

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

**4TH Annual Report:
2017-2018**

RISE Team

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE ORANGE

Table of Contents

I.	REVISED UPDATED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	REVISED UPDATED PURPOSE, GOALS, AND LEARNING OUTCOMES	2
A.	Purpose	2
B.	Goals	2
C.	Student Learning Outcomes	2
III.	COLLECTION, MANAGEMENT, INTERPRETATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	4
A.	Pre-, Post-Test Results: Interpretation and Analysis	5
1.	Sampling and Data Pool Considerations	9
2.	Analysis of Student Performance Data	10
B.	Pre-, Post-Survey Results: Interpretation and Analysis	31
3.	Selection of the MARSII to replace the survey originally employed.....	31
4.	Analysis of Skills Inventory Results	31
IV.	EVALUATE IMPLEMENTATION	33
A.	Expansion of the Plan into New Disciplines and Programs.....	33
B.	Curriculum Changes to Pre-LVN Prerequisites: Curriculum Planning, Training, and Implementation	34
V.	EVALUATE RESOURCE ALLOCATION	34
A.	Operations	34
B.	Remuneration	34
VI.	TRAVEL	35
VII.	EVALUATE LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE.....	35
VIII.	CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.....	35
A.	Use of Results.....	35
1.	Training, Curriculum.....	35
2.	Implementation Protocols	38
B.	Consultants	38
C.	Peer Review	38
IX.	APPENDIX A: RISE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT DATA SUMMARY 2017-2018 ...	39
A.	Cohort and Control Testing Information.....	39
B.	QEP Data Analysis: Summer 2017.....	39
X.	APPENDIX B: TEST OF ESSENTIAL ACADEMIC SKILLS	39
A.	Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS)	53

B. National Council of Licensure Examination (NCLEX-PN)..... 53

XI. APPENDIX C: LIST OF COHORT, CONTROL, AND SUPPORT COURSES 55

I. REVISED UPDATED 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 (LSCO). 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, LSCO'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 (Revised Spring 2018):

- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 24 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 24 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 evaluators were originally 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.

In Spring 2017, the contact hour threshold for assessing student achievement in goals 1 and 2 was raised from 20 hours to 24 hours. Details and discussion are included in Sections II. C and III.A.

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 (MARSII).

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

For the fourth year of the RISE plan’s implementation, 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, the **plan goals as originally approved did become a focal point for discussion**. As a result of preliminary data analysis for the third (2016-2017) plan implementation year, the RISE team began to consider raising the threshold of the number of contact hours of enhancement instruction indicated in the goals from 20 contact hours to 24 contact hours. These discussions continued through Fall 2017, into the beginning of the plan’s fourth academic year of implementation.

The 20-hour threshold in the goals originally approved would be met by all students completing the EDUC 1300 Learning Frameworks classes designated for pre-LVN students who comprise the plan’s primary cohort, because in this class, the curriculum is significantly condensed and the bulk of the reading enhancement instruction concentrated; 20 of the course’s 48 hour contact hours are devoted to delivering instruction to enhance student’s reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness of their own responses to reading challenges. Thus, under the plan’s original conception, to meet the plan’s goals, students would have to not only improve their reading skills (Goal 2) but **read at a college level after one semester of enhancement instruction**. Administrations of pre- and post-instructional tests of student proficiency in this course are separated by only 10-12 weeks, and data indicated that students coming into the course with low-grade-level (9th grade or lower) reading proficiency were meeting Goal 2 by showing improvement as a result of instruction, but were not attaining college-level proficiency at a 70% rate. After collecting and analyzing data for two years of the plan’s implementation, the team concluded that **10 weeks was not sufficient time for underprepared, low-grade-level readers to receive, absorb, practice, and apply the training and raise performance levels to the college-level proficiency benchmark**. The team’s Curriculum and Instruction Specialist (CIS) confirmed the team’s conclusions and suggested that achievement of the plan’s goals and outcomes could more accurately be assessed if an interval of more than one semester interposed between initial exposure to the range of techniques, strategies, academic values,

and attitudes and the assessment of their effects on student reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness. In Spring 2018 the team determined that the data were sufficient to warrant change. Further discussion of this potential change will be developed in the next section of this report.

The RISE CIS confirmed the team's conclusion, drawn from analysis of assessment data, that, in the case of underprepared, low-grade-level readers, an accurate measure of the plan's ability to foster college-level reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness requires an interval of more than one semester interposed between reading enhancement instruction and assessment.

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 performing 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 MARSII. Data pertaining to student performance on the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) was also collected and archived for the 2017-2018 academic year.

The archiving mechanisms functioned without incident during the 2017-18 plan year. However, the team experienced significant difficulty and delay in extracting archived assessment data. Control group data confirmed to be archived in Banner was not being extracted by the program created for that purpose; the problem required several weeks to diagnose and remedy. A code created to facilitate improved management of control group data and added in Spring 2017 to the list of codes unique to the RISE plan required a reconfiguration of the extraction program used to pull data from Banner into an Excel document readable by the RISE data analysis action team.

Investigation ultimately revealed that the revised extraction program was supposed to have been made available to the LSCO registrar by the Lamar University staff controlling Banner program functions, but was never moved into her access, so the program she was using could not extract control group data. Personnel turnover in data management resulted in additional complication in diagnosis of the problem. Data became available for analysis by the RISE team in October and a preliminary report was delivered to the assembled RISE team on October 29, 2018.

