

RISE:
Reading Is Simply Everything

**The Quality Enhancement Plan
For Lamar State College – Orange**

2015-2016 Annual Report

Table of Contents

2015-16 Annual Report

Appendix A: Executive Summary

Appendix B: Gates-Macginitie Reading Test (GMRT: Overview)

**Appendix C: RISE Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Data Summary
2015-16**

Cohort and Control Testing Information

QEP Data Storage in Internet Native Banner

RISE Notes on Data Input Process

RISE Data Retrieval Request for Plan Implementation Year 1:

Summer, 2016

QEP Data Analysis Summer 2016

Appendix D: Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

(MARSI)

Survey (Blank Copy)

Scoring Rubric

Tips on Administering the MARSI

Appendix E: Budget Worksheet

RISE: Reading Is Simply Everything
The Quality Enhancement Plan for Lamar State College-Orange
Second Annual Report
2015-2016

I. Review of plan goals and learning outcomes:

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

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.

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 four nationally normed instruments—the Nelson-Denny Reading Test, the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test, the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS), and the National Counsel Licensure Exam (NCLEX)—as well as a pre-and post-instructional administration of the Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI).

See Appendix C for details about the MARSI.

The RISE team determined that no change in the Student Learning Outcomes is necessary. It further agreed that no change was necessary in the 70% benchmark in the goals for this first full year of implementation. However, as a result of preliminary data analysis, the RISE team is considering raising the threshold of the number of hours of enhancement instruction indicated in the goals from 20 contact hours to 22 contact hours. Further discussion of this possible change will be developed in the next section of this report.

II. Collection, management, interpretation and analysis of data:

The QEP Director is responsible for coordinating the plan's implementation and assessment activities, managing data collection, analysis and interpretation, facilitating communication within and between constituencies, and related duties as required. Beginning in October 2015 and continuing until February 2016, the college's Vice President of Academic Affairs, the Computer Center Director, a Banner expert on the Computer Center staff, the Registrar, and the RISE director collaborated to create location in the Banner database and devise an extraction plan that would facilitate storage and management of assessment data collected during the 2015-16 academic year, and wrote a series of codes to enable 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.

For additional details, please refer to Appendix B.

A. Pre-, post-test results: interpretation and analysis

The RISE team's Curriculum and Instructional Design Specialist (CIS) has noted in the past that the Nelson-Denny test is not popular among reading specialists, in part because of the time constraints built into the administration of the test. However, the CIS herself does not share this view. After discussion, the RISE team agreed to continue using the Nelson-Denny Reading Test as an assessment measure in EDUC 1300. The following considerations informed this decision:

- the other assessment instruments the plan will eventually employ also involve time constraints
- the instrument used to determine entry into the Vocation Nursing Program involves time constraints
- the instrument used to determine licensure eligibility also involves time constraints

Since the purpose of the plan is ultimately to increase student success by increasing the number of students qualifying for the program and for licensure, the team determined that the timed testing that students in the cohort would undergo as part of RISE data collection would also give those students additional practice at testing time- and self-management, thus having a beneficial impact on their ultimate success. Given these considerations, and in light of the practical reasons for choosing the Nelson-Denny initially (the low cost, the availability of baseline data, the institution's familiarity with administering and

interpreting the results, and the availability of national norming data), the team chose to retain the Nelson-Denny as one of the plan's assessment measures.

This second year of the plan's implementation also called for expanding the list of courses that include reading enhancement instruction. Training in curriculum redesign and reading enhancement instruction was provided in Summer and Fall 2015 to instructors in co-requisite courses supporting the LVN program instructors. Those support courses include BIOL 1322, BIOL 2301, BIOL 2302, and PSYC 2314. Provisions of the plan accepted by SACSCOC call for pre-and post-instructional testing in these courses as well. The RISE CIS and the LSC-O Testing Center Director reviewed various testing options and narrowed the list to three, from which the 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.

1. Possible small cohort impact (addressed from considerations raised in 2015 Annual Report)

The Nelson-Denny Reading Test (NDRT) and the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (GMRT) yield data that will directly address outcomes one and four, and the pre-and post-test assessment strategy will yield data regarding the performance and progress of the students tested. The Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory (MARSI) will address outcomes two and three. In the pilot semester for which the 2015 Annual Report detailed results, only eight (8) Pre-LVN students began the semester enrolled in the section of EDUC designated for the plan cohort, and of those, only four (4) students belonging to the plan cohort completed the semester and earned scores for both the pre- and post-instructional administration of the Nelson-Denny test, thus leading the data analysis subcommittee to find that the test results for the pilot semester were inconclusive.

In Fall 2015, two (2) sections of EDUC 1300 Learning Frameworks were added to the cohort and one section added as a control group, with Nelson-Denny and MARSI results for each. A total of 39 students were tested and inventoried.

In Spring 2016, two more (2) sections of EDUC 1300 Learning Frameworks were added to the cohort and one more added as a control group, with a total of 28 students being tested. In addition, 8 sections of support courses and one section as a control group were added to the cohort as required by the approved plan, each delivering 2 hours of reading enhancement instruction. A total of 144 students were tested using the Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (see II.A. above) and 109 students inventoried (two sections did not complete inventories).

The RISE team determined that the number of students tested and inventoried was sufficient to provide data for a statistically relevant analysis.

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 eight (8) cohort sections of the support courses, and the two (2) control sections of the support courses.

2. Analysis of student performance data

The data indicated mixed results. At the July meeting, the members of the data analysis team met to identify which data would best address each of the plan's goals and outcomes. A Banner report was prepared using the test codes correlating to the data needed and extracted into a spreadsheet. The spreadsheet distinguished between cohort and control groups, with two 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 the analysis by goal and outcome are listed below:

Goal 1:

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

GOAL 1: Reading level (Nelson-Denny)

- 36.4% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 21% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 33% of support course group read at grade level 13 (for those who took this test, a small subset of the control group)
- 23% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

GOAL 1: Reading Level (Gates-Macginitie)

- 44.4% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 40% of the cohort group read at grade level 13
- 80% of support course group read at grade level 13

- 69% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13

Goal 1 was not met.

Goal 2:

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

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 4:

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

GOAL 2: SLO 4: Comprehension (Nelson-Denny)

- 61% of control group showed improvement
- 78% of cohort group showed improvement
- 67% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 76% of all students receiving enhancement instruction showed improvement

GOAL 2, SLO 4: Comprehension (Gates-Macginitie)

- 22% of control group showed improvement
- 33% of cohort group showed improvement
- 28% of support course group showed improvement
- 29% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

GOAL 2, SLO 4: Fluency (Nelson-Denny)

- 63% of control group showed improvement
- 63% of cohort group showed improvement
- 83% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) showed improvement
- 65% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

GOAL 2, SLO 4: Fluency (Gates-Macginitie)

- 44% of control group showed improvement
- 33% of cohort group showed improvement
- 44% of support course group showed improvement
- 43% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Goal 2 and SLO 4 were met as written.

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.

