critical and analytical reading skills in college- level texts and materials.

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (MARSI)

- 62.5% of control group showed improvement
- 93.3% of cohort group showed improvement
- 52.6% of support course group showed improvement
- 57.4% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 2:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will select and use reading strategies appropriate to content and purpose.

Reading strategy mastery (MARSI)

- Control group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.89 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.98 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.69 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.72 (of 5)

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 3:

After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will monitor the effectiveness of their own comprehension strategies and adjust them as needed.

SLO 3: Self-monitoring, adaptive ability, metacognitive reflection (MARSI)

- Control group: overall mean strategies: 3.89 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 4.06 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.71 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.74 (of 5)

These analyses suggest that the plan is having a significant impact. See section V for further discussion. Additional discussion of the annual report will provide a forum for possible change.

See **Appendix A** for the data analysis subcommittee's full report.

IV. EVALUATE IMPLEMENTATION

A. Expansion of the Plan Cohort

The RISE implementation plan for 2016-2017 called for two (2) sections of EDUC 1300 to be included in the RISE cohort for Fall 2016. EDUC 1300-02 and EDUC 1300-12 were designated in the Fall 2016 course schedule for students declaring a Pre-LVN major, and the importance of populating these sections exclusively with Pre-LVN majors was discussed with Advising, Counseling, and Testing personnel. Two sections were planned for Spring 2017 as well, but only one had sufficient enrollment to be offered. EDUC 1300-02 was designated as a cohort section, and EDUC 1300-03 was designated as a control section. However, no post-instructional data for the control section was collected in Spring 2017, as the instructor failed to schedule testing.

The plan also called for the continued inclusion of pre- and co-requisite courses supporting the LVN program, first piloted in Spring 2016. Training and implementation, assessment, and data storage continued for 2016-2017 without incident.

Four instructors for Pre-LVN support courses received RISE training during a 6-hour session conducted on July 21, 2015 with follow-up training completed in a two-hour session following convocation on August 20, 2015. Additional training was completed on November 6, 2016 from 9-12:30 and November 13 from 2:00-4:00 PM for instructors who volunteered to implement reading enhancement instruction in PSYC 2314. Instruction was implemented in the LVN classes as planned, with student feedback reported by program faculty as being generally positive.

Additional training will be offered in 2017-2018 for instructors in other, non-support course instructors who wish to volunteer as part of the planned institutionalization of the reading enhancement curriculum approved by SACS COC for plan year four.

B. Curriculum Changes to Pre-LVN Prerequisites: Curriculum Planning, Training, and Implementation

Modifications to the curricula of BIOL 1322, BIOL 2301, BIOL 2302, and PSYC 2314 were implemented in Spring 2016, following training on curriculum compaction and delivery of instruction. A total of twenty-five (25) sections were involved in implementation for 2016-2017, as the team agreed in its October 08, 2015 meeting that as many sections as possible should be augmented with reading enhancement instruction, in order to maximize the exposure of the enhancement strategies to students in the plan cohort, and therefore maximize the plan's impact on student performance measures. Two (2) contact hours of reading enhancement instruction (chosen by the instructor to fit the content and delivered in scaffolding "mini-lessons" throughout the courses) were woven into the curriculum of each course and section.

Six (6) contact hours of training was provided for all faculty teaching courses to be included in the plan's implementation (see section III. A above).

V. EVALUATE RESOURCE ALLOCATION

A. Operations

Budgetary allocations for purchasing or preparing course materials and training resources were projected by the plan's leadership in Spring 2016 and proposed as part of the normal procedure for preparing the 2016-17 budget. Those budgets were approved. Likewise, projected costs for purchasing or preparing assessments and for data management for 2017-2018 were proposed and approved as submitted:

Travel	$1500
Maintenance and Operations	$3000
Total	$4500

The Travel/M&O budget worksheet is attached as **Appendix D**.
These allocations have proven adequate and no additional funds have been requested.