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

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

The RISE team continues to use the Nelson-Denny Reading Test as an assessment measure in EDUC 1300. 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-Denny 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 CIS had previously noted that many of her colleagues disapproved of the instrument, in large part because it employs time constraints which impact student performance and may skew indicators to show lower achievement than would untimed assessments.

The team noted that the following assessments required for student success involve time restraints:

- the other reading assessment (the GMRT) that the plan employs
- most course-level assessments in support courses and many in the LVN program
- the instrument used to determine entry into the Vocational Nursing program (the TEAS)
- the instrument used to determine licensure eligibility (NCLEX)

Since the purpose of the plan is ultimately to increase student success by increasing the number of students qualifying for the program, fulfilling its requirements, and attaining licensure, the team continues to maintain 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-Denny Reading Test as one of the plan's assessment measures for 2017-2018.

The second and third years of the plan's implementation (2015-2016 and 2016-2017) 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-Denny 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. In Summer 2017, the RISE CIS trained members of the LVN program faculty to compress their curricula and implement reading enhancement instruction in courses throughout their program. The fourth year of plan implementation called for additional expansion, to courses and programs outside the pre-LVN program. Training was advertised to the campus and offered to all interested participants in July 2017, but no additional courses have been added to the plan's assessment protocol.

Until Fall 2017, students in multiple sections of each course and in control sections were given both pre- and post-instructional assessments. On Friday, August 25, 2017, the President's office issued a notice suspending classes due to begin on Monday, August 28 because of the anticipated impact of tropical storm Harvey. Catastrophic flooding from the storm closed campus for over two weeks, damaged or destroyed many homes and businesses in the LSCO service area, and displaced thousands of residents. On September 18, classes began after the campus reopened upon recovery of critical functions following the devastating flooding. Since funding is tied to contact hours, the college had to file a plan with the THECB showing how it would recover contact hours lost in the delay of school opening. When the RISE team met to determine how to respond to the effects of this compression of the semester, the most important topic was assessment. All team members agreed that enhancement instruction already embedded into course curricula should continue to be offered, but, since administering the GMRT and MARSII assessments takes at minimum two 75-minute class periods per course, many of the members of the team, who are also faculty teaching the support courses, believed that the time required for assessment could not be spared. On further discussion, the team determined that the base cohort, comprised of students in the plan-designated EDUC 1300 sections (which traditionally end one week early) would be assessed, but that assessment of reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness in support courses would be suspended for Fall 2017.

RISE assessments in support courses were suspended in Fall 2017 in the aftermath of tropical storm Harvey and the consequent shortfall of contact hours. Assessment in the primary cohort, EDUC 1300, continued.

At that point, the topic turned to the ongoing problems with assessment reported in the 2016-17 Annual Report.

Analysis of the results of these assessments (delivered in the 2016-2017 Annual Report) indicated that the assessment strategy employed did not adequately incent students to optimum performance. After discussions in Spring 2016, 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 RISE Director and by the Testing Center personnel and the results of assessment were distributed to instructors in time to be included in compiling course grades.

Support course data entered into Banner in fall and early spring of the 2016-2017 plan year (reported in the 2016-17 RISE Annual Report) indicated that these modifications were not having the anticipated effect. Scores on post-instructional assessment in many cases were lower than those on pre-instructional assessment. In cases when students knew ahead of time that testing would be completed in a given class period, absenteeism would be unusually high. While testing was mandatory in all classes, the requirement was typically satisfied by the fact that students took the test, or had taken it in another class that term. This dynamic was complicated by the fact that some support course instructors gave extra credit tied to performance. But although instructors received information regarding their own students' testing, they did not know whether their students were being simultaneously assessed in other classes unless the students self-reported (in which case information confirming their claims could be verified by a query to the RISE Director). The promise of receiving bonus credit for high achievement gave some students incentive to take the same assessment in more than one class during the same term. In cases where no extra credit was offered, scores suggest that students saw insufficient incentive prompting them to exert themselves on the assessment. And, even though reading skills

instruction had been woven into their curricula and had become part of their courses, faculty did not opt to assess reading proficiency for course grades in the same way they assessed mastery of other knowledge or skill. For these reasons, the RISE team concluded that assessments were still not yielding an accurate profile of the impact reading enhancement instruction was having on student reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness.

Assessment data led the RISE team to conclude that, even with modifications in protocol implemented in the 2016-2017 plan year, assessments were not yielding an accurate profile of the plan's impact on student reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness.

While some of the factors in assessment were beyond the team's control, discussions focused on factors within the team's sphere of influence. The team determined that testing fatigue could be in large part responsible for the observed behaviors, especially as they were observed for post-instructional assessment. After discussion, and in consideration of the determination that an interval of more than one semester interposed between instruction and assessment would yield more accurate assessment data, the team agreed to discontinue testing in BIOL 1322 and PSYC 2314, to reduce testing fatigue, clarify the data stream by reducing redundancy, and relieve some of the administrative pressure on the participating faculty. Testing in support courses would be completed only in BIOL 2301 and 2302.

Beginning in Spring 2018, all participating BIOL 2301 faculty will administer the pre-instructional GMRT (Form S) and MARSİ assessments within the first two weeks of the beginning of the semester. Also all participating BIOL 2302 faculty will administer post-instructional GMRT (Form T) and MARSİ assessments within two weeks of the end of the semester. Since students cannot take BIOL 2301 and 2302 in the same semester and since they complete the courses sequentially, at least two semesters will be interposed between pre- and post-instructional testing, allowing time for students to absorb, learn, apply, practice, and receive benefit from enhanced reading skills and metacognitive awareness. Since both Nelson-Denney reading tests and GMRT measure comprehension, vocabulary, and grade-level proficiency, comparison of the pre-instructional assessments in EDUC 1300 and the post-instructional assessments in BIOL 2302 should be revealing.