SLO 1: Grade Level Comprehension (Nelson Denny)

- 39% of control group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 19% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 50% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 23% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

SLO 1: Grade Level Reading (Nelson Denny total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels)

- 36% of control group demonstrated college-level overall reading ability
- 21% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 33% of support course group (for this test, a small subset of the control group) demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 23% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

SLO 1: Grade Level Comprehension (Gates-Macginitie)

- 67% of control group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 90% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 80% of support course group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 82% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

SLO 1: Grade Level Reading (Gates-Macginitie total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels)

- 44% of control group demonstrated college-level overall reading ability
- 40% of cohort group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 74% of support course group demonstrated college-level reading comprehension
- 69% of students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction demonstrated college-level reading comprehension

SLO 1 was on pace to be partially met, but as written the SLO applies to students who have finished their course of study. Therefore the TEAS test will be the instrument to measure this outcome.

These analyses suggest that the plan is having a positive impact and that students in the cohort classes are improving more than those in the control groups. However, the plan is still falling short of some of its goals and failing to deliver on some of its student learning outcomes. See section VII for further discussion. Additional discussion of the annual report will provide a forum for possible change.

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

B. Pre-, post-survey results: interpretation and analysis

1. Selection of the MARSII to replace the survey originally employed

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

The 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).

See Appendix C for more details about the MARSI.

2. Analysis of survey results

The plan calls for pre- and post-instructional surveys of both the plan cohort and control sections of EDUC 1300 and for cohort and control sections of support courses serving as pre- and co-requisites taken by students seeking admission to the Licensed Vocational Nursing (LVN) program, using an instrument recommended by the CIS and approved by the RISE team. For Fall 2015 and Spring 2016, this instrument was the MARSI (see item II.A.2 above). The following synopsis was submitted by the RISE CIS.

Goal 2:

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

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 4:

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

GOAL 2, SLO 4: Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (MARSI)

- 75% of control group showed improvement
- 82% of cohort group showed improvement
- 53% of support course group showed improvement
- 68% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction showed improvement

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 2:

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

SLO 2: Reading strategy mastery (MARSI)

- Control group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.46 (of 5)

- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.98 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.55 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.71 (of 5)

Student Learning Outcome (SLO) 3:

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

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

- Control group: overall mean strategies: 3.56 (of 5)
- Cohort group: mean for global reading strategies: 4.01 (of 5)
- Support course group: mean for global reading strategies: 3.61 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies: 3.76 (of 5)

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

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

III. Evaluate Implementation

A. Expansion of the plan cohort

The RISE implementation plan for 2015-16 called for two (2) sections of EDUC 1300 to be included in the RISE cohort for Fall 2015. EDUC 1300-08 and EDUC 1300-14 were designated in the Fall 2015 course schedule for students declaring a Pre-LVN major, and the importance of populating these sections exclusively with Pre-LVN majors was discussed with Advising, Counseling, and Testing personnel. In addition, the CIS and the Program Director for the Vocational Nursing Program discussed the plan with Pre-LVN students at the July 29, 2015 student orientation session. Enrollment in the designated sections was healthy, with 15 students registered for EDUC 1300-08 and 18 students registered for EDUC 1300-14. EDUC 1300-01 and EDUC 1300-11 were designated as control sections.

For Spring 2016, the plan called for the designation of two more sections of EDUC 1300 (sections 02 and 04) to be added to the cohort and one section of EDUC 1300 to be added as a control (section 11). The plan also called for an expansion to include pre- and co-requisite courses supporting the LVN program. Sections in which these modifications were incorporated included BIOL 1322-02, BIOL 1322-03, BIOL 2301-02, BIOL 2301-04, BIOL 2302-01, BIOL 2302-03, PSYC 2314-01, and PSYC 2314-04. BIOL 1322-01 served as the control.

One EDUC 1300 faculty member received training in implementing the compacted and enhanced curriculum and methodology, along with four instructors for Pre-LVN support courses (see section II. B below). Training was delivered during a 6-hour session conducted on July 21, 2015. Follow-up training was completed in a two-hour session following convocation on August 20, 2015. Additional training was completed on November 6, 2016 from 9-12:30 and November 13 from 2:00-4:00 PM for instructors who volunteered to implement reading enhancement instruction in PSYC 2314. The training was completed on schedule and evaluations were emailed following, but only one trainee responded.

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 scheduled to be implemented in Spring 2016, with curriculum compaction and training to precede implementation. A total of eight (8) sections were chosen to pilot reading instruction enhancement, as the team 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).

IV. 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 2015 and proposed as part of the normal procedure for preparing the 2015-16 budget. Those budgets were approved. Likewise, projected costs for purchasing or preparing assessments and for data management for 2016-17 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.

B. Remuneration

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

Position	fall 2016	Spring 2016	Summer 2016
Curriculum Specialist	\$2400	\$2400	\$2400
Director	\$4800	\$4800	\$4800

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

V. Travel

No travel funds were spent for RISE personnel between September 1, 2015 and Sept, 1, 2016. The travel budget for FY 2015-16 is \$1500, to cover ongoing training in reading instruction and curriculum design.

VI. Evaluate Leadership, Administrative Structure

No changes to the administrative leadership or its structure are scheduled at this time, but annual reviews will drive any future decisions.

VII. 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.

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 had no bearing on their course grades) did not have a strong incentive to perform optimally on the post-instructional RISE testing. Instructors reported that many did not exert themselves on the post-instructional assessment, with faculty in fact noting that **some students finished the 75-minute test in a very few minutes, seeming to mark answers at random.** This is consistent with the fact noted above that **post-instructional test scores for many students were lower than pre-instructional test scores.**

Use of Results

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

1: 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. This should avoid producing testing fatigue and allow time for tests to be graded and scores to be returned to instructors;

2: 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 will be incorporated into the plan's implementation for 2016-17.

The Director's intention to discuss revision of the plan's goals and outcome statements was addressed in Part I of this report. Further details will not be included in the 2015-16 Annual Report, however, as they will more properly be represented and delineated in the 2016-17 RISE Annual Report.

Training was conducted in July for nursing instructors who will be implementing reading enhancement instruction in their courses in Spring 2017, but since their training was conducted after the 2015-16 year for which this report is prepared, it will be addressed more fully in the 2017-17 Annual Report. However, feedback and written evaluations being universally positive, no significant changes are expected.

2. Implementation Protocols

Generally, implementation was transparent for students and went as planned, with the exception of testing issues already noted.

In Fall 2016, the team considered rebranding the plan and conducting an internal marketing campaign, but the measure was dropped for lack of interest on the part of the team members.

B. Consultants

As data suggests that the plan is meeting some goals and partially meeting others, no use of consultants is deemed necessary at this time.

C. Peer Review

The RISE CIS has consistently uses her network of peer consultants to evaluate the plan's elements, processes, and/or protocols. However, for the same reason that consultants are not deemed necessary, formal peer review is not deemed necessary and is not envisioned at this time.

APPENDIX A: EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Lamar State College-Orange Quality Enhancement Plan: *RISE (Reading Is Simply Everything)*

QEP Director: Andrew B. Preslar (Andy.Preslar@lsco.edu)

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

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

Goals:

- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend college-level texts. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will read at college level, grade thirteen (13).
- 70% of students completing the plan's curriculum and receiving at least 20 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate an increase in the proficiency of comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college level texts and materials. More simply stated, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

Student Learning 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.

Appendix B: Gates–MacGinitie Reading Test (Overview)

Purpose

The Gates–MacGinitie Reading Test is designed to provide general assessment of reading achievement. It enables teachers and schools to measure the reading levels of students throughout their school careers. It is beneficial to community colleges to be knowledgeable about the level of their students' reading skills. This data can be a basis for the following:

- to compare the reading skills of job applicants and trainees with the reading requirements of college courses,
- to choose individuals that would benefit from developmental reading instruction at the college level,
- to select reading materials and plan for instruction in developmental reading programs,
- to work with individuals and groups to improve reading skills,
- to evaluate the effect of developmental instructional programs.

