

**PET FORM**  
**Planning and Evaluation Tracking**  
**(2011-2012 Assessment Period)**

Division of: **Academic Success**

Person Responsible for this Division: **Tamara Clunis**

Department of: **Reading**

Person Responsible for this Form: **Judy Isbell**

Purpose Statement (With Last Updated Date): **Prepare students for college-level coursework by improving reading comprehension, vocabulary, and study skills. (September 2011)**

---

**Goal Statement #1:**

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

**Outcome/Objective Statement 1A:**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

Reading staff will use institutional data to determine success of students who complete Reading Techniques II – RDNG-0331. Students will be successful in intensive reading classes within 10% of first-time-in-college students who did **not** need remediation, as measured by the course grades in the intensive reading classes. (Revised 10/11; AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1.1)

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
  - **2009-2010 Data:** Numbers = \_\_\_\_ out of \_\_\_\_ and Percentage =s \_\_\_\_%  
*?% Remediated students passed intensive reading courses with A-C*  
*?% Tested Ready students passed intensive reading courses with A-C*
  - **2010-2011 Data:** Numbers = \_\_\_\_ out of \_\_\_\_ and Percentage =s \_\_\_\_%  
*?% Remediated students passed intensive reading courses with A-C*  
*?% Tested Ready students passed intensive reading courses with A-C*
- Analysis
  - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
  - **2009-2010 Data:**  
*Awaiting data from the Office of Institutional Research*
  - **2010-2011 Data:**  
*Students have not had enough time to demonstrate success in college-level courses.*
- Improvements
  - List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results:  
*Awaiting data from the Office of Institutional Research*
  - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:  
*Awaiting data from the Office of Institutional Research*
  - Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):  
*No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program*

- Recommendations/Actions for 2011-2012
    - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
Reading Staff and the Office of Institutional Research
    - Action Plan:  
Continue to coordinate efforts to acquire the necessary data
    - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):  
Request data on June 1, 2012 for the 2010-2011 academic year, with a deadline of September 1, 2012.
    - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):  
No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program
- 

**Goal Statement #1:**

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

**Outcome/Objective Statement 1B:**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

Upon receiving an exit placement test score indicating college readiness, students will be successful in intensive reading classes within 10% of first-time-in-college students who did **not** need remediation, as measured by the course grades in the intensive reading classes. (Revised 10/11)

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
  - **2009-2010 Data:** Numbers = \_\_\_\_ out of \_\_\_\_ and Percentage =s \_\_\_\_%  
?% Remediated students passed intensive reading courses with A-C  
?% Tested Ready students passed intensive reading courses with A-C
  - **2010-2011 Data:** Numbers = \_\_\_\_ out of \_\_\_\_ and Percentage =s \_\_\_\_%  
?% Remediated students passed intensive reading courses with A-C  
?% Tested Ready students passed intensive reading courses with A-C
- Analysis
  - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
  - **2009-2010 Data:**  
Awaiting data from the Office of Institutional Research
  - **2010-2011 Data:**  
Students have not had enough time to demonstrate success in college-level courses.
- Improvements
  - List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results:  
Awaiting data from the Office of Institutional Research
  - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:  
Awaiting data from the Office of Institutional Research
  - Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):  
No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program
- Recommendations/Actions for 2011-2012
  - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
Reading Staff and the Office of Institutional Research
  - Action Plan:  
Continue to coordinate efforts to acquire the necessary data

- Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):  
Request data on June 1, 2012 for the 2010-2011 academic year, with a deadline of September 1, 2012.
  - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):  
No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program
- 

### Goal Statement #1:

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

### Outcome/Objective Statement 2A:

Upon completion of developmental reading each semester, 70% of students will improve reading skills as measured by a pre-post assessment. (Revised 9/08).

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
  - **2009-2010 Data:**

**Fall 2009 Data:** Numbers = 277 out of 428 and Percentage = 65%  
**Spring 2010 Data:** Numbers = 246 out of 387 and Percentage = 64%  
*The number of students who showed improvement on the Post Test out of the total number of students who took the Post Test*
  - **2010-2011 Data:**

**Fall 2010 Data:** Numbers = 286 out of 448 and Percentage = 64%  
**Spring 2011 Data:** Numbers = 219 out of 366 and Percentage = 60%  
*The number of students who showed improvement on the Post Test out of the total number of students who took the Post Test*
- Analysis
  - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
  - **2009-2010 Data:**  
Did not meet the target for Fall 2009 or Spring 2010
  - **2010-2011 Data:**  
Did not meet the target for Fall 2010 or Spring 2011
- Improvements
  - List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results:  
No improvements were made.
  - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:  
Since Spring 2008 the percent of improvement from the Pre/Post assessments has fluctuated from semester to semester. No reasons have been identified for the varied results.
  - Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):  
No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program
- Recommendations/Actions for 2011-2012
  - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
Reading staff
  - Action Plan:  
We will no longer use the Pre/Post assessments as an indicator of skill development; however, we will continue to use the assessments as a placement tool. Our focus will shift to increasing the number of students who complete our Reading classes.

- Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):  
Fall 2011
  - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):  
No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program
- 

### **Goal Statement #1:**

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

### **Outcome/Objective Statement 2B:**

During the semester 10% of students enrolled will test out of Reading as measured by a state-approved test. (Added Fall 2009)

#### • Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)

##### ○ **2009-2010 Data:**

**Fall 2009 Data:** Numbers = 55 out of 631 and Percentage = 9%

**Spring 2010 Data:** Numbers = 60 out of 595 and Percentage = 10%

*The number of students who passed the ACCUPLACER or THEA test out of the total number of students enrolled in Reading classes on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day*

##### ○ **2010-2011 Data:**

**Fall 2010 Data:** Numbers = 56 out of 683 and Percentage = 8%

**Spring 2011 Data:** Numbers = 43 out of 573 and Percentage = 8%

*The number of students who passed the ACCUPLACER or THEA test out of the total number of students enrolled in Reading classes on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day*

#### • Analysis

##### ○ Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis

(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):

##### ○ **2009-2010 Data:**

Did not meet the target for Fall 2009, but met the target for Spring 2010

##### ○ **2010-2011 Data:**

Did not meet the target for Fall 2010 or Spring 2011

#### • Improvements

##### ○ List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results: No improvements were made.

##### ○ Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:

Some students identified as having the skills to pass a state-approved test (THEA/ACCUPLACER) did not take advantage of the opportunity due to financial difficulty.

Reading Techniques II students are no longer encouraged to test out prior to completing the class due to the increased focus on mapping strategies which should improve college-level success.

##### ○ Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):

No additional funds necessary for the Reading Program

#### • Recommendations/Actions for **2011-2012**

##### ○ Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):

Reading staff and a funding source

##### ○ Action Plan:

We will continue to identify students who could pass a state-approved test during each semester. If students self-disclose their inability to pay for the test, funds will be provided for the test. In addition, we

will also exclude the Reading classes located at the Hereford and Moore County campuses from this data. The total number of students will be reduced by the number of students enrolled in those Reading classes until the outreach programs are more aligned with the program on the Washington Campus.

- **Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):**  
Reading staff will try to find funding for the current academic year from additional funding sources. We will continue to work with outreach sites to bring them into alignment. The curricula alignment is nearly complete, and operational procedures are improving each semester.
  - **Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):**  
The Reading Program will request \$435 for testing fees for the 2012-2013 Academic Year. (15 THEA tests @ \$29 each)
- 

### **Goal Statement #1:**

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

### **Outcome/Objective Statement 3A**

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

Upon completion of the Pre-Test assessment, 5% of those pretested will advance into a higher reading level than previously placed by the state-approved assessment, in order to progress through Reading at a faster rate. Of those students who advanced, 50% will pass the higher level with an A-C. (Revised 10/11)

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
  - **2009-2010 Data:**
    - Fall 2009 Data:** Numbers = 35 out of 631 and Percentage = 6%
    - Spring 2010 Data:** Numbers = 48 out of 595 and Percentage = 8%  
*The number of students who were placed in higher levels of Reading out of the total number of students enrolled in Reading classes on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day*
  - **2010-2011 Data:**
    - Fall 2010 Data:** Numbers = 56 out of 683 and Percentage = 8%
    - Spring 2011 Data:** Numbers = 34 out of 573 and Percentage = 6%  
*The number of students who were placed in higher levels of Reading out of the total number of students enrolled in Reading classes on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day*
  - **Fall 2010 Data:** Numbers = 30 out of 56 and Percentage = 54%
  - Spring 2011 Data:** Numbers = 16 out of 34 and Percentage = 47%  
*The number of students who were placed in a higher level and passed with an A-C out of the total number of students who were placed in a higher level*
- Analysis
  - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
  - **2009-2010 Data:**  
Met the target for Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 for the number of students placed in a higher level  
Did not collect pass rate data for the number of students placed in a higher level
  - **2010-2011 Data:**  
Met the target for Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 for the number of students placed in a higher level  
Met the target for Fall 2010, but did not meet the target for Spring 2011 for the pass rate

- Improvements
    - List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results:  
We expanded the amount of data collected by including pass rates.
    - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:  
The number of students moved remained constant.
    - Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):  
\$1200 in additional funds was provided from the Academic Success Division's contingency funds. This allowed for additional staff time in the summer to compile and analyze data.
  - Recommendations/Actions for 2011-2012
    - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
Reading staff
    - Action Plan:  
The 2010-2011 academic year was the first year that we measured the pass rate. We will continue to move students and evaluate their success rate as measured by course completions with a passing grade of A-C from the data collected.
    - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):  
We will continue the evaluation and placement process at the beginning and end of each semester. The fall data is compiled and analyzed in the spring semester, and the spring data is completed in the summer.
    - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):  
The Reading Program will request an additional \$1200 in the 2012-2013 Budget to cover the time needed for 9-month staff to compile and analyze data in the summer.
- 