Pre- and post-instructional testing in EDUC 1300 will continue, with the results of improvement over one semester being compared to improvement over two or more. This comparative review will confirm or disprove the team's conclusion that the interposition of an extended interval between pre- and post-instructional testing will improve proficiency as tested.

Beginning in Spring 2018, within two weeks of the first class day each term, BIOL 2301 faculty will administer all pre-instruction assessment for students in support courses. Within two weeks of the last class day of each term, BIOL 2302 faculty will administer post-instructional assessments. No other RISE assessments will be administered in support courses.

1. Sampling and Data Pool Considerations

For 2017-2018, a total of fifty-eight (58) students were enrolled in the EDUC 1300 sections designated for pre-LVN students. Of those, fifty-seven (57) were assessed using the pre-instructional Nelson-Denney Reading Test. Thirty-two (32) students in control sections completed testing. Forty-four (44) students in the cohort sections completed post-instructional testing, and twenty-seven (27) students in the control sections completed post-instructional testing.

For the same period, a total of twenty-three students in the cohort and support sections were tested using the pre-instructional Gates MacGinitie Reading Test. Forty-three (43) students in cohort and support sections completed post-instructional testing.

No support course data for either cohort or control sections was collected for Fall 2017 because of the impact of the college's post-Harvey contact hour recovery plan. Support course testing was limited to BIOL 2301 and BIOL 2302 courses in spring 2018. No control group data was collected on pre-instructional GMRT assessment in Spring, although the plan identified BIOL 2302-02 as the designated control section for support courses in Spring 2018. Six (6) of the seven (7) students in that section completed the GMRT Form T post-instructional assessment. However, since three of

them either were receiving or had previously received reading enhancement instruction in non-control sections concurrently with or prior to their enrollment in the control section, their assessment data is not true control group data, so only data pertaining to four (4) students is valid control data.

At this point in the plan's implementation calendar, while control group data still may possibly be collectible for students in EDUC 1300 courses, the support course complement has become so saturated with reading enhancement instruction that a true control group is difficult to identify, and in fact many students in EDUC 1300 control sections are simultaneously enrolled in sections receiving reading and metacognitive awareness enhancement. With these data and under these circumstances, in Fall 2018 the RISE team will consider suspension of control group testing for the remainder of the plan's implementation schedule.

Ninety (90) students (up from 45 the previous year) 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 2018 as part of the requirement for applying to the LVN program. Of those, twenty-one (21) students (up from 3 the previous year) 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 second group of students taking the TEAS assessment 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 seven (7) cohort sections of the support courses, the one (1) control section of the support courses, and those completing the TEAS assessment.

2. Analysis of Student Performance Data

The data indicated mixed results. The members of the data analysis team agreed that the same paradigm and codes would be employed for 2017-18 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 MARSII 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 24 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 (included for comparison purposes, but no longer the primary measure of achievement for Goal 1).
- Pre- and post-instructional GMRT Comprehension Grade Level and Total Score (with the change in the plan goal’s contact hour threshold, this assessment becomes the primary ,measure of achievement for Goal 1).

Grade-level reading: total score (Nelson-Denny) for 2017-2018

- 40.7% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 34.1% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 33.3% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 34.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (10.4% decrease)

Grade-level reading: total score (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 40.9% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 30.2% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 43.2% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 33.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Measures for all groups showed significant decreases from the previous year’s scores, but the smallest decrease was in the cohort group (5.9%), less than half the decrease in scores for the control group (12.2%).

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for 2017-2018

- 40.7% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 45.5% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 33.3% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 44.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 40.9% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 33.6% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 54.1% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 38.9% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13

The only increase in reading comprehension level this plan year was for the cohort group, up 7.4% over 2016-2017 levels.

Reading level: total score (Gates-MacGinitie) 2017-18

- 75% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 76.9% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 86.7% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Reading level: total score (Gates-MacGinitie), all years:

- 54.5% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 63.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 77.1% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 75.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Performance trended upwards for all groups. The largest increase was for the control group (19.4%), but the small sample size for the control group (4 students) makes its statistical validity questionable.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2017-18

- 75.0% of the control group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up 12.55 from 2016-2017)
- 92.3% of the cohort group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up 17.3% from 2016-2017)
- 93.3% of support course group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up 9.2% from 2016-2017)
- 93.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up 9.2% from 2016-2017)

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie), all years:

- 66.7% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 88.9% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 84.3% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 84.8% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Performance trended upwards in this category as well, but the largest increase in reading comprehension was in the cohort group, up 17.3%

Grade-level reading level (TEAS): 2017-2018 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Grade-level reading (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (6 of 6)
- 96% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 92.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 2017-2018 TEAS data samples for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Grade-Level Reading (NCLEX): 2017-2018 and historical data

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

Goal 1 was met, as members of the cohort group (having received 24 or more hours' reading enhancement instruction) and testing in support courses using the GMRT post-instructional form did exceed the 70% standard for reading comprehension grade level and total score grade level. In addition, the cohort group outperformed the control group in GMRT post-instructional assessments and outperformed the historical baseline for TEAS testing, with a sample size now large enough to be statistically relevant.

GOAL 2:

70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 24 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.