Benefits

- The GMRT is a nationally used diagnostic tool to determine students' levels of reading achievement and is developmentally appropriate.
- The AR (adult reading) assessment is designed for use by colleges, community colleges, adult education programs, GED programs, vocational and training schools, and other post-high school educational programs.
- A variety of testing needs are met which include screening, diagnosis, outcome planning, and progress monitoring.
- It includes alternate forms (S and T) for pre and post testing.
- It helps to identify students that might need additional diagnosis for special instruction.
- It measures comprehension stages from listening to mature reading comprehension.
- On-line reports available include student population analysis and the ability for disaggregation of data.

Who May Be Screened

- Pre-reading (grades K.7-1.4)
 - Beginning reading (grades 1.0 – 1.9)
 - Reading (grades 1 – 12)
 - AR (adult reading)
-

Test Content for Adult Reading

- A vocabulary assessment measures an individual's reading vocabulary and contains 45 questions. It tests word knowledge with a wide range of difficulty. The task involves choosing a word or phrase that means most nearly the same as the test word.
- A comprehension assessment of 48 questions measure an individual's ability to read and understand different types of prose. There are 11 passages about various subjects selected from published books and periodicals.

Testing Options and Answer Formats

- The testing can be given on-line or with pencil-paper.
- Re-usable testing booklets can be used.
- Answer formats include using a GMRT answer sheet that can be sent to Riverside Publishing for scoring, answer sheets that can be scanned locally, and the use of transparent scoring templates to score by hand. A self-scoring answer sheet and a test booklet scoring key may also be used.

Scoring

- Raw scores for the GMRT are converted to derived scores.
- Derived scores include status scores of National Percentile Rank (NPR), Normal Curve Equivalent (NCE), National Stanine (NS), and growth scores of an Extended Scale Score (ESS) and Grade Equivalent (GE).

Available Reports

- Group profiles
- Student labels
- A longitudinal report
- Group population display
- Student roster report

Norms

The 1999 and 2006 norms for Level AR are based on samples of students enrolled in junior and community colleges. Included are the 2006 tables of norms for forms S and T that are used for our testing.

Level AR, Form S

2006 EOBMS

Vocabulary

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
0	1	1	1	1.4	382
1	1	1	1	1.6	395
2	1	1	1	1.9	406
3	1	1	1	2.1	417
4	1	1	1	2.3	427
5	1	1	1	2.5	436
6	1	1	1	2.7	445
7	1	1	1	3.0	453
8	1	1	1	3.3	461
9	1	1	1	3.6	468
10	1	1	1	3.9	475
11	7	2	1	4.3	482
12	13	4	2	4.6	489
13	15	5	2	4.9	495
14	17	6	2	5.2	500
15	20	8	2	5.8	507
16	23	10	2	6.1	512
17	26	13	3	6.6	518
18	29	16	3	7.0	523
19	32	19	3	7.5	528
20	34	23	4	8.1	534
21	36	26	4	8.6	538
22	39	30	4	9.1	542
23	42	35	4	9.9	547
24	46	42	5	11.2	553
25	48	47	5	12.2	557
26	52	53	5	PHS	562
27	55	59	5	PHS	567
28	58	65	6	PHS	572
29	61	70	6	PHS	577
30	64	75	6	PHS	582
31	68	80	7	PHS	588
32	71	84	7	PHS	593
33	74	87	7	PHS	598
34	77	90	8	PHS	604
35	80	92	8	PHS	610
36	83	94	8	PHS	616
37	85	95	8	PHS	622
38	90	97	9	PHS	628
39	90	97	9	PHS	634
40	93	98	9	PHS	641
41	99	99	9	PHS	647
42	99	99	9	PHS	654
43	99	99	9	PHS	663
44	99	99	9	PHS	672
45	99	99	9	PHS	681

Comprehension

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
0	1	1	1	1.8	400
1	1	1	1	2.1	417
2	1	1	1	2.3	429
3	1	1	1	2.6	442
4	1	1	1	2.9	452
5	1	1	1	3.2	460
6	1	1	1	3.5	468
7	1	1	1	3.8	476
8	1	1	1	4.1	482
9	1	1	1	4.4	488
10	1	1	1	4.7	494
11	1	1	1	5.1	499
12	1	1	1	5.5	505
13	1	1	1	5.9	511
14	7	2	1	6.3	516
15	10	3	1	6.6	520
16	13	4	2	7.0	524
17	15	5	2	7.4	528
18	19	7	2	7.9	533
19	20	8	2	8.2	536
20	24	11	3	8.8	541
21	26	13	3	9.2	544
22	28	15	3	9.6	547
23	31	18	3	10.1	551
24	34	22	3	10.7	555
25	36	25	4	11.4	559
26	38	29	4	11.9	562
27	41	33	4	12.4	565
28	43	37	4	PHS	569
29	46	42	5	PHS	573
30	48	46	5	PHS	576
31	51	52	5	PHS	580
32	54	58	5	PHS	585
33	56	62	6	PHS	588
34	60	68	6	PHS	593
35	64	74	6	PHS	598
36	67	79	7	PHS	603
37	70	83	7	PHS	608
38	75	88	7	PHS	614
39	78	91	8	PHS	621
40	83	94	8	PHS	628
41	87	96	9	PHS	634
42	90	97	9	PHS	642
43	93	98	9	PHS	650
44	99	99	9	PHS	658
45	99	99	9	PHS	665
46	99	99	9	PHS	673
47	99	99	9	PHS	681
48	99	99	9	PHS	689

Total

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
0	1	1	1	1.5	368
1	1	1	1	1.7	390
2	1	1	1	1.9	405
3	1	1	1	2.1	416
4	1	1	1	2.2	424
5	1	1	1	2.3	429
6	1	1	1	2.5	434
7	1	1	1	2.6	440
8	1	1	1	2.7	444
9	1	1	1	2.8	448
10	1	1	1	2.9	452
11	1	1	1	3.1	456
12	1	1	1	3.2	459
13	1	1	1	3.4	463
14	1	1	1	3.5	466
15	1	1	1	3.6	469
16	1	1	1	3.7	472
17	1	1	1	3.8	475
18	1	1	1	4.0	478
19	1	1	1	4.1	481
20	1	1	1	4.2	483
21	1	1	1	4.4	486
22	1	1	1	4.5	489
23	1	1	1	4.6	491
24	1	1	1	4.8	494
25	1	1	1	5.1	497
26	1	1	1	5.2	499
27	1	1	1	5.3	501
28	1	1	1	5.5	504
29	7	2	1	5.6	506
30	7	2	1	5.8	509
31	7	2	1	6.0	511
32	10	3	1	6.2	514
33	13	4	2	6.4	516
34	13	4	2	6.6	519
35	15	5	2	6.8	521
36	17	6	2	7.0	524
37	19	7	2	7.2	526
38	22	9	2	7.5	529
39	23	10	2	7.7	531
40	24	11	3	7.9	533
41	25	12	3	8.2	535
42	28	15	3	8.5	538
43	29	16	3	8.7	540
44	31	18	3	8.9	542
45	33	21	3	9.2	544
46	35	24	4	9.7	547
47	36	26	4	10.0	549
48	38	28	4	10.3	551
49	39	30	4	10.6	553