### Goal Statement #1:

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

### Outcome/Objective Statement 3B

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

Upon completion of the Pre-Test assessment, 2% of students tested will be placed in a Fast Track reading class, in order to complete TSI requirements. Of those students who were moved into Fast Track, 90% will pass the class with an A-C. (Revised 10/11)

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
  - **2009-2010 Data:**
    - Fall 2009 Data:** Numbers = 12 out of 631 and Percentage = 2%
    - Spring 2010 Data:** Numbers = 20 out of 595 and Percentage = 3%
    - The number of students who were placed in the Fast Track reading class out of the total number of students enrolled in Reading classes on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day*
  - **2010-2011 Data:**
    - Fall 2010 Data:** Numbers = 20 out of 683 and Percentage = 3%
    - Spring 2011 Data:** Numbers = 20 out of 573 and Percentage = 3%
    - The number of students who were placed in the Fast Track reading class out of the total number of students enrolled in Reading classes on the 12<sup>th</sup> class day*

- **Fall 2010 Data:** Numbers = 20 out of 20 and Percentage = 80%
  - **Spring 2011 Data:** Numbers = 20 out of 20 and Percentage = 100 %  
*The number of students who were placed in a Fast Track reading class and passed with an A-C out of the total number of students who were placed in the Fast Track class*
  - Analysis
    - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
 (Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
    - **2009-2010 Data:**  
 Met the target for Fall 2009 and Spring 2010 for the number of students placed in Fast Track  
 Did not collect pass rate data for the number of students placed in Fast Track
    - **2010-2011 Data:**  
 Met the target for Fall 2010 and Spring 2011 for the number of students placed in Fast Track  
 Did not meet the target for Fall 2010, but met the target for Spring 2011 for the pass rate.
  - Improvements
    - List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results:  
 We increased the number of students moved into Fast Track.  
 We expanded the amount of data collected by including pass rates.
    - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:  
 The system has been improved to accommodate more students.  
 The data allows us information needed to evaluate the success of Fast Track.
    - Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):  
 \$1200 in additional funds was provided from the Academic Success Division's contingency funds. This allowed for additional staff time in the summer to compile and analyze data.
  - Recommendations/Actions for 2011-2012
    - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
 Reading staff
    - Action Plan:  
 The 2010-2011 academic year was the first year that we measured the pass rate. We will continue to move students and evaluate their success rate as measured by course completions with a passing grade of A-C from the data collected.  
 We will continue to define the population of students who are moved into Fast Track and to increase the number of students served in the Fast Track program.
    - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):  
 We will continue the evaluation and placement process at the beginning and end of each semester. The fall data is compiled and analyzed in the spring semester, and the spring data is completed in the summer.  
 We will expand the process to include different populations throughout the semester.
    - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):  
 The Reading Program will request an additional \$1200 in the 2012-2013 Budget to cover the time needed for 9-month staff to compile and analyze data in the summer. (Total amount requested for the 2012-2013 Budget is \$1200.)
-

## Goal Statement #1:

*Adjust instruction and services based on assessment data. (AC Strategic Plan through 2015: Strategy 1.1).*

## Outcome/Objective Statement 4

**(Be sure to include audience, behavior, conditions, degree/benchmark, and evaluation method):**

Seventy percent of students who complete a Reading class will receive a grade of A-C. (10/11)

- Results (Provide Numbers and Percentages for Quantitative Data)
    - **2009-2010 Data:**
    - **2010-2011 Data:**
  - Analysis
    - Provide Previous Data/Result Analysis  
(Include if benchmark was met and how results relate to outcome statement):
    - **2009-2010 Data:**
    - **2010-2011 Data:**
  - Improvements
    - List any Improvements Made in the **2010-2011** (Last Academic) Year Based on the **2009-2010** PET Results:
    - Evaluate Why Improvements Were Successful/Were Not Successful:
    - Provide the Budget Information Needed to Make Past Improvements (Cost/Details):
  - Recommendations/Actions for **2011-2012**
    - Person Responsible (Who will complete the action?):  
Reading staff
    - Action Plan:  
We will collect, compile, and analyze data to determine the number of students who complete with a grade of A-C.  
We will exclude those students who never attended, stopped attending, and withdrew from the classes.
    - Expected Time Frame Needed to Implement Action Plan (Please provide specific deadline date):  
We will start collecting data in Fall 2011 and subsequent semesters.
    - Budget Information Needed for Future Action (Cost/Details):  
The Reading Program will request an additional \$1200 in the 2012-2013 Budget to cover the time needed for 9-month staff to compile and analyze data in the summer. (Total amount requested for the 2012-2013 Budget is \$1200.)
-