Applicable Measures:

- Pre- and post-instructional NDRT Comprehension Grade Level and Vocabulary Score (included for comparison purposes, but no longer the primary measure of achievement for Goal 2).
- Pre- and post-instructional GMRT Comprehension Grade Level and Vocabulary Score (with the change in the plan goal's contact hour threshold, this assessment becomes one primary measure of achievement for Goal 2).
- Pre- and post-instructional MARSII assessment (problem-solving mean)

Comprehension Levels

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) 2017-2018 only

- 64.0% of control group showed improvement
- 74.4% of cohort group showed improvement

- 60.0% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 72.9% of all students receiving enhancement instruction showed improvement

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) all years

- 63.9% of control group showed improvement
- 76.7% of cohort group showed improvement
- 68.6% of support course group showed improvement
- 74.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Performance trended downwards slightly in 3 of the 4 groups.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2017-2018

- no new data for control group
- no new data for cohort group
- no new data for support course group
- no new data for any students receiving enhancement instruction

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

Because all GMRT assessment was suspended in Fall 2017 and because of changes to the assessment paradigm approved in Fall 2017 and implemented in Spring 2018, GMRT comparison data is not available for the 2017-2018 plan year. Since GMRT assessments resumed in Spring 2018, comparison data for students from Spring 2017 will be available beginning Fall 2018.

Comprehension level (TEAS) 2017-2018 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (21 of 22)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (66 of 68)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (87 of 90)

Comprehension level (TEAS) all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 96.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 92.6 of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 2017-2018 TEAS data sample for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide a statistically relevant basis for forming conclusions.

Comprehension (NCLEX): 2017-2018 and historical data

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 -- 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 -- 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 -- 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

Fluency

Fluency (Nelson-Denny) 2016-2017

- 64.0% of control group showed improvement
- 61.9% of cohort group showed improvement
- 40.0% of support course group (for this test, a subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 59.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Fluency (Nelson-Denny) all years

- 63.9% of control group showed improvement
- 61.2% of cohort group showed improvement
- 62.9% of support course group (for this test, a subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 61.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

The cohort group was the only group completing the NDRT to show improvement in fluency over scores from the 2016-2017 plan year.

Fluency (Gates-MacGinitie) 2016-2017

- no new data for control group
- no new data for cohort group
- no new data for support course group
- no new data for any students receiving enhancement instruction

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

Because all GMRT assessment was suspended in Fall 2017 and because of changes to the assessment paradigm approved in Fall 2017 and implemented in Spring 2018, GMRT comparison data is not available for the 2017-2018 plan year. Since GMRT assessments resumed in Spring 2018, comparison data for students from Spring 2017 will be available beginning Fall 2018.

Fluency

(TEAS: 2017-2018 only)

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (21 of 22)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (66 of 68)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (87 of 90)

Fluency (TEAS) all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 96.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 92.6 of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 fluency, according to the vendor. In addition, the 2017-2018 TEAS data sample for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide a statistically relevant basis for forming conclusions.

Fluency (NCLEX): 2017-2018 and historical data

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills

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

- no data
- 87.5% of cohort group showed improvement
- no data
- 87.5% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

All years

- 68.8% of control group showed improvement
- 85.2% of cohort group showed improvement
- 52.7% of support course group showed improvement
- 62.1% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

The group of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed a 30.1% improvement over measures from the 2016-2017 plan year.

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

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (21 of 22)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (66 of 68)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (87 of 90)

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (TEAS), all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (6 of 6)
- 96.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 92.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 critical and analytical reading skills, according to the vendor. In addition, the 2017-2018 TEAS data sample for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide a statistically relevant basis for forming conclusions.

Critical / Analytical Reading Skills (NCLEX): 2017-2018 and historical data

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)

- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

Goal 2 and SLO 4 were partially met.

The 70% standard for improvement was met in Nelson-Denny data sets for comprehension and in MARSII 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. Under the current paradigm, with a 24-contact-hour threshold for delivery of reading enhancement instruction, data from the GMRT assessments are now the most apt measures. Temporary lack of comparison data from pre- and post-instructional GMRT assessments for 2017-2018 is a function of the paradigm shift effected in Fall 2017 and implemented in Spring 2018. Comparison data will be available for students from Spring 2018 BIOL 2301 sections beginning in Fall 2018, when those students will undergo post-instructional testing in BIOL 2302.

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.

Applicable Measures:

- Pre- and post-instructional NDRT Comprehension Grade Level and Total Scores (included for comparison purposes, but not the primary measure of achievement for SLO 1).
- Pre- and post-instructional GMRT Comprehension Grade Level and Vocabulary Score (As this outcome applies to students who have completed their course of study, this assessment becomes one primary measure of achievement for SLO 1).
- TEAS (included for purposes of comparison to historical baseline performance)

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for 2017-2018

- 40.7% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 45.5% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 33.3% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 44.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 40.9% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 33.6% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13
- 54.1% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 38.9% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13

The only increase in reading comprehension level this plan year was for the cohort group, up 7.4% over 2016-2017 levels.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2017-2018

- no new data for control group
- no new data for cohort group
- no new data for support course group
- no new data for any students receiving enhancement instruction

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

Because all GMRT assessment was suspended in Fall 2017 and because of changes to the assessment paradigm approved in Fall 2017 and implemented in Spring 2018, GMRT comparison data is not available for the 2017-2018 plan year. Since GMRT assessments resumed in Spring 2018, comparison data for students from Spring 2017 will be available beginning Fall 2018.