Level AR, Form S

Total

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
50	41	33	4	11.0	555
51	43	37	4	11.7	558
52	45	40	5	12.2	560
53	46	42	5	12.7	562
54	48	46	5	PHS	564
55	50	50	5	PHS	567
56	51	52	5	PHS	568
57	53	56	5	PHS	571
58	55	59	5	PHS	573
59	56	61	6	PHS	575
60	59	66	6	PHS	578
61	60	68	6	PHS	580
62	62	71	6	PHS	582
63	64	74	6	PHS	585
64	66	77	7	PHS	588
65	67	79	7	PHS	590
66	69	82	7	PHS	593
67	71	84	7	PHS	596
68	73	86	7	PHS	599
69	75	88	7	PHS	602
70	78	91	8	PHS	606
71	80	92	8	PHS	609
72	81	93	8	PHS	612
73	85	95	8	PHS	616
74	87	96	9	PHS	619
75	90	97	9	PHS	623
76	90	97	9	PHS	627
77	93	98	9	PHS	631
78	93	98	9	PHS	635
79	99	99	9	PHS	639
80	99	99	9	PHS	644
81	99	99	9	PHS	648
82	99	99	9	PHS	653
83	99	99	9	PHS	657
84	99	99	9	PHS	662
85	99	99	9	PHS	666
86	99	99	9	PHS	671
87	99	99	9	PHS	675
88	99	99	9	PHS	680
89	99	99	9	PHS	685
90	99	99	9	PHS	689
91	99	99	9	PHS	694
92	99	99	9	PHS	699
93	99	99	9	PHS	705

* Level AR norms are based on the scores of entering community college students.

Scores in the colored bands may be chance level scores. See "Chance Level Scores" in the section "Using the Norms Tables."

Raw Score	Number correct	GE	Grade Equivalent
NCE	Normal Curve Equivalent	ESS	Extended Scale Score
NPR	National Percentile Rank	K	Kindergarten
NS	National Stanine	PHS	Post High School

Level AR, Form T

Vocabulary

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
0	1	1	1	1.4	382
1	1	1	1	1.6	391
2	1	1	1	1.7	398
3	1	1	1	1.9	407
4	1	1	1	2.1	415
5	1	1	1	2.2	423
6	1	1	1	2.4	432
7	1	1	1	2.6	441
8	1	1	1	2.8	449
9	1	1	1	3.1	457
10	1	1	1	3.5	465
11	1	1	1	3.8	472
12	7	2	1	4.2	480
13	10	3	1	4.6	488
14	15	5	2	4.9	494
15	17	6	2	5.2	500
16	22	9	2	5.8	508
17	24	11	3	6.2	513
18	27	14	3	6.7	519
19	30	17	3	7.1	524
20	32	20	3	7.6	529
21	35	24	4	8.2	535
22	37	27	4	8.7	539
23	40	31	4	9.2	543
24	42	36	4	10.0	548
25	46	42	5	11.2	553
26	49	48	5	12.7	558
27	52	53	5	PHS	562
28	55	59	5	PHS	567
29	58	65	6	PHS	572
30	62	71	6	PHS	578
31	65	76	6	PHS	583
32	68	81	7	PHS	589
33	72	85	7	PHS	595
34	75	88	7	PHS	600
35	78	91	8	PHS	607
36	81	93	8	PHS	614
37	85	95	8	PHS	621
38	90	97	9	PHS	628
39	93	98	9	PHS	635
40	93	98	9	PHS	642
41	99	99	9	PHS	649
42	99	99	9	PHS	657
43	99	99	9	PHS	666
44	99	99	9	PHS	674
45	99	99	9	PHS	680

Comprehension

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
0	1	1	1	1.8	400
1	1	1	1	2.0	410
2	1	1	1	2.2	422
3	1	1	1	2.5	436
4	1	1	1	2.7	446
5	1	1	1	3.1	456
6	1	1	1	3.4	466
7	1	1	1	3.8	475
8	1	1	1	4.1	482
9	1	1	1	4.5	489
10	1	1	1	4.9	496
11	1	1	1	5.4	503
12	1	1	1	5.8	509
13	7	2	1	6.2	515
14	10	3	1	6.5	519
15	10	3	1	6.9	523
16	15	5	2	7.3	527
17	19	7	2	7.8	532
18	20	8	2	8.1	535
19	23	10	2	8.7	540
20	25	12	3	9.1	543
21	27	14	3	9.4	546
22	31	18	3	10.1	551
23	34	22	3	10.7	555
24	36	25	4	11.4	559
25	38	29	4	11.9	562
26	41	33	4	12.4	565
27	43	37	4	PHS	569
28	46	42	5	PHS	573
29	48	46	5	PHS	576
30	51	52	5	PHS	580
31	54	58	5	PHS	585
32	56	62	6	PHS	588
33	60	68	6	PHS	593
34	63	73	6	PHS	597
35	66	78	7	PHS	602
36	69	82	7	PHS	607
37	74	87	7	PHS	613
38	78	91	8	PHS	620
39	83	94	8	PHS	627
40	87	96	9	PHS	633
41	90	97	9	PHS	640
42	93	98	9	PHS	648
43	99	99	9	PHS	655
44	99	99	9	PHS	662
45	99	99	9	PHS	668
46	99	99	9	PHS	676
47	99	99	9	PHS	684
48	99	99	9	PHS	689

Total

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
0	1	1	1	1.5	368
1	1	1	1	1.6	383
2	1	1	1	1.8	398
3	1	1	1	2.0	411
4	1	1	1	2.2	421
5	1	1	1	2.3	426
6	1	1	1	2.4	431
7	1	1	1	2.5	434
8	1	1	1	2.6	439
9	1	1	1	2.6	443
10	1	1	1	2.7	446
11	1	1	1	2.9	450
12	1	1	1	3.0	454
13	1	1	1	3.1	457
14	1	1	1	3.2	460
15	1	1	1	3.4	464
16	1	1	1	3.5	467
17	1	1	1	3.6	470
18	1	1	1	3.7	473
19	1	1	1	3.9	477
20	1	1	1	4.1	480
21	1	1	1	4.2	482
22	1	1	1	4.3	485
23	1	1	1	4.5	488
24	1	1	1	4.6	491
25	1	1	1	4.8	494
26	1	1	1	5.1	497
27	1	1	1	5.2	499
28	1	1	1	5.4	502
29	1	1	1	5.6	505
30	7	2	1	5.8	508
31	7	2	1	5.9	510
32	10	3	1	6.1	513
33	13	4	2	6.4	516
34	13	4	2	6.6	519
35	15	5	2	6.8	521
36	17	6	2	7.0	524
37	19	7	2	7.2	526
38	22	9	2	7.5	529
39	23	10	2	7.7	531
40	25	12	3	8.1	534
41	26	13	3	8.3	536
42	29	16	3	8.6	539
43	31	18	3	8.8	541
44	32	19	3	9.1	543
45	33	21	3	9.4	545
46	36	25	4	9.9	548
47	36	26	4	10.0	549
48	38	28	4	10.3	551
49	39	30	4	10.6	553

