

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

**5TH Annual Report:
2018-2019**

RISE Team

LAMAR STATE COLLEGE ORANGE

Table of Contents

I.	REVISED UPDATED EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
II.	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
Overview	5	
1.	Analysis of Student Performance Data	8
B.	Pre-, Post-Survey Results: Interpretation and Analysis	34
Selection of the MARSJ to replace the survey originally employed.....	34	
Analysis of Skills Inventory Results	34	
IV.	EVALUATE IMPLEMENTATION	35
A.	Expansion of the Plan Cohort.....	35
B.	Curriculum Changes to Pre-LVN Prerequisites: Curriculum Planning, Training, and Implementation	36
V.	EVALUATE RESOURCE ALLOCATION	36
A.	Operations	36
B.	Remuneration	36
VI.	TRAVEL	37
VII.	EVALUATE LEADERSHIP, ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE.....	37
VIII.	CONTINUOUS IMPROVEMENT.....	37
A.	Use of Results.....	37
1.	Training, Curriculum.....	37
2.	Implementation Protocols	40
B.	Consultants	40
C.	Peer Review	40
IX.	APPENDIX A: RISE STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT DATA SUMMARY 2017-2018 ...	41
A.	Cohort and Control Testing Information.....	41
B.	QEP Data Analysis: Summer 2019.....	41
X.	APPENDIX B: TEST OF ESSENTIAL ACADEMIC SKILLS	59
A.	Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS)	59

B. National Council of Licensure Examination (NCLEX-PN)..... 59

XI. APPENDIX C: LIST OF COHORT, CONTROL, AND SUPPORT COURSES 61

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 datum 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 focused 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 have received embedded reading instruction from trained faculty at designated points in their courses 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 has been 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. Stated otherwise, 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. Stated otherwise, 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 24 contact hours of RISE instruction will demonstrate the ability to read and comprehend college-level texts. Stated otherwise, 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 of comprehension, fluency, critical and analytical reading skills in college level texts and materials. Stated otherwise, 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 (Spring 2015 was a pilot term), the RISE team determined that **no change in the Student Learning Outcomes (SLOs) was necessary**. Members also agreed that no change was advisable for the 70% benchmark in the goals for the final year of implementation.

However, the **plan goals as originally approved continue to serve as a focal point for discussion**. As a result of preliminary data analysis for the second full plan implementation year (2016-2017), 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. In the third year the threshold was raised to 24 contact hours. This threshold can only be met by students completing the EDUC 1300 Learning Frameworks classes designated for pre-LVN students; these have comprised 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 students’ reading proficiency and metacognitive awareness of their own responses to reading challenges. Under the plan’s original conception, in order 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. Thus, in Spring 2018, the team determined that the data were sufficient to warrant change.

In Spring 2018 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 MARSJ. Data pertaining to student performance on the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) and the National Council on Licensure Examination for Professional Nursing (NCLEX-PN®) was also collected and archived for the 2018-2019 academic year, the second academic year for which data was introduced from administration of these assessment measures.

The archiving and extraction mechanisms functioned without incident during the current plan year. Unlike the previous plan year, the team experienced no difficulty in extracting archived assessment data for the 2018-2019. Codes were created at the plan's inception to facilitate management of cohort data, and more were added in Spring 2017 to facilitate management of control group data, which codes formed the basis of a protocol used to extract data from Banner into an Excel document readable by the RISE data analysis action team. The registrar ran the extraction program and delivered the data to the team on July 2, 2019. The data analysis team led

by Eric Owens met with the RISE director to present their findings on August 21, 2019. The results of analysis were presented to the full RISE team on October 21, 2019.

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

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

Overview

In 2018-2019, the RISE team continued to use the Nelson-Denny Reading Test as an assessment measure in EDUC 1300, administering pre- and post-instructional testing in both cohort and control sections. For a full discussion of the factors leading to this decision, see the corresponding section(s) of the 2017-2018 Annual Report, III.A and Appendix A.

In Fall 2016, with the planned expansion of the list of courses offering embedded instruction in reading and metacognitive awareness strategies to include Pre-LVN program support courses, the RISE team chose the Gates-Macginitie Reading Test as an assessment measure for pre- and post-instructional testing to be administered in BIOL 1322 (Nutrition), BIOL 2301 (Anatomy and Physiology I), BIOL 2302 (Anatomy and Physiology II), and PSYC 2314 (Lifespan). This paradigm was piloted in Spring 2016 and was in place for the plan's third full year of implementation. TEAS test results would also be considered as assessment measures for the plan's goals and outcomes for students completing the Pre-LVN program and entering the Vocational Nursing (VN) program. In Summer 2107, faculty in the VN program were also trained to teach reading and metacognitive awareness enhancement strategies and implemented revised curricula for the plan's third complete year. In order to become licensed to practice nursing, graduates of this program take the (NCLEX-PN) which was also used as an indicator of student success for plan graduates in the plan's fourth year, although it does not correlate directly to the plan's goals or outcomes.

When data indicated that redundant testing and testing fatigue was affecting student performance on Gates-Macginitie Form S and Form T assessments for Fall 2016 and Spring 2017, the team considered a new testing paradigm, with Form S of the Gates-Macginitie Reading Test to be administered as a pre-instructional assessment only in BIOL 2301 and Form T being administered as a post-instructional assessment only in BIOL 2302 courses. **For a full discussion of the factors leading to this decision, see the corresponding section(s) of the 2017-2018 Annual Report, III.A and Appendix A.**

In Fall 2017, Tropical Storm Harvey devastated the LSCO service area and caused school and college closures and widespread displacement, necessitating implementation of

curriculum and scheduling adaptations to facilitate completion of the Fall 2017 semester. RISE testing continued in EDUC 1300 sections but was suspended in all support courses.

Beginning in Spring 2018, all participating BIOL 2301 faculty administered the pre-instructional GMRT (Form S) and MARSI assessments within the first two weeks of the beginning of the semester. Also, all participating BIOL 2302 faculty administered post-instructional GMRT (Form T) and MARSI assessments within two weeks of the end of the semester. No testing was conducted in BIOL 1322 or in PSYC 2314 (except control testing). This protocol was followed for the 2018-2019 plan year as well.

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.