Comprehension level (TEAS) 2017-2018 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (21 of 22)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (66 of 68)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (87 of 90)

Comprehension level (TEAS) all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 96.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 92.6 of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 2017-2018 TEAS data sample for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide a statistically relevant basis for forming conclusions.

Comprehension (NCLEX): 2017-2018 and historical data

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

Grade-level reading: total score (Nelson-Denny) for 2017-2018

- 40.7% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 34.1% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 33.3% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 34.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (10.4% decrease)

Grade-level reading: total score (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 40.9% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 30.2% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 43.2% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 33.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Measures for all groups showed significant decreases from the previous year's scores, but the smallest decrease was in the cohort group (5.9%), less than half the decrease in scores for the control group (12.2%).

Grade-Level Reading (Gates-MacGinitie total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels) 2017-18

- 75% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 76.9% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 86.7% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 83.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Grade-Level Reading: total score (Gates-MacGinitie), all years:

- 54.5% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 63.0% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 77.1% of support course group read at grade level 13
- 75.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Performance trended upwards for all groups. The largest increase was for the control group (19.4%), but the small sample size for the control group (4 students) makes its statistical validity questionable.

Grade-level reading level (TEAS): 2017-2018 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (3 of 3)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (35 of 42)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt

Grade-level reading (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (6 of 6)
- 96% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 92.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 2017-2018 TEAS data samples for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Grade-Level Reading (NCLEX): 2017-2018

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

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 2018-2019 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.

Applicable measure:

- Pre- and post-instructional MARSİ assessment (global reading strategies)
- TEAS
- NCLEX

Reading strategy mastery (MARSİ) 2017-2018

- Control group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.20 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.83 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.45 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.55 (of 5)

Reading strategy mastery (MARSİ) all years

- Control group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.57 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.96 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.62 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.70 (of 5)

Student mastery trended slightly downward in all groups, but showed the smallest decrease from previous years among all groups assessed.

Reading strategies (TEAS), 2017-2018

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (5 of 5)
- 95.5% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (21 of 22)
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (66 of 68)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (87 of 90)

Reading strategies (TEAS), all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (6 of 6)
- 96.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (24 of 25)
- 91.8% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (101 of 110)
- 96.7% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135)

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 2017-2018 TEAS data samples for the control group (5 students) was too small to provide statistically relevant information.

Reading strategies (NCLEX): 2017-2018 and historical data

NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (from Texas Board of Nursing, PN (Vocational Nurse))

- Pass rate: Fall 2018 -- 100% (50/50)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, or fluency. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Fall 2018 was the first term RISE students were eligible for the exam.

SLO 2 was met; students in the cohort group met or exceeded a 3.5 on the MARSII (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.

Applicable measure: MARSII overall mean

Self-monitoring, adaptive ability, metacognitive reflection (MARSII), 2017-2018

- Control group: overall mean strategies: 3.33 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.98 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.48 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.61 (of 5)

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

- Control group: overall mean strategies: 3.65 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 4.01 (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: 3.73 (of 5)

Student mastery trended downward in all groups, but the cohort group showed the smallest decrease among all groups assessed.

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

Overview: Despite continuing difficulties with data collection, analyses reveal that the plan is having a significant positive impact on the students involved, and that students in the cohort classes are improving more than those in the control groups and succeeding in their efforts to qualify for a competitive-entry program at levels consistently above the pre-RISE historical baseline. The team will continue to scrutinize the new assessment paradigm. Discussion of these analyses and of the 2017-2018 Annual Report will inform any changes to take place in the 2018-2019 plan year.

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

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

3. Selection of the MARSII 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, at the recommendation of the RISE CIS, in Fall 2015 the team elected to replace the locally developed survey with the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory MARSII, which is in widespread use across the country and offers advantages over the current instrument. The MARSII 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. Participating faculty and RISE team members continue to express satisfaction with the instrument, and its pre- and post-instructional administrations continue to yield useful data.

4. Analysis of Skills Inventory Results

Fewer MARSII data were collected in 2017-2018 than in the previous year. The RISE team's efforts to administer the plan were hampered by problems with data

collection during the 2017-2018 year. Identification of a control group became problematic; logistics of delivery and collection of assessment materials was made inordinately difficult by staff changes, building changes, and schedule changes resulting from implementation of the post-Harvey contact hour recovery protocols. Students and faculty were not able to cooperate as fully as in past semesters. High-level changes in personnel and a voluntary separation initiative further unsettled faculty and students in Spring 2018. Participating faculty were not able to gather as much relevant data as in semesters past. However, the team's assessment of the difficulties and its response to the challenges resulted in enough data being collected to continue to inform decision making and implement plan expansion.

IV. EVALUATE IMPLEMENTATION

A. Expansion of the Plan Cohort

The RISE implementation plan for 2017-2018 called for two (2) sections of EDUC 1300 to be included in the RISE cohort for Fall 2017. EDUC 1300-01 and EDUC 1300-09 were designated in the Fall 2017 course schedule for students declaring a Pre-LVN major. Discussions between the RISE director, the RISE CIS, and the Director of Advising and Counseling reinforced the importance of populating these sections exclusively with Pre-LVN majors. Because of effective communication and meaningful cooperation between the team and the college's Advising, Counseling, and Testing staff, both sections had very healthy enrollment. Two sections were planned for Spring 2018 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.

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 2017-2018 without incident.