Level AR, Form T

Total

Raw Score	Community College*				
	NCE	NPR	NS	GE	ESS
50	41	33	4	11.0	555
51	42	35	4	11.5	557
52	44	38	4	12.0	559
53	45	41	5	12.5	561
54	47	44	5	12.9	563
55	49	48	5	PHS	566
56	51	52	5	PHS	568
57	52	54	5	PHS	570
58	54	57	5	PHS	572
59	55	60	6	PHS	574
60	58	64	6	PHS	577
61	59	67	6	PHS	579
62	60	69	6	PHS	581
63	63	73	6	PHS	584
64	65	76	6	PHS	587
65	66	78	7	PHS	589
66	68	81	7	PHS	592
67	71	84	7	PHS	596
68	74	87	7	PHS	600
69	76	89	8	PHS	604
70	80	92	8	PHS	608
71	81	93	8	PHS	611
72	83	94	8	PHS	614
73	85	95	8	PHS	618
74	90	97	9	PHS	622
75	90	97	9	PHS	626
76	93	98	9	PHS	630
77	93	98	9	PHS	634
78	99	99	9	PHS	638
79	99	99	9	PHS	643
80	99	99	9	PHS	647
81	99	99	9	PHS	653
82	99	99	9	PHS	657
83	99	99	9	PHS	662
84	99	99	9	PHS	666
85	99	99	9	PHS	671
86	99	99	9	PHS	675
87	99	99	9	PHS	680
88	99	99	9	PHS	684
89	99	99	9	PHS	688
90	99	99	9	PHS	693
91	99	99	9	PHS	696
92	99	99	9	PHS	698
93	99	99	9	PHS	700

* Level AR norms are based on the scores of entering community college students.

Scores in the colored bands may be chance level scores. See "Chance Level Scores" in the section "Using the Norms Tables."

Raw Score	Number correct	GE	Grade Equivalent
NCE	Normal Curve Equivalent	ESS	Extended Scale Score
NPR	National Percentile Rank	K	Kindergarten
		PHS	Post High School
	NS	National Stanine	

2016 FORM T

Appendix C:

RISE Student Learning Outcomes Assessment Data Summary 2015-16

- **Cohort and Control Testing Information**
 - **QEP Data Storage in Internet Native Banner**
 - **RISE Notes on Data Input Process**
 - **RISE Data Retrieval Request for Plan
Implementation Year 1: Summer, 2016**
 - **QEP Data Analysis Summer 2016**
-

QEP Courses	Term	Test Given	No. St. In Class	Pre Form	No. Tests	Pre Date	Post Form	No. Tests	Post Date	Instructor	Date Entered
EDUC 1300-02	SP 2015	Nelson-Denny	12	G	10	1/28/15	H	7	4/27/16	Babcock	4/20/16
EDUC 1300-03	SP 2015	Nelson-Denny	20	G	14	1/28/15	H	11	4/27/16	Thomas	4/20/16
EDUC 1300-01	F 2015	Nelson-Denny	23	G	22	9/3/15	H	15	11/17/15	Thomas	5/25/16
EDUC 1300-08	F 2015	Nelson-Denny	15	G	15	9/2/15	H	10	11/18/15	Babcock	4/20/16
EDUC 1300-08	F 2015	MARSI	15		12	9/9/15		10	11/11/15	Babcock	6/10/16
EDUC 1300-11	F 2015	Nelson-Denny	24	G	24	9/3/15	H	14	11/17/15	Thomas	4/21/16
EDUC 1300-14	F 2015	Nelson-Denny	18	G	16	9/3/15	H	12	11/17/15	Babcock	4/21/16
EDUC 1300-14	F 2015	MARSI	21		17	9/8/15		13	11/12/15	Babcock	6/10/16
EDUC 1300-01	SP 2016	Nelson-Denny	19	G	16	1/20/16	H	11	4/20/16	Moreau	5/26/16
EDUC 1300-02	SP 2016	Nelson-Denny	17	G	17	1/20/16	H	8	4/20/16	Babcock	5/24/16
EDUC 1300-02	SP 2016	MARSI	17		16	1/13/16		13	4/13/16	Babcock	6/10/16
EDUC 1300-07	SP 2016	Nelson-Denny	10	G	10	1/19/16	H	4	4/19/16	Sellers	5/26/16
EDUC 1300-07	SP 2016	MARSI	11		10	1/14/16		4	4/21/16	Sellers	6/10/16
BIOL 1322-01	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	19	S	12	1/27/16	T	10	4/20/16	Song	5/31/16
BIOL 1322-01	SP 2016	MARSI	18		12	2/1/16		12	4/25/16	Song	6/13/16
BIOL 1322-02	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	29	S	15	2/2/16	T	8	4/28/16	Sanford	6/6/16
BIOL 1322-02	SP 2016	MARSI	29		None			7	4/28/16	Sanford	6/13/16
BIOL 1322-03	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	16	S	8	2/2/16	T	6	4/28/16	Sanford	6/6/16
BIOL 1322-03	SP 2016	MARSI	15		None			6	4/28/16	Sanford	6/13/16
BIOL 2301-02	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	24	S	15	2/2/16	T	None		Sanford	6/7/16
BIOL 2301-04	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	22	S	18	1/27/16	T	11	4/20/16	Song	5/31/16
BIOL 2301-04	SP 2016	MARSI	23		18	2/1/16		11	5/2/16	Song	6/13/16
BIOL 2302-01	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	30	S	19	2/1/16	T	14	4/27/16	Sanford	6/7/16
BIOL 2302-01	SP 2016	MARSI	27		21	3/7/16		15	4/27/16	Sanford	6/13/16
BIOL 2302-03	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	13	S	13	1/27/16	T	10	4/27/16	Sanford	6/8/16
BIOL 2302-03	SP 2016	MARSI	13		11	3/2/16		5	5/2/16	Sanford	6/13/16
PSYC 2314-01	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	30	T	24	1/28/16	S	25	4/21/16	Moreau	6/8/16
PSYC 2314-01	SP 2016	MARSI	29		3	1/26/16		23	4/21/16	Moreau	6/14/16
PSYC 2314-04	SP 2016	Gates-Macginitie	23	S	20	1/26/16	T	14	4/26/16	Hodges	6/9/13
PSYC 2314-04	SP 2016	MARSI	22		18	2/4/16		14	4/26/16	Hodges	6/14/16
QEP Control Groups											

QEP Data Storage in Banner INB

STVTESC – Test Code Validation Table

Test codes and score information entered by the Registrar.

heading	Records	Test Code	Description	Number of Positions	Min Score	Max Score
TEAS	1	QEPT	QEP TEAS Test	5	000.0	100.0
ND/Pre	9	QRVR	QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score	2	00	80
		QRVP	QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Percentile	2	01	99
		QRVG	QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Grade Level	4	04.1	18.9
		QRCR	QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Raw Score	2	00	80
		QRCP	QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Percentile	2	01	99
		QRCG	QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Grade Level	4	04.1	18.9
		QRTR	QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Raw Score	2	00	80
		QRTP	QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Percentile	3	000	156
		QRTG	QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level	4	04.1	18.9
ND/Post	9	QOVR	QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score	2	00	80
		QOVP	QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Percentile	2	01	99
		QOVG	QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Grade Level	4	04.1	18.9
		QOCR	QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score	2	00	80
		QOCP	QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Percentile	2	01	99
		QOCG	QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level	4	04.1	18.9
		QOTR	QEP Post NDRT Total Score Raw Score	3	000	156
		QOTP	QEP Post NDRT Total Score Percentile	2	01	99
		QOTG	QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level	4	04.1	18.9
GM/Pre	9	QSVR	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Raw Score	2	00	45
		QSVP	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Percentile	2	01	99