Sampling and Data Pool Considerations

Cohort data:

For 2018-2019,

- A total of forty-eight (48) students were enrolled in the primary cohort (EDUC 1300 sections designated for pre-LVN students)
- Of those, forty-four (44) were assessed using the pre-instructional Nelson-Denny Reading Test Form G
- Thirty-three (33) were assessed using the post-instructional Nelson-Denny Reading Test Form H

Control data:

- Forty-three (43) students were enrolled in the control sections of EDUC 1300
- Of those, all forty-three (43) were assessed using the pre-instructional Nelson-Denny Reading Test Form G
- Thirty (30) students completed post-instructional testing using the Nelson-Denny Reading Test Form H

Support course data:

For 2018-2019,

- a total of one hundred ninety-two students were enrolled in the support sections scheduled for pre-instructional testing (BIOL 2301).
- One hundred sixty-seven (167) students from that group completed pre-instructional testing using the Gates MacGinitie Reading Test Form S.
- One hundred and twenty-three (123) students were enrolled in support sections scheduled for post-instructional testing (BIOL 2302). Eighty-three (83) of the students from that group completed post-instructional testing using the Gates-Macginitie Reading Test Form T.

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 considered suspension of control group testing for the remainder of the plan's implementation schedule, but decided to continue it for 2018-2019. A vote on the question is scheduled for August 2019.

Eighty-five (85) students having received some quantity of reading enhancement instruction during the course of their program of study completed the Test of Essential Academic Skills (TEAS) in Spring 2019 as part of the requirement for applying to the VN program. Of those, fifteen (15) students (down from 21 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

third 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 fourteen (14) sections of the support courses, the one (2) control sections of the support courses, and those completing the TEAS assessment.

1. Analysis of Student Performance Data

The members of the data analysis team agreed that the same paradigm and codes would be employed for 2018-19 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 (combining both cohort and support groups without duplicating head count). 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. Stated otherwise, 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 Scores (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 Scores (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 2018-2019

- 0% of the control group read at grade level 13 (only one participant)

- 48.5% of the cohort group read at grade level 13 (up from 34.1%)
- 25.0% of support course group read at grade level 13 (down from 33.3%)
- 42.2% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (down from 48.8%)

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

- 40.5% of the control group read at grade level 13
- 34.5% of the cohort group read at grade level 13 (up from 30.2%)
- 38.8% of the support course group read at grade level 13 (down from 43.2%)
- 35.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (up from 33.6%)

Measures for the cohort group in 2018-2019 showed significant increases from the previous year's scores (14.4%), and over the course of the plan's history, the cohort group reading proficiency levels continue to rise.

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for 2018-2019

- 0% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (only one participant)
- 51.5% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 45.5%)
- 41.7% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13, up from 33.3% (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 48.9% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 44.0%)

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 40.4% of the control group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no change from previous levels)
- 37.9% of the cohort group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 33.6%)
- 51.0% of support course group demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13, down from 54.1% (for those who took this test, a subset of the control group)
- 41.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 38.9%)

Comprehension levels for 2018-2019 cohort groups and for all groups receiving RISE enhancements rose significantly. Comprehension levels rose for the same groups for participants over the entire course of the plan's implementation, and narrowed the performance gaps with control groups.

Reading level: total score (Gates-MacGinitie) 2018-19

- 90% of the control group read at grade level 13 (up from 75%)
- 58.8% of the cohort group read at grade level 13 (down from 76.9%)
- 74.6% of the support course group read at grade level 13 (down from 86.7%)
- 71.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (down from 83.7%)

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

- 65.6% of the control group read at grade level 13 (up from 54.5%)
- 61.4% of the cohort group read at grade level 13 (down from 63.0%)
- 76.6% of support course group read at grade level 13 (down from 77.1%)
- 74.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (down from 75.6%)

Performance trended slightly downwards for all groups except the control group. However, the goal of reading at college level was met for the second year in a row for all students having received RISE enhancements.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2018-2019

- 100% of the control group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 75.0%)

- 81.3% of the cohort group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (down from 92.3%)
- 86.6% of support course group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (down from 93.3%)
- 85.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (down from 93.0%)

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie), all years:

- 77.4% of the control group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 66.7%)
- 86.0% of the cohort group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (down slightly from 88.9%)
- 84.8% of support course group demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up slightly from 84.3%)
- 85.0% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated reading comprehension at grade level 13 (up slightly from 84.8%)

Reading comprehension for the cohort group trended downwards in this category as well, but trended upwards slightly for support groups and for all student have received RISE enhancements.

Grade-level reading level (TEAS): 2018-2019 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 93.3% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (14 of 15), down slightly from 95.5%, but with a much larger sample size
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (68 of 70), unchanged from previous levels but with a larger sample size
- 96.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (82 of 85), down slightly from 96.7%, but with a much larger sample size

Control group data comes from students who took the exam but had no RISE instruction. Most of these students took the exam here but had prior coursework elsewhere and did not complete LSCO's pre-LVN program, so do not constitute a true control group.

Grade-level reading (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of =24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

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

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)

- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

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. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

Goal 1 was partially 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 exceeded the 70% threshold for college-level reading comprehension, but did not meet the 70% standard for total score grade level threshold. In addition, the cohort group outperformed the control group in GMRT post-instructional assessment of reading comprehension level and outperformed the historical baseline for TEAS testing, with a sample size now large enough to be statistically relevant. RISE participants also outscored the historical baseline on the NCLEX-PN®.

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. Stated otherwise, 70% of students receiving a minimum designated amount of enhanced instruction through the plan will demonstrate improved reading skills.

