



EOPS Student Learning Outcome 1: Spring 2014 Pre-Orientation and Post-Orientation Assessment

Prepared by Benjamin Gamboa

Purpose of Brief

This brief provides a summary of evidence of the Spring 2014 pre/post assessment results for EOPS department Student Learning Outcome 1.

Summary of Evidence

Students were statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) and substantially ($ES = 0.90$) more likely to answer all ten questions correctly on the post-assessment (40%) than on the pre-assessment (17%) — an overall increase of 23%.

Overview

In Spring 2014, the Crafton Hills College (CHC) Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) Department will assess the following student learning outcome:

- SLO 1: New students who attend orientation will be familiar with eligibility requirements and services offered through the EOPS program.

Methodology

A pre-post assessment was developed to assess student knowledge of the EOPS program after the Orientation. The ten question multiple choice pre/post assessment was administered to the students at the beginning of the orientation to determine their knowledge level of the EOPS program. At the conclusion of the orientation, students were asked to answer the same ten multiple choice questions to determine how helpful the orientation was at informing students of EOPS requirements and available resources. 297 assessments were received in Spring 2014.

The effect size (ES) statistic is a commonly used quantitative technique in meta-analysis to determine the average effect of a given treatment. One method of interpreting effect size developed by Jacob Cohen defined effect sizes of 0.20, 0.50, and 0.80 as “small,” “medium,” and “large” effect sizes, respectively. Accordingly, a substantial effect would be 0.20 or higher. It is important to mention that the number of students in each group does not influence effect size; whereas, the number of students in each group does influence statistical significance (i.e. p -value < 0.05).

Findings

Table 1 illustrates the percentage correct for each assessment question and statistical difference between the pre-assessment and post-assessment responses.

Table 1. Pre/Post Assessment Results with Effect Size and Statistical Significance.

Question	Pre-Assessment			Post-Assessment			Effect Size & 95% CI			p-value
	% Correct	#	SD	% Correct	#	SD	ES	Lower	Upper	
1	0.92	291	0.276	0.97	264	0.172	0.22	0.06	0.39	0.008
2	0.64	290	0.479	0.89	260	0.311	0.61	0.43	0.78	<0.001
3	0.54	289	0.499	0.83	259	0.373	0.66	0.49	0.83	<0.001
4	0.84	292	0.368	0.98	256	0.139	0.50	0.33	0.67	<0.001
5	0.41	284	0.492	0.82	257	0.384	0.93	0.75	1.10	<0.001
6	0.60	281	0.491	0.90	247	0.302	0.73	0.55	0.90	<0.001
7	0.64	289	0.481	0.94	259	0.234	0.79	0.61	0.96	<0.001
8	0.93	284	0.250	0.98	257	0.151	0.21	0.04	0.38	0.016
9	0.44	277	0.498	0.74	254	0.439	0.63	0.45	0.80	<0.001
10	0.87	287	0.340	0.93	260	0.261	0.19	0.03	0.36	0.023
100% Correct	0.06	17	0.233	0.40	120	0.492	0.90	0.73	1.07	<0.001

Note: ‘#’ refers to the number of correct responses, ‘SD’ refers to standard deviation, and ‘CI’ refers to confidence interval.

Students were statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) and substantially ($ES = 0.90$) more likely to answer all ten questions correctly on the post-assessment than on the pre-assessment. Overall, 17% of the students answered all ten questions correctly on the pre-assessment and 40% of the students answered all ten questions correctly on the post-assessment.

Specific questions with the highest rate of knowledge improvement include question 5: How many contacts must students complete with an EOPS counselor, which substantially ($ES = 0.93$) improved from 41% of students answering correctly in the pre-assessment to 82% in the post-assessment, and question 7: What grade point average must you maintain for Satisfactory Academic Progress, which substantially ($ES = 0.79$) increased from 64% correct on the pre-assessment to 94% on the post-assessment.

Questions most likely to have correct answers on the pre-assessment were question 1 (92%): EOPS is an acronym for, question 8 (93%): How many units must you enroll in to continue in the EOPS Program, and question 10 (87%): Before adding or dropping classes, what are you required to do? Consequently, these questions also had the lowest percentages of improvement in student knowledge with questions 1 and 8 yielding a 5% increase, and question 10 yielding a 6% increase between the pre-assessment and post-assessment.

The two questions students were least likely to respond correctly to in the post-assessment include question 3: What educational disadvantaged criteria meet the eligibility requirements to enter the EOPS program (83%) and question 9: What are the time limits for EOPS students to continue in the program (74%). Although the percentage of students who answered question 3 correctly statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) and substantially ($ES = .59$) increased from 54% on the pre-assessment to 83% on the post-assessment. Similarly, the percentage of students who answered question 9 correctly statistically significantly ($p < 0.001$) and substantially ($ES = .51$) increased from 44% on the pre-assessment to 74% on the post-assessment.

Conclusion

This brief provides a summary of evidence for Spring 2014 pre/post assessment results for an EOPS department student learning outcome. The summary of evidence provided should be used to develop implications for program improvement and planning and complete the outcomes assessment cycle. Resources to complete the outcomes assessment cycle can be found on the Office of Institutional Effectiveness, Research and Planning [website](#).