		QSVG	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Grade Level	4	01.0	16.0
		QSCR	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score	2	00	45
		QSCP	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Percentile	2	01	99
		QSCG	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level	4	01.0	16.0
		QSTR	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Raw Score	2	00	45
		QSTP	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Percentile	2	01	99
		QSTG	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level	4	01.0	16.0
GM/Post	9	QTVR	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score	2	00	45
		QTVP	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Percentile	2	01	99
		QTVG	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Grade Level	4	01.0	16.0
		QTCR	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score	2	00	45
		QTCP	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Percentile	2	01	99
		QTCG	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level	4	01.0	16.0
		QTTR	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Raw Score	2	00	45
		QTTP	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Percentile	2	01	99
		QTTG	QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level	4	01.0	16.0
NCLEX	1	QEPN	QEP NCLEX Test	2	00	01
MARSI/ pre	4	QRMG	Pre-instructional MARSI global strategies mean	3	1.0	5.0
		QRMP	Pre-instructional MARSI problem-solving mean	3	1.0	5.0
		QRMS	Pre-instructional MARSI support strategies mean	3	1.0	5.0
		QRMO	Pre-instructional MARSI overall mean	3	1.0	5.0
MARSI/ Post	4	QOMG	Post-instructional MARSI global strategies mean	3	1.0	5.0
		QOMP	Post-instructional MARSI problem-solving mean	3	1.0	5.0
		QOMS	Post-instructional MARSI support strategies mean	3	1.0	5.0
		QOMO	Post-instructional MARSI overall mean	3	1.0	5.0

RISE Notes on Data Input Process

Pre-instructional MARSIs for Fall 2015 not given in class all at once, so validity negatively influenced (some dated as late as October 19th)

I did not, as a rule, check the tallying and arithmetic on the MARSIs. That leaves some room for erroneous results.

Many of the students in the SP 2016 control group for support courses had been exposed (in other courses) to the RISE enhancements, as I could tell from the pre and post-test records from Fall 2015. Makes use of a control group questionable.

I did not include duplicate MARSIs scores from the same semester but did include them for different semesters.

Pretesting done very late in some semesters (1st week in March) consider discounting them as not indicative (since not pre-instructional)

Only three of 28 MARSIs in one support course had student names on them, so were unusable (pre-instruction inventories). The post instructional MARSIs in that same course all had names but no tally sheets, so had to be processed by hand.

RISE Data Retrieval Request for Plan Implementation Year 1: Summer 2016

We request that the following data be retrieved from Banner:

Goal 1: students will read at college level (grade 13)

QEPT

QOCG, QOTG: Nelson-Denny post-instructional tests, grade level

QTCG, QTTG: Gates-MacGinitie post-instructional tests, grade level

(individual scores, means for each)

Goal 2: students will show improvement in reading

QEPT

QRVR, QQVR; Nelson-Denny vocabulary: pre- and post-instructional tests, raw scores

QRRC, QOCR: Nelson-Denny comprehension: pre- and post-instructional tests, raw scores

QSVR, QTVR: Gates-MacGinitie vocabulary: pre- and post-instructional tests, raw scores

QSCR, QTCR: Gates-MacGinitie comprehension: pre- and post-instructional tests, raw scores

QRMP, QOMP: MARS, pre- and post-instructional assessments, problem-solving mean

Request report on individual scores; request comparisons for each grouping:

- Number of scores that rose from pre- to post, and mean increase
- number of scores that fell from pre- to post-, and mean decrease
- overall increase or decrease: mean

Learning Outcome 1: college-level reading

Same as for Goal 1

Learning Outcome 2: select and use reading strategies appropriate to content and purpose

QOMG: MARS post-instructional assessment global strategies mean

Request listed individual scores, mean

Learning Outcome 3: self-monitor and adjust comprehension strategies

QOMO: MARS post-instructional MARS overall mean

Request listed individual scores, mean

Learning Outcome 4: increase proficiency of comprehension, fluency, and critical/analytical reading

Included in data request for goal 1

Data was analyzed for the following four groups:

QEPC - Control Group: students who received no RISE instruction

QEPE - Students who completed 20+ hours of RISE instruction in EDUC 1300

QEPS - Students who did not receive RISE instruction in EDUC 1300 but did receive RISE instruction in at least one supporting course

QEPZ - All students who received RISE instruction (i.e., both QEPE and QEPS)

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

QRCG: QEP Pre NDRT Comprehension Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.53 – 24 of 67 scored 13.0 or higher (35.8%)

QEPE Mean: 9.01 – 9 of 63 scored 13.0 or higher (14.3%)

QEPS Mean: 9.86 – 2 of 12 scored 13.0 or higher (16.7%)

QEPZ Mean: 9.15 – 11 of 75 scored 13.0 or higher (14.7%)

QRTG: QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.50 – 24 of 67 scored 13.0 or higher (35.8%)

QEPE Mean: 9.35 – 9 of 63 scored 13.0 or higher (14.3%)

QEPS Mean: 9.54 – 2 of 11 scored 13.0 or higher (18.2%)

QEPZ Mean: 9.38 – 11 of 74 scored 13.0 or higher (14.9%)

QOCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.66 – 17 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (38.6%)

QEPE Mean: 10.59 – 8 of 42 scored 13.0 or higher (19.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.60 – 3 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (50.0%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.84 – 11 of 48 scored 13.0 or higher (22.9%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.56 – 16 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (36.4%)

QEPE Mean: 10.62 – 9 of 42 scored 13.0 or higher (21.4%)

QEPS Mean: 11.53 – 2 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.73 – 11 of 48 scored 13.0 or higher (22.9%)

Pre-test data in italics

Goal #1 continues on the next page

QSCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 12.53 – 8 of 12 scored 13 (66.7%)
QEPE Mean: 12.73 – 14 of 16 scored 13 (87.5%)
QEPS Mean: 12.67 – 86 of 92 scored 13 (93.5%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.68 – 100 of 108 scored 13 (92.6%)

QSTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.13 – 6 of 12 scored 13 (50.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.31 – 13 of 16 scored 13 (81.3%)
QEPS Mean: 12.44 – 79 of 92 scored 13 (85.9%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.42 – 92 of 108 scored 13 (85.2%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.28 – 6 of 9 scored 13 (66.7%)
QEPE Mean: 12.21 – 9 of 10 scored 13 (90.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.07 – 49 of 61 scored 13 (80.3%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.09 – 58 of 71 scored 13 (81.7%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 10.91 – 4 of 9 scored 13 (44.4%)
QEPE Mean: 11.55 – 4 of 10 scored 13 (40.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.04 – 46 of 62 scored 13 (74.2%)
QEPZ Mean: 11.97 – 50 of 72 scored 13 (69.4%)

Pre-test data in italics

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

Student Learning Outcome #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.

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

QEPC Mean: 43.6 (67 participants)

QEPE Mean: 33.9 (63 participants)

QEPS Mean: 37.3 (12 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 34.4 (75 participants)

QOCR: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 46.7 (44 participants)

QEPE Mean: 42.6 (42 participants)

QEPS Mean: 48.3 (6 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 43.3 (48 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 41 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 25 showed improvement (61.0%). QEPE Group had 40 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 31 showed improvement (77.5%). QEPS group had 6 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 4 showed improvement (66.7%). QEPZ Group had 46 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 35 showed improvement (76.1%).