B. Remuneration

Money budgeted to cover course release time for the director and stipendiary remuneration for RISE's curriculum and instructional design specialist are also delineated in the budget. These funds were approved for 2016-17:

Position	**Fall 2016**	**Spring 2017**	**Summer 2017**
Curriculum Specialist	$1200	$1200	$1200
Director	$4800	$4800	$4800

The remuneration for the CIS was reduced by half for 2016-17, as the heaviest burden of compacting curricula, developing training materials, and conducting training will be significantly reduced following the first full year of implementation (which ended in May 2016). The Director's remuneration is unchanged from that proposed and approved at the plan's original drafting. Funding for 2017-2018 will be unchanged from this amount.

VI. TRAVEL

No travel funds were spent for RISE personnel between September 1, 2016 and Sept, 1, 2017. The travel budget for FY 2017-2018 is $1500, to cover ongoing training in reading instruction and curriculum design and to cover anticipated travel to SACS COC training on completing the Impact Statement.

VII. EVALUATE LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

No changes to the administrative leadership or its structure are scheduled at this time, but an evaluation of the Director will be requested for Fall 2017. This performance review will inform any changes that the team and executive administration deem necessary or desirable.

VIII. CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT

A. Use of Results

1. Training, Curriculum

Securing student cooperation for assessment testing proved significantly problematic in the first semester of the inclusion of support courses (Spring 2016). This determination was informed in part by testimony from instructors, and in part by testing data. The testing data itself showed the surprising result that, for many students, **pre-instruction test scores were higher than post-instructional test scores.** The CIS, who teaches the cohort EDUC 1300 classes which comprise the most important instructional component in the plan, noted the same problems with testing in her sections. The team determined the cause to be procedural. The problem developed as outlined below.

Background

Initially, in Spring and Fall 0f 2015, instructors implementing reading enhancement instruction did not include the test scores from either pre-instructional or post-instructional testing in course grades; the scores "did not count." This resulted in a negative assessment dynamic. Following pre-instructional testing in early Spring 2016, the RISE team recommended providing some course-level incentives to encourage student cooperation, leaving the exact inducement to be determined by individual instructors. Most chose to offer extra credit to students who completed the post-instructional testing. However, this inducement failed to produce the desired results. The disparity between desired and observed results became more pronounced in the 2016-2017 plan year.

Data

When post-instructional testing was being administered, students were observed by their instructors to be exhausted by course-level testing and in addition (since the scores in many classes still had little bearing on their course grades, aside from counting as extra credit) did not have a strong enough incentive to perform optimally on the post-instructional RISE testing, or in some cases even to take the exam. Other problems included students testing multiple times over the course of two or three semesters, which the RISE team believes had the effect of reducing the apparent importance of the test (many students simply did not seem to take it seriously, especially the post-instructional administration, given when many other assessments in their programs were in the process of being simultaneously administered).

Use of Results

As a consequence, in its October 2016 meeting, the RISE team recommended two changes in implementation and curriculum:

- all testing should be completed within narrow windows of time, so for Fall 2016, pre-instructional testing was to be completed within two (2) weeks of the first class day (by September 5, 2016, if possible), and post-instructional testing should be completed between November 7 and November 18. The team believed that this alleviate testing fatigue and allow time for tests to be graded and scores to be returned to instructors

- for Fall 2016, the reading enhancement instruction should be regarded as regular course content, and post-instructional testing should be included as a component in the overall course grade, leaving the exact weight of this grade to be determined by each instructor

These changes in procedure and curriculum were incorporated into the plan's implementation for 2016-2017.

However, the changes did not produce the desired effect, and the problems persist. The team believes that the strategy behind these changes was sound, but that they did not result in creating a proper incentive or adequately alleviate the fatigue noted by faculty administering the assessments and reflected in the data analyzed for Part II of this report. The RISE team recommends that participating faculty continue to employ these approaches, but also recommends the following additional measures:

- The plan goals should be changed to assess performance and gauge the plan's impact after students have received twenty-four (24) hours of reading enhancement instruction, rather than twenty (20) hours

- Instruction should be continued in all support courses, but testing would be completed **only** in the following courses:

  - GMRT pre-instructional testing should be completed within two weeks of the beginning of each semester in BIOL 2301 (Anatomy and Physiology I), and

  - Post-instructional testing should be completed late during the next-to-last full month of each semester (late March and late October) in BIOL 2302 (Anatomy and Physiology II), with test results being factored into the course grade in A&P II as a major assignment

Testing would be suspended in other support courses.