NOTE: Student Learning Outcome 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) 2018-2019 only

- 100% of control group (1 of 1) showed improvement
- 66.7% of cohort group (22 of 33) showed improvement (down from 76.7%)
- 63.6% of support course group (7 of 11) showed improvement (down from 68.6%)
- 65.9% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (29 of 44) showed improvement (down from 74.6%)

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) all years

- 64.3% of control group (54 of 84) showed improvement (up from 63.9%)
- 74.3% of cohort group (101 of 136) showed improvement (down from 76.7%)
- 67.4% of support course group (31 of 46) showed improvement (down from 68.6%)
- 72.5% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (132 of 182) showed improvement (down from 74.6%)

Performance trended downwards slightly in 3 of the 4 groups.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2018-2019

- 30.0% of control group (3 of 10) showed improvement (up from 23.5%)
- 20.0% of cohort group (2 of 10) showed improvement (down from 33.3%)
- 28.6% of support course group (12 of 42) showed improvement (down from 34.3%)

- 26.9% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (14 of 52) showed improvement

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) all years

- 25.9% of control group (7 of 27) showed improvement (up from 23.5%)
- 27.3% of cohort group (6 of 22) showed improvement (down from 33.3%)
- 33.2% of support course group (73 of 220) showed improvement (down slightly from 34.3%)
- 32.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (79 of 242) showed improvement (down from 34.2%)

Decreases in comprehension level assessment scores compared to results from previous years may be partially attributable to the fact that students are no longer completing pre- and post-instructional testing in every support class, and so are only seeing and completing each assessment once, making the assessments more accurate by removing the positive influence on scoring of familiarity with the testing instrument(s).

Comprehension level (TEAS): 2018-2019 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 93.3% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (14 of 15), down slightly from 95.5%, but with a much larger sample size
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (68 of 70), unchanged from previous levels but with a larger sample size
- 96.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (82 of 85), down slightly from 96.7%, but with a much larger sample size

Control group data comes from students who took the exam but had no RISE instruction. Most of these students took the exam here but had prior coursework elsewhere and did not complete LSCO's pre-LVN program, so do not constitute a true control group.

Comprehension level (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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 comprehension level, according to the vendor. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of =24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

Comprehension level (NCLEX): December 2018 and historical data

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)
- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

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. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

Fluency

Vocabulary (Nelson-Denny) 2018-2019

- 100% of control group (1 of 1) showed improvement (up from 64.0%)
- 57.6% of cohort group (19 of 33) showed improvement (down from 61.9%)
- 60.0% of support course group (6 of 10) showed improvement (up from 40%)
- 58.1% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (25 of 43) showed improvement (up from 59.6%)

Vocabulary (Nelson-Denny) all years

- 64.3% of control group (54 of 84) showed improvement (up from 63.9%)
- 60.3% of cohort group (82 of 136) showed improvement (down from 61.2%)
- 62.2% of support course group (45 of 82) showed improvement (down from 62.9%)
- 60.8% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (110 of 181) showed improvement (down from 61.6%)

The cohort group was the only group completing the NDRT to show improvement in fluency over scores from the 2017-2018 plan year.

Vocabulary (Gates-MacGinitie) 2018-2019

- 60.0% of control group (6 of 10) showed improvement (up from 22.2%)
- 10.0% of cohort group (1 of 10) showed improvement (down from 36.4%)
- 34.1% of support course group (14 of 41) showed improvement (down from 46.7%)
- 29.4% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (15 of 51) showed improvement (down from 46.1%)

Vocabulary (Gates-MacGinitie) all years

- 35.7% of control group (10 of 28) showed improvement (up from 22.2%)
- 23.8% of cohort group (5 of 21) showed improvement down from 36.4%
- 44.3% of support course group (98 of 221) showed improvement (down from 46.7%)
- 42.6% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (103 of 242) showed improvement (down from 46.1%)

The cohort group was the only group completing the NDRT to show improvement in fluency over scores from the 2017-2018 plan year.

Vocabulary level (TEAS): 2018-2019 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 93.3% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (14 of 15), down slightly from 95.5%, but with a much larger sample size
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (68 of 70), unchanged from previous levels but with a larger sample size
- 96.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (82 of 85), down slightly from 96.7%, but with a much larger sample size

Control group data comes from students who took the exam but had no RISE instruction. Most of these students took the exam here but had prior coursework elsewhere and did not complete LSCO's pre-LVN program, so do not constitute a true control group.

Vocabulary (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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 vocabulary, according to the vendor. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of =24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

Vocabulary (NCLEX): December 2018 and historical data

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)

- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

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. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (MARSI), 2018-2019

- 44.4% of the control group (4 of 9) showed improvement (no data available from previous year)
- 64.1% of cohort group (25 of 39) showed improvement (down from 87.5%)
- 45.5% of support course group (20 of 44) showed improvement (no data available from previous year)
- 54.2% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (45 of 83) showed improvement (down from 87.5%)

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (MARSI), all years

- 60.0% of control group (15 of 25) showed improvement down from 68.8%)
- 77.0% of cohort group (77 of 100) showed improvement (down from 85.2%)
- 51.0% of support course group (99 of 194) showed improvement (down from 52.7%)
- 59.9% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (176 of 294) showed improvement (down from 62.1%)

Scores from all groups trended downward from 2017-2018 levels, with support course group participants showing the smallest decrease.

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of 24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

Critical and Analytical Reading Skills (NCLEX): December 2018 and historical data

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)
- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)

- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading level, comprehension level, vocabulary, fluency, or critical and analytical reading skills. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

Goal 2 and SLO 4 were not met.

The 70% standard for improvement was not met in any assessment category for cohort or support course group performance levels.

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 Scores (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)
- NCLEX®-PN (included for purposes of comparison to historical baseline performance)

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for 2018-2019

- 0.0% of the control group (0 of 1) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (down from 40.7%)
- 51.5% of the cohort group (17 of 33) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 45.5%)

- 41.7% of support course group (5 of 12) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 33.3%)
- 48.9% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 44.0%)

Comprehension level (Nelson-Denny) for all years

- 40.4% of the control group (36 of 89) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (down from 40.9%)
- 37.9% of the cohort group (53 of 140) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 33.6%)
- 51.0% of the support course group (25 of 49) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (down from 54.1%)
- 41.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction (78 of 189) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (up from 38.9%)

The only decrease in reading comprehension level this plan year was for the control group. Performance levels of students on the NDRT receiving RISE enhancements were up in all categories by statistically relevant margins.