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

QSCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 31.7 (12 participants)

QEPE Mean: 34.9 (16 participants)

QEPS Mean: 36.1 (91 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 35.9 (117 participants)

QTCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 27.8 (9 participants)

QEPE Mean: 30.8 (10 participants)

QEPS Mean: 33.8 (62 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 33.4 (72 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 9 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 2 showed improvement (22.2%). QEPE Group had 9 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 3 showed improvement (33.3%). QEPS Group had 54 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 15 showed improvement (27.8%). QEPZ Group had 63 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 18 showed improvement (28.6%).

(B) Fluency

QRVR: QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 43.7 (67 participants)

QEPE Mean: 36.1 (63 participants)

QEPS Mean: 33.9 (11 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 35.7 (74 participants)

QOVR: QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 44.0 (44 participants)

QEPE Mean: 39.5 (42 participants)

QEPS Mean: 42.3 (6 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 39.9 (48 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 41 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 26 showed improvement (63.4%). QEPE Group had 40 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 25 showed improvement (62.5%). QEPS group had 6 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 5 showed improvement (83.3%). QEPZ Group had 46 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 30 showed improvement (65.2%).

QSVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Vocabulary Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 25.3 (12 participants)

QEPE Mean: 27.9 (16 participants)

QEPS Mean: 30.1 (92 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 29.8 (108 participants)

QTVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score

QEPC Mean: 26.0 (9 participants)

QEPE Mean: 25.8 (10 participants)

QEPS Mean: 31.0 (62 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 30.3 (72 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 9 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 4 showed improvement (44.4%). QEPE Group had 9 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 3 showed improvement (33.3%). QEPS Group had 54 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 24 showed improvement (44.4%). QEPZ Group had 63 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 27 showed improvement (42.9%).

(C) Critical and Analytical Reading Skills

QRMP: Pre-instructional MARSJ problem-solving mean

QEPC Mean: 3.90 (13 participants)

QEPE Mean: 3.89 (52 participants)

QEPS Mean: 3.92 (53 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 3.91 (105 participants)

QOMP Post-instructional MARSJ problem-solving mean

QEPC Mean: 4.03 (9 participants)

QEPE Mean: 4.36 (39 participants)

QEPS Mean: 4.05 (64 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 4.16 (103 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 8 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 6 showed improvement (75.0%). QEPE Group had 38 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 31 showed improvement (81.6%). QEPS Group had 36 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 19 showed improvement (52.8%). QEPZ Group had 74 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 50 showed improvement (67.6%).

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

QEPC Mean: 11.66 – 17 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (38.6%)

QEPE Mean: 10.59 – 8 of 42 scored 13.0 or higher (19.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.60 – 3 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (50.0%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.84 – 11 of 48 scored 13.0 or higher (22.9%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.56 – 16 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (36.4%)

QEPE Mean: 10.62 – 9 of 42 scored 13.0 or higher (21.4%)

QEPS Mean: 11.53 – 2 of 6 scored 13.0 or higher (33.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.73 – 11 of 48 scored 13.0 or higher (22.9%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 11.28 – 6 of 9 scored 13 (66.7%)

QEPE Mean: 12.21 – 9 of 10 scored 13 (90.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.07 – 49 of 61 scored 13 (80.3%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.09 – 58 of 71 scored 13 (81.7%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level

QEPC Mean: 10.91 – 4 of 9 scored 13 (44.4%)

QEPE Mean: 11.55 – 4 of 10 scored 13 (40.0%)

QEPS Mean: 12.04 – 46 of 62 scored 13 (74.2%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.97 – 50 of 72 scored 13 (69.4%)

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.

GOMG: Post-instructional MARSII global strategies mean

QEPC Mean: 3.46 (9 participants)

QEPE Mean: 3.98 (39 participants)

QEPS Mean: 3.55 (64 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 3.71 (103 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 3.56

QEPE Mean: 4.01

QEPS Mean: 3.61

QEPZ Mean: 3.76

Appendix D: Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory

(MARSI)

- **Survey (Blank Copy)**
- **Scoring Rubric**
- **Tips on Administering the MARSI**

Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory, (MARS) Version 1.0

Kouider Mokhtari and Carla Reichard, 2002

Directions: *Listed below are statements about what people do when they read academic or school-related materials such as textbooks, library books, etc.*

Five numbers follow each statement (1, 2, 3, 4, 5). Each of these numbers indicate the following:

- 1 = I never or almost never do this
- 2 = I only occasionally do this
- 3 = I sometimes do this. (about 50% of the time)
- 4 = I usually do this.
- 5 = I always or almost always do this.

After reading each strategy statement, circle the number (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) that goes with the scale above and applies to you when you read from various sources. There are no right or wrong answers to the statements on the inventory. The "TYPE" of reading strategies abbreviated and listed to the left in the inventory will be used in the attached scoring rubric.

TYPE	STRATEGIES	SCALE				
		1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	1. I have a purpose in mind when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	2. I take notes while reading to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	3. I think about what I know to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	4. I preview the text to see what it's about before reading it.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	5. When text becomes difficult, I read aloud to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	6. I summarize what I read to reflect on important information in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	7. I think about whether the content of the text fits my reading purpose.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	8. I read slowly but carefully to be sure I understand what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	9. I discuss what I read with others to check understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	10. I skim the text first by noting characteristics like length and organization.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	11. I try to get back on track when I lose concentration.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	12. I underline or circle information in the text to help me remember it.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	13. I adjust my reading speed according to what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	14. I decide what to read closely and what to ignore.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	15. I use reference materials such as dictionaries to help me understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	16. When text becomes difficult, I pay close attention to what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	17. I use tables, figures, and pictures in text to increase my understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	18. I stop from time to time and think about what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	19. I use context clues to help me better understand what I'm reading.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	20. I paraphrase (restate in my own words) to better understand what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	21. I try to picture or visualize information to help remember what I read.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	22. I use typographical aids like bold face and italics to identify key information.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	23. I critically analyze and evaluate the information presented in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	24. I go back and forth in the text to find relationships among ideas in it.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	25. I check my understanding when I come across conflicting information.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	26. I try to guess what the material is about when I read.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	27. When text becomes difficult, I re-read to increase my understanding.	1	2	3	4	5
SUP	28. I ask myself questions I like to have answered in the text.	1	2	3	4	5
GLOB	29. I check to see if my guesses about the text are right or wrong.	1	2	3	4	5
PROB	30. I try to guess the meaning of unknown words or phrases.	1	2	3	4	5

Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory
SCORING RUBRIC

Student Name: _____ Age: _____ Current Grade Level: _____ Date: _____

Directions for Scoring Rubric:

1. Write your responses to each item on the inventory in the corresponding blanks below. (1, 2, 3, 4, or 5)
2. Add up the scores in each column. Record the totals on each line below the column, "Total Score."
3. Below that, divide the "Total Score" by the number of items in that column to get the "Mean." (average)
4. In the last column to the right, record the score totals of each subscale (GLOB, PROB, SUP).
5. Add the subscale scores to get an "Overall Total Score."
6. Divide the "Overall Total Score" by 30 to get the "Overall Mean," or average.
7. Look at the "KEY TO AVERAGES" to determine your reading strategy use, and read "INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES" to understand what your scores indicate.