Nine (9) instructors received RISE training during a 6-hour session conducted on April 13, 2018 by the RISE CIS. The invitation for training was offered to faculty at the Spring 2018 Convocation and reiterated in messages to all faculty sent in February and March. Participants were faculty in history, criminal justice, English, science, education, and psychology, as well as three members of the Learning Center staff. **Additional training will be offered in 2018-19 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 2017 and proposed as part of the normal procedure for preparing the 2017-18 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 2017	Spring 2018	Summer 2018
Curriculum Specialist	\$1200	\$1200	\$1200
Director	\$4800	\$4800	\$4800

The remuneration for the CIS and for the director were unchanged from that proposed and approved at the plan’s original drafting.

VI. TRAVEL

No travel funds were spent for RISE personnel between September 1, 2017 and Sept, 1, 2018. The travel budget for FY 2018-2019 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 2018. 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 Of 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 persisted. The team agreed 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 enacted the following additional measures:

- The plan goals were 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 was suspended in other support courses.

MARSI administration protocols were also changed to correspond with changes in the testing paradigm. **These changes were implemented in Spring 2018.**

Training in the offering of reading enhancement instruction was completed for faculty across the disciplines, with feedback and written evaluations being universally positive. Elements of the plan will be implemented in their courses in Fall 2018.

The plan's impact will be assessed beginning in Spring 2018 for students in the plan cohort taking the NCLEX.

2. Implementation Protocols

Generally, implementation has been transparent for students and has gone as planned, with the exception of testing issues already noted. As noted in the previous section of this report, changes in the testing paradigm were enacted for 2017-2018 to address issues of testing fatigue impacting student performance. The 2018-2019 Annual Report will analyze the effects of any proposed changes that are approved by the full team in its Fall 2018 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 2017-2018

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 2018

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).

QRCCG: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.43 – 10 of 32 scored 13.0 or higher (31.3%)

QEPE Mean: 9.94 – 15 of 57 scored 13.0 or higher (26.3%)

QEPS Mean: 10.96 – 1 of 5 scored 13.0 or higher (20.0%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.55 – 16 of 62 scored 13.0 or higher (25.8%)

QRCCG: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.50 – 44 of 132 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPE Mean: 9.27 – 29 of 145 scored 13.0 or higher (20.0%)

QEPS Mean: 10.70 – 14 of 55 scored 13.0 or higher (25.5%)

QEPZ Mean: 9.79 – 43 of 200 scored 13.0 or higher (21.5%)

QRRTG: QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.41 – 12 of 32 scored 13.0 or higher (37.5%)

QEPE Mean: 10.70 – 14 of 57 scored 13.0 or higher (24.6%)

QEPS Mean: 11.15 – 1 of 5 scored 13.0 or higher (20.0%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.98 – 15 of 62 scored 13.0 or higher (24.2%)

QRRTG: QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.47 – 47 of 132 scored 13.0 or higher (35.6%)

QEPE Mean: 9.73 – 31 of 145 scored 13.0 or higher (21.4%)

QEPS Mean: 10.80 – 17 of 55 scored 13.0 or higher (30.9%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.12 – 48 of 200 scored 13.0 or higher (24.0%)

QOCCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.16 – 11 of 27 scored 13.0 or higher (40.7%)

QEPE Mean: 11.38 – 20 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (45.5%)

QEPS Mean: 12.06 – 2 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.75 – 22 of 50 scored 13.0 or higher (44.0%)

QOCCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.80 – 36 of 88 scored 13.0 or higher (40.9%)

QEPE Mean: 10.85 – 36 of 107 scored 13.0 or higher (33.6%)

QEPS Mean: 12.16 – 20 of 37 scored 13.0 or higher (54.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.29 – 56 of 144 scored 13.0 or higher (38.9%)

Goal #1 continues on the next page

Pre-test data in italics

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.56 – 11 of 27 scored 13.0 or higher (40.7%)

QEPE Mean: 11.31 – 15 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (34.1%)

QEPS Mean: 11.75 – 2 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.55 – 17 of 50 scored 13.0 or higher (34.0%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.84 – 36 of 88 scored 13.0 or higher (40.9%)

QEPE Mean: 10.84 – 32 of 106 scored 13.0 or higher (30.2%)

QEPS Mean: 11.71 – 16 of 37 scored 13.0 or higher (43.2%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.13 – 48 of 143 scored 13.0 or higher (33.6%)

QSCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.94 – no new data

QEPE Mean: 12.71 – 3 of 3 scored 13 (100.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.51 – 17 of 19 scored 13 (89.5%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.52 – 20 of 22 scored 13 (90.9%)

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 – 26 of 29 scored 13 (89.7%)

QEPS Mean: 12.56 – 299 of 342 scored 13 (87.4%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.57 – 327 of 371 scored 13 (88.1%)

QSTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.50 – no new data

QEPE Mean: 12.37 – 3 of 3 scored 13 (100.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.45 – 14 of 14 scored 13 (100.0%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.44 – 17 of 17 scored 13 (100.0%)

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 – 23 of 29 scored 13 (79.3%)
QEPS Mean: 12.45 – 286 of 340 scored 13 (84.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.43 – 309 of 369 scored 13 (83.7%)