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) 2018-2019

- 100% of control group (10 of 10) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 62.5% in 2016-2017)
- 81.3% of the cohort group (13 of 16) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 75.0% in 2016-2017)
- 86.6% of the support course group (58 of 67) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 84.1% in 2016-2017)
- 85.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction (71 of 83) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 83.8% in 2016-2017)

Comprehension level (Gates-MacGinitie) all years

- 77.4% of control group (24 of 31) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 64.7% in 2016-2017)
- 86.0% of cohort group (37 of 43) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 85.7% in 2016-2017)

- 84.8% of the support course group (246 of 290) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 82.9% in 2016-2017)
- 85.0% of all students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (283 of 333) demonstrated comprehension at grade level 13 (no data from previous year—up from 83.1% in 2016-2017)

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): 2018-2019 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 93.3% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (14 of 15), down slightly from 95.5%, but with a much larger sample size
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (68 of 70), unchanged from previous levels but with a larger sample size
- 96.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (82 of 85), down slightly from 96.7%, but with a much larger sample size

Control group data comes from students who took the exam but had no RISE instruction. Most of these students took the exam here but had prior coursework elsewhere and did not complete LSCO's pre-LVN program, so do not constitute a true control group.

Comprehension level (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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 comprehension, according to the vendor. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of =24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

Comprehension level (NCLEX-PN®): December 2018 and historical data

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)
- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

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. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

Grade-level reading: total score (Nelson-Denny) for 2018-2019

- 0.0% of the control group (0 of 1) read at grade level 13 (down from 40.7%)
- 51.5% of the cohort group (17 of 33) read at grade level 13 (up from 43.1%)
- 41.7% of the support course group (5 of 12) read at grade level 13 (up from 33.3%)
- 48.9% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction read at grade level 13 (up from 34.0%)

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

- 40.4% of the control group (36 of 48) read at grade level 13 (down from 40.9)
- 37.9% of the cohort group (53 of 140) read at grade level 13 (up from 30.2%)
- 51.0% of support course group (25 of 49) read at grade level 13 (up from 43.2%)
- 41.3% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction (78 of 189) read at grade level 13 (up from 33/6%)

Measures for all groups except the control group showed significant increases from the previous year's scores, but the largest increase was in the group of all students receiving any RISE enhancements, up 14.9% over 2017-2018 levels.

Grade-Level Reading (Gates-MacGinitie total score: includes both vocabulary and comprehension skill levels) 2018-19

- 90% of the control group (9 of 10) read at grade level 13 (up from 75%)
- 58.8% of the cohort group (10 of 17) read at grade level 13 (down from 76.9%)

- 74.6% of support course group (50 of 67) read at grade level 13 (down from 86.7%)
- 71.4% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction (60 of 84) read at grade level 13 (down from 83.7%)

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

- 65.6% of the control group (21 of 32) read at grade level 13 (up from 54.5%)
- 61.4% of the cohort group (27 of 44) read at grade level 13 (down from 63%)
- 76.6% of the support course group (222 of 290) read at grade level 13 (down from 77.1%)
- 74.6% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction (249 of 334) read at grade level 13 (down from 75.6%)

Performance levels fell by very small percentages for all groups except the control group.

Comprehension level (TEAS): 2018-2019 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 93.3% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (14 of 15), down slightly from 95.5%, but with a much larger sample size
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (68 of 70), unchanged from previous levels but with a larger sample size
- 96.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (82 of 85), down slightly from 96.7%, but with a much larger sample size

Control group data comes from students who took the exam but had no RISE instruction. Most of these students took the exam here but had prior coursework elsewhere and did not complete LSCO's pre-LVN program, so do not constitute a true control group.

Comprehension level (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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 comprehension, according to the vendor. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of =24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

Comprehension level (NCLEX-PN®): December 2018 and historical data

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)
- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

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. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

SLO 1 was partially met, as students in the cohort met the 70% performance standard on the GMRT for grade-level reading comprehension, but other data from other cohorts tested may be seen to indicate failure to meet the standard as written. As written, the SLO applies to students who have finished their course of study, so the GMRT is the primary assessment to indicate success or failure. Over the course of the plan's implementation, the overall levels of reading comprehension and total reading scores meet the target for students receiving RISE instruction in support groups and all groups combined, though not in the group limited to the primary cohort. Only the TEAS and NCLEX measures yield data reflecting true end-of-program performance, and they are not calibrated specifically to yield data on reading level, comprehension, or fluency.

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 MARSII assessment (global reading strategies)
- TEAS
- NCLEX

Reading strategy mastery (MARSII) 2018-2019

- Control group (n=10): mean for global reading strategies: 3.10, down from 3.20 (of 5)
- Cohort group (n=48): mean for global reading strategies: 3.69, down from 3.83 (of 5)
- Support course group (n=75): mean for global reading strategies: 3.53, up from 3.45 (of 5)

- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (n=123): mean for global reading strategies: 3.59, up from 3.55 (of 5)

Reading strategy mastery (MARSI) all years

- Control group (n=31): mean for global reading strategies: 3.42, down from 3.57 (of 5)
- Cohort group (n=113): mean for global reading strategies: 3.85, down from 3.96 (of 5)
- Support course group (n=305): mean for global reading strategies: 3.60, down from 3.62 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction (n=418): mean for global reading strategies: 3.67, down from 3.70 (of 5)

Student mastery trended slightly upward in the support course group and the group of all students receiving any RISE enhancements

Reading strategy mastery (TEAS): 2018-2019 only

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (1 of 1)
- 93.3% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt (14 of 15), down slightly from 95.5%, but with a much larger sample size
- 97.1% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (68 of 70), unchanged from previous levels but with a larger sample size
- 96.5% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (82 of 85), down slightly from 96.7%, but with a much larger sample size

Control group data comes from students who took the TEAS exam but had no RISE instruction. Most of these students took the exam here but had prior coursework elsewhere and did not complete LSCO's pre-LVN program, so do not constitute a true control group.

Reading strategy mastery (TEAS): all years

- 100% of the control group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt unchanged from the previous year, with an increase of 6 students in the sample size (11 of 11)
- 95.0% of the cohort group scored a 50 or above on a first attempt, down slightly from 96%, with an increase of 15 students in the sample size (38 of 40)
- 93.9% of the support course group scored 50 or above on a first attempt (169 of 180), up from 91.8%, with an increase of 70 students in the sample size
- 94.1% of all students receiving any amount of reading enhancement instruction scored 50 or above on a first attempt (125 of 135), up from 92.6%, with an increase of 85 students in the sample size

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 comprehension, according to the vendor. However, the cohort group scored higher than students from the support groups who had some RISE instruction, but did not meet the threshold of =24 contact hours. All groups outscored the historical performance level indicated by baseline data.