Global Reading Strategies (GLOB Subscale)	Problem Solving Strategies (PROB Subscale)	Support Reading Strategies (SUP Subscale)	Overall Reading Strategies (Score Totals)
1.	8.	2.	
3.	11.	5.	GLOB Total =
4.	13.	6.	
7.	16.	9.	PROB Total =
10.	18.	12.	
14.	21.	15.	SUP Total =
17.	27.	20.	
19.	30.	24.	
22.		28.	
23.			
25.			
26.			
29.			
GLOB Total Score =	PROB Total Score =	SUP Total Score =	Overall Total Score =
Divide by 13 = (mean)	Divide by 8 = (mean)	Divide by 9 = (mean)	Divide by 30 = (overall mean)

KEY to AVERAGES
 Directions: Use your "Overall Mean" to indicate how often you use strategies when reading academic material.
 High = 3.5 or more Medium = 2.5 to 3.4 Low = 2.4 or lower

INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES:

- The overall average indicates how often you use reading strategies when reading academic materials.
- The average for each subscale of the inventory shows which group of strategies (global, problem-solving, support strategies) you use when reading. You will be able to see if you are high, medium, or low in the strategy groups.
- The best possible use of these strategies depends on your reading ability in English, the type of material read, and the purpose for reading.
- A low score on any of the subscales or parts of the inventory indicate the need for you to learn and apply strategies in these areas.

(adapted from Oxford 19190: 297-300)

**Tips for Administration of MARSII
Metacognitive Awareness of Reading Strategies Inventory**

(Specific directions for taking and scoring this inventory are explained on the inventory and scoring rubric.)

- 1. Explain the reason for assessing reading strategies:**
 - a. For an understanding of what, when, why, how, and where students read.
 - b. To promote an awareness of reading and thinking about reading (meta-cognition).
 - c. To determine each student's overall use of reading strategies when reading academic or specific content area materials.
 - d. To identify each student's global, problem solving, and support reading strategies with an overall average of the use of strategies in academic reading.

- 2. Give directions about how to take the inventory:**
 - a. Use a focus marker to focus on specific areas of the inventory as directions are given.
 - b. Call on students to read directions, including numerical rating guidelines.
 - c. Tell them to ignore the "TYPE" column until actual scoring occurs.
 - d. Model the reading of the first statement/ strategy and how to give it a scale rating number (1,2,3,4, or 5), with 1 being the lowest and 5 being the highest.
 - e. Give them a set amount of time in which you think they should be finished, but allow for individual differences in the amount of time to take the inventory.

- 3. Explain the scoring directions and rubric. Give as many hints and helps as possible, as this can be very confusing.**
 - a. Make sure the SCORING RUBRIC and the INVENTORY are printed on separate pages.
 - b. Make sure the students fill out all the information at the top of the page.
 - c. Allow the students to read the directions orally and to complete each step before going to the next.
 - d. Ask students to make transfers and complete totals for each column using their focus markers. It makes it easier and less confusing.
 - e. As the instructor, model totaling the score and calculating the mean on the board.
 - f. If students have trouble adding to get totals or dividing to get the average/mean, have them use a calculator.

4. **Take special note and give special directions in the scoring of “Overall Reading Strategies.”**
 - a. GLOB is the total of the first column
 - b. PROB is the total of the second column
 - c. SUP is the total of the third column
 - d. The “Overall Score” is the total of the GLOB, PROB, and SUP.
 - e. The “Overall Mean” is the “Overall Score” divided by 30 (the total items on the inventory).
5. **The “KEY TO AVERAGES” gives a rating of student reading strategy use.**
6. **“INTERPRETING YOUR SCORES” explains what the ratings might mean and that this is an indication of the student’s reading strategy use in English.**

Appendix E: Budget Worksheets

- **2015-16**
- **2016-17**

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT WORKSHEET
FISCAL YEAR = 2017
AS OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

Index Number: D11130
 Index Description: QEP
 Responsible Person: VP for Academic Affairs, Fin Mgr

Pool Account Numbers	Pool Description	Current Original Budget	Current Revised Budget	Current Year-to-Date Actual Plus Encumbrances	Next Yr. Base Budget	Proposed Budget	Notes
61702	Faculty Salaries-Adjunct	-	-	-	-	-	
61703	Faculty Salaries-Summer	-	-	-	-	-	
61704	Faculty Salaries-Overload	-	-	-	-	-	
61723	Faculty Salaries-Summer Overload	-	-	-	-	-	
61713	Salaries and Wages - Hourly	-	-	-	-	-	
61714	Student Employees	-	-	-	-	-	
61717	Federal Work Study Employees	-	-	-	-	-	
61718	State Work Study Employees	-	-	-	-	-	
61720	Achievement Bonus	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Labor		-	-	-	-	-	
71700	Travel	-	-	-	-	1,500	
72700	Maintenance & Operations	1,400	3,600	1,742	1,400	3,000	Increase \$1,600
73700	Other Services	-	-	-	-	-	
74700	Rental & Lease	-	-	-	-	-	
75700	Repairs & Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	
76700	Telecommunications	-	-	-	-	-	
77700	Utilities	-	-	-	-	-	
78700	Financial Aid	-	-	-	-	-	
79100	Interdepartmental Chargebacks	-	-	-	-	-	
79210	Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-	
79280	Library Capital	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Non-Labor		1,400	3,600	1,742	1,400	4,500	
Index Total		1,400	3,600	1,742	1,400	4,500	

Financial Manager: _____
 Date: _____

Approved By: _____
 Date: _____

BUDGET DEVELOPMENT WORKSHEET
FISCAL YEAR = 2017
AS OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

Index Number: S11130
 Index Description: QEP
 Responsible Person: VP for Academic Affairs, Fin Mgr

Pool Account Numbers	Pool Description	Current Original Budget	Current Revised Budget	Current to-Date Actual Plus Encumbrances	Next Yr. Base Budget	Proposed Budget	Notes
61702	Faculty Salaries-Adjunct	-	-	-	-	-	
61703	Faculty Salaries-Summer	-	-	-	-	-	
61704	Faculty Salaries-Overload	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600	21,600	Babcock \$7,200 & Preslar \$14,400
61723	Faculty Salaries-Summer Overload	-	-	-	-	-	
61713	Salaries and Wages - Hourly	-	-	-	-	-	
61714	Student Employees	-	-	-	-	-	
61717	Federal Work Study Employees	-	-	-	-	-	
61718	State Work Study Employees	-	-	-	-	-	
61720	Achievement Bonus	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Labor		9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600	21,600	
71700	Travel	-	-	-	-	-	
72700	Maintenance & Operations	500	-	-	-	-	
73700	Other Services	-	-	-	-	-	
74700	Rental & Lease	-	-	-	-	-	
75700	Repairs & Maintenance	-	-	-	-	-	
76700	Telecommunications	-	-	-	-	-	
77700	Utilities	-	-	-	-	-	
78700	Financial Aid	-	-	-	-	-	
79100	Interdepartmental Chargebacks	-	500	212	500	500	
79210	Capital Outlay	-	-	-	-	-	
79280	Library Capital	-	-	-	-	-	
Total Non-Labor		500	500	212	500	500	
Index Total		10,100	10,100	9,812	10,100	22,100	

Financial Manager: _____
 Date: _____

Approved By: _____
 Date: _____