Goal #1 continues on the next page

Pre-test data in italics

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.78 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.43 – 12 of 13 scored 13 (92.3%)
QEPS Mean: 12.47 – 28 of 30 scored 13 (93.3%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.47 – 40 of 43 scored 13 (93.0%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.52 – 14 of 21 scored 13 (66.7%)
QEPE Mean: 12.27 – 24 of 27 scored 13 (88.9%)
QEPS Mean: 12.34 – 188 of 223 scored 13 (84.3%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.34 – 212 of 250 scored 13 (84.8%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.46 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)
QEPE Mean: 11.90 – 10 of 13 scored 13 (76.9%)
QEPS Mean: 12.19 – 26 of 30 scored 13 (86.7%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.18 – 36 of 43 scored 13 (83.7%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.19 – 12 of 22 scored 13 (54.5%)
QEPE Mean: 11.65 – 17 of 27 scored 13 (63.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.14 – 172 of 223 scored 13 (77.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.11 – 189 of 250 scored 13 (75.6%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)

QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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 (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 39.8 (32 participants)

QEPE Mean: 37.8 (57 participants)

QEPS Mean: 40.4 (5 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 38.0 (62 participants)

QOCR: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 46.2 (27 participants)

QEPE Mean: 47.6 (44 participants)

QEPS Mean: 40.8 (6 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 46.8 (50 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 25 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 16 showed improvement (64.0%). QEPE Group had 43 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 32 showed improvement (74.4%). QEPS group had 5 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 3 showed improvement (60.0%). QEPZ

Group had 48 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these 35 showed improvement (72.9%).

Pre-test data in italics

QRCR: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 42.7 (132 participants)

QEPE Mean: 36.4 (144 participants)

QEPS Mean: 40.9 (56 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 37.6 (200 participants)

QOCR: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 47.0 (88 participants)

QEPE Mean: 45.2 (107 participants)

QEPS Mean: 46.6 (37 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 45.6 (144 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 83 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 53 showed improvement (63.9%). QEPE Group had 103 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 79 showed improvement (76.7%). QEPS Group had 35 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 24 showed improvement (68.6%). QEPZ Group had 138 participants who completed both QRCR to QOCR. Of these, 103 showed improvement (74.6%).

QSCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: no new data

QEPE Mean: 39.7 (3 participants)

QEPS Mean: 34.8 (20 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 35.4 (23 participants)

QTCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 33.0 (4 participants)

QEPE Mean: 34.6 (13 participants)

QEPS Mean: 37.8 (30 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 36.8 (43 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. QEPE Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. QEPS Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. QEPZ Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QOCR. {NOTE: The data seems to suggest that no course sections completed BOTH Form S and Form T of the Gates MacGinitie test in 2017-2018}

Pre-test data in italics

Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (A) Comprehension continues on the next page.

QSCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 32.6 (24 participants)
QEPE Mean: 34.8 (29 participants)
QEPS Mean: 35.9 (345 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 35.9 (374 participants)

QTCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 30.9 (21 participants)
QEPE Mean: 32.9 (27 participants)
QEPS Mean: 35.4 (226 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 35.1 (253 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) (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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%)

QEPN: QEP NCLEX (Pass/Fail) (since plan implementation)

Pass rate: 2017-2018 -- 100% (first year RISE students eligible)
Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83%
Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39%
Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24%

(B) Fluency

QRVR: QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 42.7 (32 participants)

QEPE Mean: 39.2 (56 participants)

QEPS Mean: 37.2 (5 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 39.0 (61 participants)

QOVR: QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 44.9 (27 participants)

QEPE Mean: 43.9 (44 participants)

QEPS Mean: 37.5 (6 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 43.1 (50 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 25 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 16 showed improvement (64.0%). QEPE Group had 42 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 26 showed improvement (61.9%). QEPS group had 5 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 2 showed improvement (40.0%). QEPZ Group had 47 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 28 showed improvement (59.6%).

QRVR: QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 43.2 (132 participants)

QEPE Mean: 38.0 (144 participants)

QEPS Mean: 41.1 (55 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 38.8 (199 participants)

QOVR: QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 45.2 (88 participants)

QEPE Mean: 42.1 (107 participants)

QEPS Mean: 42.8 (37 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 42.3 (144 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 83 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 53 showed improvement (63.9%). QEPE Group had 103 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 63 showed improvement (61.2%). QEPS group had 35 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 22 showed improvement (62.9%).

QEPZ Group had 138 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 85 showed improvement (61.6%).

Pre-test data in italics

Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (B) Fluency continues on the next page.

QSVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: no new data

QEPE Mean: 26.3 (3 participants)

QEPS Mean: 30.1 (19 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 29.6 (22 participants)

QTVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 29.8 (4 participants)

QEPE Mean: 30.2 (12 participants)

QEPS Mean: 32.0 (29 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 31.5 (41 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. QEPE Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. QEPS Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. QEPZ Group had 0 participants who completed both QSCR and QOCR. {NOTE: The data seems to suggest that no course sections completed BOTH Form S and Form T of the Gates MacGinitie test in 2017-2018}

QSVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 28.3 (26 participants)

QEPE Mean: 26.8 (28 participants)

QEPS Mean: 30.8 (347 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 30.5 (375 participants)

QTVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score (all years)

QEPC Mean: 28.4 (22 participants)

QEPE Mean: 28.1 (26 participants)

QEPS Mean: 31.2 (224 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 30.9 (250 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 continues on the next page.

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2017-2018 only)
QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)
QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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 MARSİ problem-solving mean (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.80 (1 participant)
QEPE Mean: 3.79 (55 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.74 (15 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.78 (70 participants)

QOMP: Post-instructional MARSİ problem-solving mean (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 4.00 (4 participants)
QEPE Mean: 4.62 (11 participants)
QEPS Mean: 4.05 (30 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 4.20 (41 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 0 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. QEPE Group had 8 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 7 showed improvement (87.5%). QEPS Group had 0 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. QEPZ Group had 8 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 7 showed improvement (87.5%).