Reading strategy mastery (NCLEX-PN®): December 2018 and historical data

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

- Pass rate: Dec. 2018-- 91.04 (61/67)
- Pass rate: Dec. 2017-- 91.48 (43/47)
- Pass rate: 2016-2017 – 85.83% (103/120; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2015-2016 – 80.39% (82/100; pre-RISE)
- Pass rate: 2014-2015 – 86.24% (94/109; pre-RISE)

The NCLEX cannot be directly correlated to reading strategy mastery. Its results do not directly address the plan's goals or outcomes, but do indicate the plan's impact on the cohort. Scores for December testing, after program completion, suggest that RISE instruction prior to and through the VN program has had a significant impact on pass rates.

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 (n=10): overall mean strategies: 3.20, down from 3.33 (of 5)
- Cohort group (n=47): mean for global reading strategies: 3.75, down from 3.98 (of 5)
- Support course group n=75): mean for global reading strategies: 3.58, up from 3.48 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies (n=122): 3.65, up from 3.61 (of 5)

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

- Control group (n=31): overall mean strategies: 3.50, down from 3.65 (of 5)
- Cohort group (n=113): mean for global reading strategies: 3.90, down from 4.01 (of 5)
- Support course group (n=303): mean for global reading strategies: 3.63, down from 3.65 (of 5)
- Students receiving some amount of enhancement instruction: mean for global reading strategies (n=416): 3.71, down from 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 testing fatigue and student apathy toward assessment, analyses reveal that the plan is having a significant positive impact on the students involved, and that students in the cohort classes are improving 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 current assessment paradigm. Discussion of these analyses and of the 2018-2019 Annual Report will inform any changes to take place in the fifth and final 2019-2020 plan year.

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

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

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.

Analysis of Skills Inventory Results

Because of the implementation of a new assessment paradigm, MARSII inventories are not being administered in as many sections as in previous plan years (fall 2017 excepted). However, the number of inventories administered is sufficient to constitute a relevant sample for cohort and support course groups. Identification of a control group continues to be problematic as well. The team has discussed discontinuing control group assessment in the support course group, since as RISE instruction is being delivered all but a handful of support courses, the number of students who have not received any RISE enhancements is dwindling to the point where their numbers do not constitute a statistically relevant sample, even in sections where the instruction is not delivered.

Currently comparison of pre- and post-instructional administrations of the MARSII is not being conducted, but is being considered for inclusion in the 5th-year QEP Impact

Statement, scheduled to be submitted to the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Commission on Colleges on September 15, 2020.

IV. EVALUATE IMPLEMENTATION

A. Expansion of the Plan Cohort

The RISE implementation plan for 2018-2019 called for two (2) sections of EDUC 1300 to be included in the RISE cohort for Fall 2018. EDUC 1300-09 and EDUC 1300-11 were designated in the Fall 2018 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 1300-01 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 2018-2019 without incident.

Eight (8) instructors and one (1) executive administrator received RISE training during a 6-hour session conducted on April 12, 2019 by the RISE CIS, Dorraine Babcock. 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 criminal justice, speech, science, and allied health. **Additional training will be offered in 2019-20 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 five.

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-four (24) sections were involved in implementation for 2018-2019, as the team continues to accept the premise 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 2018 and proposed as part of the normal procedure for preparing the 2018-19 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 2018-19:

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

Travel funds of \$1,426 were spent for RISE personnel between September 1, 2018 and Sept, 1, 2019 for travel to the SACSCOC Annual Meeting to prepare for completion of the QEP Impact Statement. The travel budget for FY 2019-2020 has been merged with the SACSCOC travel pool.

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 2019. 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

Testing data continues to show 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.

The same issues are still apparent in the data collected for 2018-2019. Instructors are not willing to make the test count as a course grade, despite the fact that reading instruction is a component in their courses' curricula. Consequently, the only incentive for students to perform well is adherence to a personal value scheme that honors the effort to do one's best on every assignment. On high-stakes assignments like the TEAS and the NCLEX-PN, however, improvement in student performance levels may be attributable to RISE enhancements. Since testing does not yield unambiguous results in the aggregate, the team will conduct interviews in Fall 2019 and Spring 2020 in an attempt to discern the impact on

actual student learning. 2019-2020 is the plan's final year before institutionalization.

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. This report has addressed the effects of those changes as approved by the full team in its Fall 2018 deliberations and subsequently implemented. Further changes, however, are unlikely, as the plan's end date is September 2020, and the effects of changes in 2019-2020 could not be evaluated with mature data.

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 2019

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 (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 7.10 – 0 of 1 scored 13.0 or higher (0.0%)

QEPE Mean: 11.61 – 18 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (40.9%)

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

QEPZ Mean: 11.20 – 20 of 55 scored 13.0 or higher (36.4%)

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

QEPC Mean: 11.47 – 44 of 133 scored 13.0 or higher (33.1%)

QEPE Mean: 9.81 – 47 of 189 scored 13.0 or higher (24.9%)

QEPS Mean: 10.51 – 16 of 66 scored 13.0 or higher (24.2%)

QEPZ Mean: 10.09 – 63 of 255 scored 13.0 or higher (24.7%)

QRTG: QEP Pre NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 8.10 – 0 of 1 scored 13.0 or higher (0.0%)

QEPE Mean: 11.89 – 17 of 44 scored 13.0 or higher (38.6%)

QEPS Mean: 10.03 – 2 of 11 scored 13.0 or higher (18.2%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.52 – 19 of 55 scored 13.0 or higher (34.5%)

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

QEPC Mean: 11.44 – 47 of 133 scored 13.0 or higher (35.3%)

QEPE Mean: 10.23 – 48 of 189 scored 13.0 or higher (25.4%)

QEPS Mean: 10.67 – 19 of 66 scored 13.0 or higher (28.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 10.42 – 67 of 255 scored 13.0 or higher (26.3%)

QOCCG: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Grade Level (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.60 – 0 of 1 scored 13.0 or higher (0.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.51 – 17 of 33 scored 13.0 or higher (51.5%)
QEPS Mean: 10.68 – 5 of 12 scored 13.0 or higher (41.7%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.02 – 22 of 45 scored 13.0 or higher (48.9%)