MARSI administration protocols will also be changed, but details will be considered by the full RISE team during deliberations in Fall 2017.

These changes would be implemented in Spring 2018.

The Director's intention to discuss revision of the plan's goals and outcome statements was addressed in Part I of this report as well as here. Further details will not be included in this report, as they will more properly be represented and delineated in the 2017-2018 RISE Annual Report.

Training in the offering of reading enhancement instruction was completed for nursing faculty and was implemented in their courses in Spring 2017, with feedback and written evaluations being universally positive. The impact will be assessed beginning in Spring 2018 for students in the plan cohort taking the NCLEX.

2. Implementation Protocols

Generally, implementation was transparent for students and went as planned, with the exception of testing issues already noted. AS noted in the previous section of this report, changes in the testing paradigm are proposed for 2017-2018 to address issues of testing fatigue impacting student performance. The 2017-2018 Annual Report will analyze the effects of any proposed changes that are approved by the full team in its Fall 2017 deliberations and subsequently implemented. Further speculation here about specific changes, however, would be premature.

B. Consultants

As data suggests that the plan is meeting some goals and partially meeting others, no use of paid consultants is deemed necessary at this time. The team will continue to self-monitor to address problems and implement changes to improve implementation and assessment.

C. Peer Review

The RISE CIS has consistently used her network of peer consultants to evaluate the plan's elements, processes, and/or protocols. In addition, the Director of Institutional Effectiveness, who frequently discusses assessment issues relevant to accreditation with colleagues at other institutions, is an ex officio member of the RISE team and attends every meeting, offering suggestions, comparisons, and ideas from other two- and four-year institutions within and outside of the Texas State University System. Therefore, for the same reason that consultants are not deemed necessary, formal peer review is not deemed necessary and is not envisioned at this time.

IX. APPENDIX A: RISE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT DATA SUMMARY 2016-2017

A. Cohort and Control Testing Information

Data was analyzed for the following groups:
QEPC – Control Group: participants who received no RISE instruction
QEPE – Participants who completed 20+ hours of RISE instruction in EDUC 1300
QEPS – Participants who did not receive RISE instruction in EDUC 1300 but did receive RISE instruction in at least one supporting course
QEPZ – All participants who received RISE instruction (i.e., both QEPE and QEPS)

B. QEP Data Analysis: Summer 2017

*Goal #1 **Pre-test data in italics***

Goal #1: 70% of participants completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend college-level texts. More simply stated, 70% of participants receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will read at college level, grade thirteen (13).

QRCG: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
*   QEPC Mean: 11.43 – 10 of 33 scored 13.0 or higher (30.3%)*
*   QEPE Mean: 9.94 – 5 of 25 scored 13.0 or higher (20.0%)*
*   QEPS Mean: 10.96 – 11 of 38 scored 13.0 or higher (28.9%)*
*   QEPZ Mean: 10.55 – 16 of 63 scored 13.0 or higher (25.4%)*

QRCG: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
*   QEPC Mean: 11.50 – 34 of 100 scored 13.0 or higher (34.0%)*
*   QEPE Mean: 9.27 – 14 of 88 scored 13.0 or higher (15.9%)*
*   QEPS Mean: 10.70 – 13 of 50 scored 13.0 or higher (26.0%)*
*   QEPZ Mean: 9.79 – 27 of 138 scored 13.0 or higher (19.6%)*