Pre-test data in italics

Goal #2 / Student Learning Outcome #4 Part (C) Critical and Analytical Reading Skills continues on the next page.

QRMP: Pre-instructional MARSII problem-solving mean (all years)

QEPC Mean: 3.98 (36 participants)

QEPE Mean: 3.87 (132 participants)

QEPS Mean: 3.96 (265 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 3.93 (397 participants)

QOMP: Post-instructional MARSII problem-solving mean (all years)

QEPC Mean: 4.08 (21 participants)

QEPE Mean: 4.40 (66 participants)

QEPS Mean: 4.08 (228 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 4.15 (294 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 16 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 11 showed improvement (68.8%). QEPE Group had 61 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 52 showed improvement (85.2%). QEPS Group had 150 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 79 showed improvement (52.7%). QEPZ Group had 211 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 131 showed improvement (62.1%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)

QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)

QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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

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.

QOCCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.16 – 11 of 27 scored 13.0 or higher (40.7%)

QEPE Mean: 11.38 – 20 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (45.5%)

QEPS Mean: 12.06 – 2 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.75 – 22 of 50 scored 13.0 or higher (44.0%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.56 – 11 of 27 scored 13.0 or higher (40.7%)

QEPE Mean: 11.31 – 15 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (34.1%)

QEPS Mean: 11.75 – 2 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.55 – 17 of 50 scored 13.0 or higher (34.0%)

QOCCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.80 – 36 of 88 scored 13.0 or higher (40.9%)

QEPE Mean: 10.85 – 36 of 107 scored 13.0 or higher (33.6%)

QEPS Mean: 12.16 – 20 of 37 scored 13.0 or higher (54.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.29 – 56 of 144 scored 13.0 or higher (38.9%)

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%)

QTCCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.78 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)

QEPE Mean: 12.43 – 12 of 13 scored 13 (92.3%)

QEPS Mean: 12.47 – 28 of 30 scored 13 (93.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.47 – 40 of 43 scored 13 (93.0%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 11.46 – 3 of 4 scored 13 (75.0%)

QEPE Mean: 11.90 – 10 of 13 scored 13 (76.9%)

QEPS Mean: 12.19 – 26 of 30 scored 13 (86.7%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.18 – 36 of 43 scored 13 (83.7%)

QTCCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.52 – 14 of 21 scored 13 (66.7%)

QEPE Mean: 12.27 – 24 of 27 scored 13 (88.9%)

QEPS Mean: 12.34 – 188 of 223 scored 13 (84.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.34 – 212 of 250 scored 13 (84.8%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.19 – 12 of 22 scored 13 (54.5%)

QEPE Mean: 11.65 – 17 of 27 scored 13 (63.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.14 – 172 of 223 scored 13 (77.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.11 – 189 of 250 scored 13 (75.6%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)

QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)

QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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 MARSİ global strategies mean (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.20 (4 participants)

QEPE Mean: 3.83 (10 participants)

QEPS Mean: 3.45 (30 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 3.55 (40 participants)

QOMG: Post-instructional MARSİ global strategies mean (all years)

QEPC Mean: 3.57 (21 participants)

QEPE Mean: 3.96 (65 participants)

QEPS Mean: 3.62 (230 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 3.70 (295 participants)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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 MARSII overall mean (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.33 (4 participants)
QEPE Mean: 3.98 (11 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.48 (30 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.61 (41 participants)

QOMO: Post-instructional MARSII overall mean (all years)

QEPC Mean: 3.65 (21 participants)
QEPE Mean: 4.01 (66 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.65 (228 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.73 (294 participants)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2017-2018 only)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 21 of 22 scored 50.0 or higher (95.5%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 66 of 68 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 87 of 90 scored 50.0 or higher (96.7%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 74.5 – 6 of 6 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 62.4 – 24 of 25 scored 50.0 or higher (96.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.3 – 101 of 110 scored 50.0 or higher (91.8%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.0 – 125 of 135 scored 50.0 or higher (92.6%)

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 2017

EDUC 1300-01 (90141) Sellers
 EDUC 1300-09 (90149) Babcock

Control:

EDUC 1300-08 Moreau (90148)

Red print indicates no reading enhancement instruction is integrated in that course's curriculum

RISE cohort sections: Spring 2018

EDUC 1300-02 Babcock (10122) 9

Control:

EDUC 1300-03 Moreau (10123) 21

Support courses where testing will be conducted:

BIOL 2301-01 Wilmore (10018) 17

BIOL 2301-02 Sanford (10019) 21

BIOL 2301-03 Wilmore (10020) 17

BIOL 2301-04 Song (10021) 23

BIOL 2302-01 Wilmore (10030) 28

BIOL 2302-03 Sanford (10032) 27

BIOL 2302-04 Wilmore (10033) 19

Control:

BIOL 2302-02 Wilmore (10031) 6

Support courses delivering reading enhancement instruction (no testing in green): Spring 2018

BIOL 1322-01 Sanford (10007)

BIOL 1322-02 Sanford (10008)

BIOL 1322-03 Sanford (10009)

BIOL 2301-02 Sanford (10019)

BIOL 2301-04 Song (10021)

BIOL 2301-04 Song (10021)

BIOL 2302-03 Sanford (10032)

PSYC 2314-02 Hodges (10255)

PSYC 2314-03 Hodges (10256)

PSYC 2314-04 Hodges (10257)