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

QEPC Mean: 11.81 – 36 of 89 scored 13.0 or higher (40.4%)
QEPE Mean: 11.24 – 53 of 140 scored 13.0 or higher (37.9%)
QEPS Mean: 11.80 – 25 of 49 scored 13.0 or higher (51.0%)
QEPZ Mean: 11.46 – 78 of 189 scored 13.0 or higher (41.3%)

Goal #1 continues on the next page

Pre-test data in italics

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.70 – 0 of 1 scored 13.0 or higher (0.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.82 – 16 of 33 scored 13.0 or higher (48.5%)
QEPS Mean: 11.16 – 3 of 12 scored 13.0 or higher (25.0%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.38 – 19 of 45 scored 13.0 or higher (42.2%)

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

QEPC Mean: 11.85 – 36 of 89 scored 13.0 or higher (40.5%)
QEPE Mean: 11.31 – 48 of 139 scored 13.0 or higher (34.5%)
QEPS Mean: 11.58 – 19 of 49 scored 13.0 or higher (38.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 11.43 – 67 of 188 scored 13.0 or higher (35.6%)

QSCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.92 – 12 of 13 scored 13 (92.3%)
QEPE Mean: 12.76 – 27 of 30 scored 13 (90.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.68 – 124 of 137 scored 13 (90.5%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.52 – 151 of 167 scored 13 (90.4%)

QSCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 12.48 – 30 of 37 scored 13 (81.1%)
QEPE Mean: 12.74 – 53 of 59 scored 13 (89.8%)
QEPS Mean: 12.59 – 423 of 479 scored 13 (88.3%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.55 – 476 of 538 scored 13 (88.5%)

QSTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.98 – 12 of 13 scored 13 (92.3%)
QEPE Mean: 12.37 – 24 of 30 scored 13 (80.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.61 – 120 of 137 scored 13 (87.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.57 – 144 of 167 scored 13 (86.2%)

QSTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Total Score Grade Level (all years)

QEPC Mean: 11.89 – 26 of 38 scored 13 (68.4%)
QEPE Mean: 12.35 – 47 of 59 scored 13 (79.7%)
QEPS Mean: 12.50 – 406 of 477 scored 13 (85.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.47 – 453 of 536 scored 13 (84.5%)

Goal #1 continues on the next page
Pre-test data in italics

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (2018-2019 only)
QEPC Mean: 13.00 – 10 of 10 scored 13 (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.51 – 13 of 16 scored 13 (81.3%)
QEPS Mean: 12.52 – 58 of 67 scored 13 (86.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.52 – 71 of 83 scored 13 (85.5%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 12.00 – 24 of 31 scored 13 (77.4%)
QEPE Mean: 12.36 – 37 of 43 scored 13 (86.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.38 – 246 of 290 scored 13 (84.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.38 – 283 of 333 scored 13 (85.0%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (2018-2019 only)
QEPC Mean: 12.95 – 9 of 10 scored 13 (90.0%)
QEPE Mean: 11.85 – 10 of 17 scored 13 (58.8%)
QEPS Mean: 12.32 – 50 of 67 scored 13 (74.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.23 – 60 of 84 scored 13 (71.4%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 11.74 – 21 of 32 scored 13 (65.6%)
QEPE Mean: 11.73 – 27 of 44 scored 13 (61.4%)
QEPS Mean: 12.18 – 222 of 290 scored 13 (76.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.14 – 249 of 334 scored 13 (74.6%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 only)
QEPC Mean: 76.6 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 64.8 – 14 of 15 scored 50.0 or higher (93.3%)
QEPS Mean: 68.5 – 68 of 70 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.9 – 82 of 85 scored 50.0 or higher (96.5%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)
QEPC Mean: 75.5 – 11 of 11 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 63.3 – 38 of 40 scored 50.0 or higher (95.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.8 – 169 of 180 scored 50.0 or higher (93.9%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.3 – 207 of 220 scored 50.0 or higher (94.1%)

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 (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 26.0 (1 participant)
QEPE Mean: 44.0 (44 participants)
QEPS Mean: 36.0 (11 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 42.4 (55 participants)

QOCR: QEP Post NDRT Comprehension Raw Score (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 50.0 (1 participant)
QEPE Mean: 50.2 (33 participants)
QEPS Mean: 42.8 (12 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 48.2 (45 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 1 participant who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 1 showed improvement (100.0%). QEPE Group had 33 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 22 showed improvement (66.7%). QEPS group had 11 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these, 7 showed improvement (63.6%). QEPZ Group had 44 participants who completed both QRCR and QOCR. Of these 29 showed improvement (65.9%).

Pre-test data in italics

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

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

QEPC Mean: 42.6 (133 participants)

QEPE Mean: 38.2 (188 participants)

QEPS Mean: 40.1 (67 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 38.6 (255 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 47.0 (89 participants)

QEPE Mean: 46.4 (140 participants)

QEPS Mean: 45.7 (49 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 46.2 (189 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 84 participants who completed both QRCCR and QOOCR. Of these, 54 showed improvement (64.3%). QEPE Group had 136 participants who completed both QRCCR and QOOCR. Of these, 101 showed improvement (74.3%). QEPS Group had 46 participants who completed both QRCCR and QOOCR. Of these, 31 showed improvement (67.4%). QEPZ Group had 182 participants who completed both QRCCR to QOOCR. Of these, 132 showed improvement (72.5%).

QSCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form S Comprehension Raw Score (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 35.9 (13 participants)

QEPE Mean: 36.1 (30 participants)

QEPS Mean: 35.7 (137 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 35.8 (167 participants)

QTCR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Raw Score (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 33.1 (10 participants)

QEPE Mean: 34.0 (17 participants)

QEPS Mean: 34.5 (68 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 34.4 (85 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 10 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 3 showed improvement (30.0%). QEPE Group had 10 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 2 showed improvement (20.0%). QEPS Group had 42 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 12 showed improvement (28.6%). QEPZ Group had 52 participants who completed both QSCR and QOOCR. Of these, 14 showed improvement (26.9%).