QRTG: QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
*   QEPC Mean: 11.41 – 11 of 33 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)*
*   QEPE Mean: 10.70 – 8 of 25 scored 13.0 or higher (32.0%)*
*   QEPS Mean: 11.15 – 14 of 39 scored 13.0 or higher (35.9%)*
*   QEPZ Mean: 10.98 – 22 of 64 scored 13.0 or higher (34.4%)*

QRTG: QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 11.47 – 35 of 100 scored 13.0 or higher (35.0%)
  QEPE Mean: 9.73 – 17 of 88 scored 13.0 or higher (19.3%)
  QEPS Mean: 10.80 – 16 of 50 scored 13.0 or higher (34.0%)
  QEPZ Mean: 10.12 – 33 of 138 scored 13.0 or higher (23.9%)

QOCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 12.16 – 8 of 17 scored 13.0 or higher (47.1%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.38 – 8 of 21 scored 13.0 or higher (38.1%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.06 – 15 of 25 scored 13.0 or higher (60.0%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.75 – 23 of 46 scored 13.0 or higher (50.0%)

QOCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 11.80 – 25 of 61 scored 13.0 or higher (41.0%)
  QEPE Mean: 10.85 – 16 of 63 scored 13.0 or higher (25.4%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.16 – 18 of 31 scored 13.0 or higher (58.1%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.29 – 34 of 94 scored 13.0 or higher (36.2%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 12.56 – 9 of 17 scored 13.0 or higher (52.9%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.31 – 8 of 20 scored 13.0 or higher (40.0%)
  QEPS Mean: 11.75 – 12 of 25 scored 13.0 or higher (48.0%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 11.84 – 25 of 61 scored 13.0 or higher (41.0%)
  QEPE Mean: 10.84 – 17 of 62 scored 13.0 or higher (27.4%)
  QEPS Mean: 11.71 – 14 of 31 scored 13.0 or higher (45.2%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.13 – 31 of 93 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QSCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
QEPC Mean: 11.94 – 10 of 12 scored 13 (83.3%)
QEPE Mean: 12.71 – 9 of 10 scored 13 (90.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.51 – 198 of 231 scored 13 (85.7%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.52 – 207 of 241 scored 13 (85.9%)

QSCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 12.24 – 18 of 24 scored 13 (75.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.72 – 23 of 26 scored 13 (88.5%)
QEPS Mean: 12.56 – 282 of 323 scored 13 (87.3%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.57 – 307 of 349 scored 13 (88.0%)

QSTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
QEPC Mean: 11.50 – 8 of 13 scored 13 (61.5%)
QEPE Mean: 12.37 – 7 of 10 scored 13 (70.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.45 – 193 of 234 scored 13 (82.5%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.44 – 200 of 244 scored 13 (82.0%)

QSTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 11.32 – 14 of 25 scored 13 (56.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.33 – 20 of 26 scored 13 (76.9%)
QEPS Mean: 12.45 – 272 of 326 scored 13 (83.4%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.43 – 292 of 352 scored 13 (83.0%)

Goal #1
Pre-test data in italics

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
QEPC Mean: 11.78 – 5 of 8 scored 13 (62.5%)
QEPE Mean: 12.43 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.47 – 111 of 132 scored 13 (84.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.47 – 114 of 136 scored 13 (83.8%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 11.52 – 11 of 17 scored 13 (64.7%)
QEPE Mean: 12.27 – 12 of 14 scored 13 (85.7%)
QEPS Mean: 12.34 – 160 of 193 scored 13 (82.9%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.34 – 172 of 207 scored 13 (83.1%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
    QEPC Mean: 11.46 – 5 of 9 scored 13 (55.6%)
    QEPE Mean: 11.90 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)
    QEPS Mean: 12.19 – 100 of 131 scored 13 (76.3%)
    QEPZ Mean: 12.18 – 103 of 135 scored 13 (76.3%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (all years)
    QEPC Mean: 11.19 – 9 of 18 scored 13 (50.0%)
    QEPE Mean: 11.65 – 7 of 14 scored 13 (50.0%)
    QEPS Mean: 12.14 – 146 of 193 scored 13 (75.6%)
    QEPZ Mean: 12.11 – 153 of 207 scored 13 (73.9%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)
    QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
    QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on first attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

Goal #2: 70% of participants completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate an increase in the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college level texts and materials. More simply stated, 70% of participants receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

Student Learning Outcome #4: After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the participants will: increase the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, and critical and analytical reading skills in college-level texts and materials.

Note that the measures chosen to assess Goal #2 and Student Learning Outcome #4 were the same.

(A)   Comprehension

QRCR: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
    QEPC Mean: 43.6 (33 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 39.3 (24 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 42.0 (39 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 41.0 (63 participants)

QOCR: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
    QEPC Mean: 48.7 (17 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 45.4 (21 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 47.5 (25 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 46.6 (46 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 17 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 12 showed improvement (70.6%). QEPE Group had 20 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 16 showed improvement (80.0%). QEPS group had 24 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 17 showed improvement (70.8%). QEPZ Group had 44 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these 33 showed improvement (75.0%).

<u>*Pre-test data in italics*</u>
Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (A) Comprehension

QRCR: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (all years)
    QEPC Mean: 43.6 (100 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 35.4 (87 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 40.9 (51 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 37.4 (138 participants)

QOCR: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (all years)
    QEPC Mean: 47.3 (61 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 43.5 (63 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 47.7 (31 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 44.9 (94 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 58 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 37 showed improvement (63.8%). QEPE Group had 60 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 47 showed improvement (78.3%). QEPS Group had 30 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 21 showed improvement (70.0%). QEPZ Group had 90 participants who completed both QRCR to QOCR. Of these, 68 showed improvement (75.6%).

QSCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
   QEPC Mean: 33.4 (12 participants)
   QEPE Mean: 33.2 (10 participants)
   QEPS Mean: 36.0 (234 participants)
   QEPZ Mean: 35.9 (244 participants)

QTCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
   QEPC Mean: 33.3 (8 participants)
   QEPE Mean: 32.5 (4 participants)
   QEPS Mean: 35.6 (134 participants)
   QEPZ Mean: 35.5 (138 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 8 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 2 showed improvement (25.0%). QEPE Group had 3 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 1 showed improvement (33.3%). QEPS Group had 124 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 46 showed improvement (37.1%). QEPZ Group had 127 participants who completed both QSCR and QOCR. Of these, 47 showed improvement (37.0%).

<u>*Pre-test data in italics*</u>
Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (A) Comprehension

QSCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score (all years)
   QEPC Mean: 32.6 (24 participants)
   QEPE Mean: 34.2 (26 participants)
   QEPS Mean: 36.0 (325 participants)
   QEPZ Mean: 35.9 (351 participants)

QTCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score (all years)
   QEPC Mean: 30.4 (17 participants)
   QEPE Mean: 31.3 (14 participants)
   QEPS Mean: 35.0 (196 participants)
   QEPZ Mean: 34.8 (210 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 17 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 4 showed improvement (23.5%). QEPE Group had 12 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 4 showed improvement (33.3%). QEPS Group had 178 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 61 showed improvement (34.3%). QEPZ Group had 190 participants who completed both QSCR and QOCR. Of these, 65 showed improvement (34.2%).

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on first attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

Pre-test data in italics

(B)   Fluency

QRVR: QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
QEPC Mean: 42.9 (33 participants)
QEPE Mean: 39.9 (25 participants)
QEPS Mean: 43.6 (39 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 42.2 (64 participants)

QOVR: QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
QEPC Mean: 49.1 (17 participants)
QEPE Mean: 43.8 (21 participants)
QEPS Mean: 44.1 (25 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 44.0 (46 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 17 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 11 showed improvement (64.7%). QEPE Group had 21 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 12 showed improvement (57.1%). QEPS group had 24 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 15 showed improvement (62.5%). QEPZ Group had 45 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 27 showed improvement (60.0%).