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: 33.8 (37 participants)

QEPE Mean: 35.5 (59 participants)

QEPS Mean: 35.8 (482 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 35.9 (541 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 31.6 (31 participants)

QEPE Mean: 33.3 (44 participants)

QEPS Mean: 35.2 (294 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 34.9 (338 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 27 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 7 showed improvement (25.9%). QEPE Group had 22 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 6 showed improvement (27.3%). QEPS Group had 220 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 73 showed improvement (33.2%). QEPZ Group had 242 participants who completed both QSCR and QOCR. Of these, 79 showed improvement (32.6%).

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 76.6 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 64.8 – 14 of 15 scored 50.0 or higher (93.3%)

QEPS Mean: 68.5 – 68 of 70 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.9 – 82 of 85 scored 50.0 or higher (96.5%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 75.5 – 11 of 11 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 63.3 – 38 of 40 scored 50.0 or higher (95.0%)

QEPS Mean: 67.8 – 169 of 180 scored 50.0 or higher (93.9%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.3 – 207 of 220 scored 50.0 or higher (94.1%)

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%)

(B) Fluency

QRVR: QEP Pre NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 34.0 (1 participant)
QEPE Mean: 46.3 (44 participants)
QEPS Mean: 40.5 (11 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 45.2 (55 participants)

QOVR: QEP Post NDRT Vocabulary Raw Score (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 47.0 (1 participant)
QEPE Mean: 50.5 (33 participants)
QEPS Mean: 44.3 (12 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 48.8 (45 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 1 participant who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 1 showed improvement (100.0%). QEPE Group had 33 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 19 showed improvement (57.6%). QEPS group had 10 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 6 showed improvement (60.0%). QEPZ Group had 43 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 25 showed improvement (58.1%).

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

QEPC Mean: 43.1 (133 participants)
QEPE Mean: 39.9 (188 participants)
QEPS Mean: 41.0 (66 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 40.2 (254 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 45.2 (89 participants)
QEPE Mean: 44.1 (140 participants)
QEPS Mean: 43.2 (49 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 43.8 (189 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 84 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 54 showed improvement (64.3%). QEPE Group had 136 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 82 showed improvement (60.3%). QEPS group had 45 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 28 showed improvement (62.2%). QEPZ Group had 181 participants who completed both QRVR and QOVR. Of these, 110 showed improvement (60.8%).

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 (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 31.0 (13 participants)

QEPE Mean: 30.6 (31 participants)

QEPS Mean: 30.3 (136 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 30.3 (167 participants)

QTVR: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Vocabulary Raw Score (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 31.3 (10 participants)

QEPE Mean: 27.4 (17 participants)

QEPS Mean: 30.2 (68 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 29.7 (85 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 10 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 6 showed improvement (60.0%). QEPE Group had 10 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 1 showed improvement (10.0%). QEPS Group had 41 participants who completed both QSCR and QTCR. Of these, 14 showed improvement (34.1%). QEPZ Group had 51 participants who completed both QSCR and QOCR. Of these, 15 showed improvement (29.4%).

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

QEPC Mean: 29.2 (39 participants)

QEPE Mean: 28.8 (59 participants)

QEPS Mean: 30.7 (483 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 30.4 (542 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 29.3 (32 participants)

QEPE Mean: 27.8 (43 participants)

QEPS Mean: 31.0 (292 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 30.6 (335 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 28 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 10 showed improvement (35.7%). QEPE Group had 21 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 5 showed improvement (23.8%). QEPS Group had 221 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 98 showed improvement (44.3%). QEPZ Group had 242 participants who completed both QSVR and QTVR. Of these, 103 showed improvement (42.6%).

Pre-test data in italics

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

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 76.6 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 64.8 – 14 of 15 scored 50.0 or higher (93.3%)
QEPS Mean: 68.5 – 68 of 70 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.9 – 82 of 85 scored 50.0 or higher (96.5%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 75.5 – 11 of 11 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 63.3 – 38 of 40 scored 50.0 or higher (95.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.8 – 169 of 180 scored 50.0 or higher (93.9%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.3 – 207 of 220 scored 50.0 or higher (94.1%)

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 (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.69 (12 participants)
QEPE Mean: 3.83 (61 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.92 (130 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.89 (191 participants)

QOMP: Post-instructional MARSİ problem-solving mean (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.63 (10 participants)
QEPE Mean: 4.09 (47 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.92 (75 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.99 (122 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 9 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 4 showed improvement (44.4%). QEPE Group had 39 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 25 showed improvement (64.1%). QEPS Group had 44 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 20 showed improvement (45.5%). QEPZ Group had 83 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 45 showed improvement (54.2%).

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 MARSİ problem-solving mean (all years)

QEPC Mean: 3.91 (48 participants)

QEPE Mean: 3.86 (193 participants)

QEPS Mean: 3.95 (395 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 3.92 (588 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 3.93 (31 participants)

QEPE Mean: 4.27 (113 participants)

QEPS Mean: 4.04 (303 participants)

QEPZ Mean: 4.10 (416 participants)

Comparison: QEPC Group had 25 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 15 showed improvement (60.0%). QEPE Group had 100 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 77 showed improvement (77.0%). QEPS Group had 194 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 99 showed improvement (51.0%). QEPZ Group had 294 participants who completed both QRMP and QOMP. Of these, 176 showed improvement (59.9%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 76.6 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 64.8 – 14 of 15 scored 50.0 or higher (93.3%)

QEPS Mean: 68.5 – 68 of 70 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.9 – 82 of 85 scored 50.0 or higher (96.5%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 75.5 – 11 of 11 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)

QEPE Mean: 63.3 – 38 of 40 scored 50.0 or higher (95.0%)

QEPS Mean: 67.8 – 169 of 180 scored 50.0 or higher (93.9%)

QEPZ Mean: 67.3 – 207 of 220 scored 50.0 or higher (94.1%)

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 #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 (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.60 – 0 of 1 scored 13.0 or higher (0.0%)

QEPE Mean: 12.51 – 17 of 33 scored 13.0 or higher (51.5%)

QEPS Mean: 10.68 – 5 of 12 scored 13.0 or higher (41.7%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.02 – 22 of 45 scored 13.0 or higher (48.9%)

QOTG: QEP Post NDRT Total Score Grade Level (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 12.70 – 0 of 1 scored 13.0 or higher (0.0%)