QRVR: QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 43.4 (100 participants)
  QEPE Mean: 37.2 (88 participants)
  QEPS Mean: 41.5 (50 participants)
  QEPZ Mean: 38.7 (138 participants)

QOVR: QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 45.4 (61 participants)
  QEPE Mean: 40.9 (63 participants)
  QEPS Mean: 43.8 (31 participants)
  QEPZ Mean: 41.9 (94 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 58 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 37 showed improvement (63.8%). QEPE Group had 61 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 37 showed improvement (60.7%). QEPS group had 30 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 20 showed improvement (66.7%). QEPZ Group had 91 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 57 showed improvement (62.6%).

<u>*Pre-test data in italics*</u>
Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (B) Fluency

QSVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 30.8 (14 participants)
  QEPE Mean: 25.0 (9 participants)
  QEPS Mean: 31.1 (236 participants)
  QEPZ Mean: 30.9 (245 participants)

QTVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score (2016-2017 only)
QEPC Mean: 30.1 (9 participants)
QEPE Mean: 27.5 (4 participants)
QEPS Mean: 31.1 (133 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 31.0 (137 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 9 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 0 showed improvement (0.0%). QEPE Group had 2 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 1 showed improvement (50.0%). QEPS Group had 126 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 60 showed improvement (47.6%). QEPZ Group had 128 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 61 showed improvement (47.7%).

QSVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)
QEPC Mean: 28.3 (26 participants)
QEPE Mean: 26.9 (25 participants)
QEPS Mean: 30.8 (328 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 30.6 (353 participants)

QTVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)
QEPC Mean: 28.1 (18 participants)
QEPE Mean: 26.3 (14 participants)
QEPS Mean: 31.1 (195 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 30.8 (209 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 18 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 4 showed improvement (22.2%). QEPE Group had 11 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 4 showed improvement (36.4%). QEPS Group had 180 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 84 showed improvement (46.7%). QEPZ Group had 191 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 88 showed improvement (46.1%).

Pre-test data in italics
Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (B) Fluency

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)

    QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
    QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on first attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

(C)   Critical and Analytical Reading Skills

QRMP: Pre-instructional MARSI problem-solving mean (2016-2017 only)
    QEPC Mean: 4.03 (22 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 4.00 (25 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 3.98 (197 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 3.98 (222 participants)

QOMP: Post-instructional MARSI problem-solving mean (2016-2017 only)
    QEPC Mean: 4.18 (8 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 4.36 (16 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 4.09 (134 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 4.12 (150 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 8 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 5 showed improvement (62.5%). QEPE Group had 15 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 14 showed improvement (93.3%). QEPS Group had 114 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 60 showed improvement (52.6%). QEPZ Group had 129 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 74 showed improvement.

Pre-test data in italics
Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (C) Critical and Analytical Reading Skills

QRMP: Pre-instructional MARSI problem-solving mean (all years)
    QEPC Mean: 3.98 (35 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 3.93 (77 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 3.97 (250 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 3.96 (327 participants)

QOMP: Post-instructional MARSI problem-solving mean (all years)
    QEPC Mean: 4.10 (17 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 4.36 (55 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 4.08 (198 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 4.14 (253 participants)

Comparison*: QEPC Group had 16 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 11 showed improvement (68.8%). QEPE Group had 53 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 45 showed improvement (84.9%). QEPS Group had 150 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 79 showed improvement (52.7%). QEPZ Group had 203 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 124 showed improvement (61.1%)*

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)
    QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
    QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on <u>first</u> attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

Student Learning Outcome #1: After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will: read and comprehend college-level materials for a variety of purposes.

QOCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 12.16 – 8 of 17 scored 13.0 or higher (47.1%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.38 – 8 of 21 scored 13.0 or higher (38.1%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.06 – 15 of 25 scored 13.0 or higher (60.0%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.75 – 23 of 46 scored 13.0 or higher (50.0%)

QOTG QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 12.56 - 9 of 17 scored 13.0 or higher (52.9%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.31 – 8 of 20 scored 13.0 or higher (40.0%)
  QEPS Mean: 11.75 – 12 of 25 scored 13.0 or higher (48.0%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.55 – 20 of 45 scored 13.0 or higher (44.4%)

QOCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 11.80 – 25 of 61 scored 13.0 or higher (41.0%)
  QEPE Mean: 10.85 – 16 of 63 scored 13.0 or higher (25.4%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.16 – 18 of 31 scored 13.0 or higher (58.1%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.29 – 34 of 94 scored 13.0 or higher (36.2%)

QOTG QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 11.84 – 25 of 61 scored 13.0 or higher (41.0%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.61 – 17 of 62 scored 13.0 or higher (27.4%)
  QEPS Mean: 11.71 – 14 of 31 scored 13.0 or higher (45.2%)
  QEPZ Mean: 11.13 – 31 of 93 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

Student Learning Outcome #1

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 11.78 – 5 of 8 scored 13 (62.5%)
  QEPE Mean: 12.43 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.47 – 111 of 132 scored 13 (84.1%)
  QEPZ Mean: 12.47 – 114 of 136 scored 13 (83.8%)

QTTG: QEPT Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (2016-2017 only)
  QEPC Mean: 11.46 – 5 of 9 scored 13 (55.6%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.90 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.19 – 100 of 131 scored 13 (76.3%)
  QEPZ Mean: 12.18 – 103 of 135 scored 13 (76.3%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 11.52 – 11 of 17 scored 13 (64.7%)
  QEPE Mean: 12.27 – 12 of 14 scored 13 (85.7%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.34 – 160 of 193 scored 13 (82.9%)
  QEPZ Mean: 12.34 – 172 of 207 scored 13 (83.1%)

QTTG: QEPT Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (all years)
  QEPC Mean: 11.19 – 9 of 18 scored 13 (50.0%)
  QEPE Mean: 11.65 – 7 of 14 scored 13 (50.0%)
  QEPS Mean: 12.14 – 146 of 193 scored 13 (75.6%)
  QEPZ Mean: 12.11 – 153 of 207 scored 13 (73.9%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)
  QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
  QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
  QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
  QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on first attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

Student Learning Outcome #2: After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will: select and use reading strategies appropriate to content and purpose.

QOMG: Post-instructional MARSI global strategies mean (2016-2017 only)
      QEPC Mean: 3.89 (8 participants)
      QEPE Mean: 3.98 (16 participants)
      QEPS Mean: 3.69 (136 participants)
      QEPZ Mean: 3.72 (152 participants)

QOMG: Post-instructional MARSI global strategies mean (all years)
      QEPC Mean: 3.66 (17 participants)
      QEPE Mean: 3.98 (55 participants)
      QEPS Mean: 3.65 (200 participants)
      QEPZ Mean: 3.72 (255 participants)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)
      QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
      QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
      QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
      QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on first attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

Student Learning Outcome #3: After completing the course of study for the Pre-LVN Program, the students will: monitor the effectiveness of their own comprehension strategies and adjust them as needed.

QOMO: Post-instructional MARSI overall mean (2016-2017 only)
    QEPC Mean: 3.89 (8 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 4.06 (16 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 3.71 (134 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 3.74 (150 participants)

QOMO: Post-instructional MARSI overall mean (all years)
    QEPC Mean: 3.72 (17 participants)
    QEPE Mean: 4.02 (55 participants)
    QEPS Mean: 3.68 (198 participants)
    QEPZ Mean: 3.75 (253 participants)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2016-2017 is the first year of cohort data for this measure)
    QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 1 of 1 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 3 of 3 scored 50.0 or higher (100%)
    QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 35 of 42 scored 50.0 or higher (83.3%)
    QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 38 of 45 scored 50.0 or higher (84.4%)

Past TEAS (Reading) data (Spring 2013 through Summer 2017) for students on first attempt with no reading enhancement instruction:
Mean: 66.5 - 616 of 699 scored 50.0 or higher (88.1%)

X. APPENDIX B: TEST OF ESSENTIAL ACADEMIC SKILLS

A. Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS)

Created by Assessment Technologies Institute (ATI), the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) is an instrument designed to assess students' preparation for entering the health science fields. Students at Lamar State College-Orange take the TEAS in partial fulfillment of the admissions requirements for the Licensed Vocational Nursing (LVN) program. According to the ATI Web page entitled "About the TEAS," researchers have noted "a consistent link between a student's performance on the TEAS and future academic success" (ATI).