QEPE Mean: 12.82 – 16 of 33 scored 13.0 or higher (48.5%)

QEPS Mean: 11.16 – 3 of 12 scored 13.0 or higher (25.0%)

QEPZ Mean: 12.38 – 19 of 45 scored 13.0 or higher (42.2%)

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

QEPC Mean: 11.81 – 36 of 89 scored 13.0 or higher (40.4%)

QEPE Mean: 11.24 – 53 of 140 scored 13.0 or higher (37.9%)

QEPS Mean: 11.80 – 25 of 49 scored 13.0 or higher (51.0%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.46 – 78 of 189 scored 13.0 or higher (41.3%)

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

QEPC Mean: 11.85 – 36 of 89 scored 13.0 or higher (40.5%)

QEPE Mean: 11.31 – 48 of 139 scored 13.0 or higher (34.5%)

QEPS Mean: 11.58 – 19 of 49 scored 13.0 or higher (38.8%)

QEPZ Mean: 11.43 – 67 of 188 scored 13.0 or higher (35.6%)

Student Learning Outcome #1 continues on the next page.

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (2018-2019 only)
QEPC Mean: 13.00 – 10 of 10 scored 13 (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 12.51 – 13 of 16 scored 13 (81.3%)
QEPS Mean: 12.52 – 58 of 67 scored 13 (86.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.52 – 71 of 83 scored 13 (85.5%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (2018-2019 only)
QEPC Mean: 12.95 – 9 of 10 scored 13 (90.0%)
QEPE Mean: 11.85 – 10 of 17 scored 13 (58.8%)
QEPS Mean: 12.32 – 50 of 67 scored 13 (74.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.23 – 60 of 84 scored 13 (71.4%)

QTCG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Comprehension Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 12.00 – 24 of 31 scored 13 (77.4%)
QEPE Mean: 12.36 – 37 of 43 scored 13 (86.0%)
QEPS Mean: 12.38 – 246 of 290 scored 13 (84.8%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.38 – 283 of 333 scored 13 (85.0%)

QTTG: QEP Gates MacGinitie Form T Total Score Grade Level (all years)
QEPC Mean: 11.74 – 21 of 32 scored 13 (65.6%)
QEPE Mean: 11.73 – 27 of 44 scored 13 (61.4%)
QEPS Mean: 12.18 – 222 of 290 scored 13 (76.6%)
QEPZ Mean: 12.14 – 249 of 334 scored 13 (74.6%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 only)
QEPC Mean: 76.6 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 64.8 – 14 of 15 scored 50.0 or higher (93.3%)
QEPS Mean: 68.5 – 68 of 70 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.9 – 82 of 85 scored 50.0 or higher (96.5%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)
QEPC Mean: 75.5 – 11 of 11 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 63.3 – 38 of 40 scored 50.0 or higher (95.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.8 – 169 of 180 scored 50.0 or higher (93.9%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.3 – 207 of 220 scored 50.0 or higher (94.1%)

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 MARS global strategies mean (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.10 (10 participants)
QEPE Mean: 3.69 (48 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.53 (75 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.59 (123 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 3.42 (31 participants)
QEPE Mean: 3.85 (113 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.60 (305 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.67 (418 participants)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 76.6 – 5 of 5 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 64.8 – 14 of 15 scored 50.0 or higher (93.3%)
QEPS Mean: 68.5 – 68 of 70 scored 50.0 or higher (97.1%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.9 – 82 of 85 scored 50.0 or higher (96.5%)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (all years)

QEPC Mean: 75.5 – 11 of 11 scored 50.0 or higher (100.0%)
QEPE Mean: 63.3 – 38 of 40 scored 50.0 or higher (95.0%)
QEPS Mean: 67.8 – 169 of 180 scored 50.0 or higher (93.9%)
QEPZ Mean: 67.3 – 207 of 220 scored 50.0 or higher (94.1%)

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 MARSİ overall mean (2018-2019 only)

QEPC Mean: 3.20 (10 participants)
QEPE Mean: 3.75 (47 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.58 (75 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.65 (122 participants)

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

QEPC Mean: 3.50 (31 participants)
QEPE Mean: 3.90 (113 participants)
QEPS Mean: 3.63 (303 participants)
QEPZ Mean: 3.71 (416 participants)

QEPT: QEP TEAS (Reading) (2018-2019 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, Support, and Control Sections 2018-2019

Fall 2018

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

RISE cohort sections: Fall 2018

EDUC 1300-09	Runnels (90133)	24
EDUC 1300-11	Babcock (90135)	15

Control:

EDUC 1300-02 Moreau (90126) 26

Support courses delivering reading enhancement instruction where testing is conducted:

Fall 2018

Control:

BIOL 2301-01	Sanford (90021)	36	PSYC 2314-01	Moreau (90273)	24
BIOL 2301-02	Sanford (90022)	19			
BIOL 2301-03	Sanford (90023)	36			
BIOL 2301-04	Song (90024)	48			
BIOL 2302-01	Sanford (90036)	13			
BIOL 2302-02	Sanford (90037)	13			
BIOL 2302-03	Vandevender (90038)	18			

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

BIOL 1322-01	McClure (90008)	15
PSYC 2314-02	Hodges (90274)	8
PSYC 2314-03	Hodges (90275)	8
PSYC 2314-04	Hodges (90276)	11

Spring 2019

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

RISE cohort sections: Spring 2019

EDUC 1300-02 Babcock (10162)	9	Control:	EDUC 1300-01 Moreau (10163)	17
------------------------------	---	-----------------	-----------------------------	----

Support courses delivering reading enhancement instruction where testing is conducted:

Spring 2019

BIOL 2301-01 Sanford (10019)	33	Control:		
BIOL 2301-03 Sanford (10021)	12	PSYC 2314-01 Moreau (10348)		23
BIOL 2301-04 Sanford (10022)	8			
BIOL 2302-01 Song (10032)	23			
BIOL 2302-02 Sanford (10033)	14			
BIOL 2302-03 Sanford (10034)	10			
BIOL 2302-04 Sanford (10035)	32			

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

PSYC 2314-02 Hodges (10349)	13
PSYC 2314-03 Hodges (10350)	12
PSYC 2314-04 Hodges (10351)	19