The test is comprised of 170 multiple-choice questions designed to assess proficiency in reading, math, science, and English grammar and usage. Over 31% of the questions (53/170) assess reading skills. Students have a maximum of 64 minutes (of 209 total) to answer the questions. Specific content includes

- the identification of and distinctions between key ideas and supporting detail;

- sentence and paragraph structure; and

- integration of knowledge and ideas.

The test is not scaled to reading grade level, but comparative analysis will be facilitated by baseline performance benchmarks informed by data from previous years.

Source:

Assessment Technologies Institute, LLC. *ATI TEAS: Prepare for Health Science School Success.* "What Is the ATI TEAS?" 2016. atitesting.com/teas-exam.aspx. Accessed 27 Dec. 2017.

B. National Council of Licensure Examination (NCLEX-PN)

The National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX-PN) is developed by the National Council of State Boards of Nursing (NCSBN), a non-profit organization whose members represent state licensing boards from all 50 states, and whose deliberations influence regulatory policy across the country.

The purpose of the NCLEX-PN is to assure licensing agencies that students have demonstrated the knowledge to safely practice entry-level nursing care in the field. It has been used for that purpose in the United States since 1994. It is currently administered by Pearson, an independent vendor, through an array of testing centers. Students must meet a benchmark set by the state licensing board in order to be eligible to take the exam.

The NCLEX-PN uses an interactive paradigm for selecting test questions called Computerized Adaptive Testing (CAT). Questions are drawn from a pool of items rated according to difficulty; since no two candidates are likely to receive the same test, this approach

- reduces security risks,
- reduces the number of "easy" questions that a candidate with high ability needs to answer,
- reduces the number of "hard" questions that candidates with low ability must answer, and
- increases the reliability of the instrument's assessment of student competence.

For more information, visit the NCSBN web site at www.ncsbn.org.

Source:

National Council of State Boards of Nursing. *NCLEX and Other Exams.* "NCLEX FAQs." 2017. www.ncsbn.org/9008.htm. Accessed 28 Dec. 2017.

XI.   APPENDIX C: LIST OF COHORT, CONTROL, AND SUPPORT COURSES

RISE cohort sections: Fall 2016   **Control:**

EDUC 1300-02   (90154)   Sellers   EDUC 1300-06 Stephenson (90158)
EDUC 1300-12   (90164)   Babcock

Support Courses: Fall 2016   **Control:**

BIOL 1322-01   (90011)   McClure   BIOL 2101-26 Foreman (90036)
BIOL 1322-02   (90012)   Sanford
BIOL 1322-03   (90013)   Sanford
BIOL 2301-02   (90026)   Sanford
BIOL 2301-04   (90028)   Song
PSYC 2314-01   (90345)   Moreau
PSCY 2314-02   (90346)   Hodges
PSCY 2314-03   (90347)   Hodges
PSYC 2314-04   (90348)   Hodges

RISE cohort sections: Spring 2017   **Control:**

EDUC 1300-02   (10152)   Babcock   EDUC 1300-03   Moreau (10155)

Support Courses: Spring 2017   **Control:**

BIOL 1322-01   (10007)   Sanford   PSYC 2314-01   Moreau (10306)
BIOL 1322-02   (10008)   Sanford
BIOL 1322-03   (10009)   Sanford
BIOL 2301-02   (10019)   Sanford
BIOL 2301-04   (10021)   Song
BIOL 2302-03   (10034)   Sanford
PSCY 2314-02   (10307)   Hodges
PSCY 2314-03   (10308)   Hodges
PSYC 2314-04   (10309)   Hodges