

# **Oklahoma State University**

## **Assessment Report**

### **2000 - 2001**

Submitted to  
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education  
October 2001

Office of University Assessment  
210 PIO Building  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043  
405-744-6687  
email: [wallinj@okstate.edu](mailto:wallinj@okstate.edu)  
website: [www.okstate.edu/assess](http://www.okstate.edu/assess)



## Contents

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b><i>What's New in Assessment at OSU in 2000-2001</i> .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Introduction .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Entry-Level Assessment. ....</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>General Education Assessment (Mid-Level Assessment) .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Program Outcomes Assessment .....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Student Satisfaction Assessment .....</b>	<b>41</b>
<b>Graduate Student Assessment .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Special Assessment Projects .....</b>	<b>51</b>
<b><i>Appendix A. General Education Assessment Task Group Annual Report</i> .....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b><i>Appendix B. Outcomes Assessment Reports for OSU Degree Programs</i> .....</b>	<b>69</b>



**Oklahoma State University  
Annual Assessment Report, 2000 – 2001**

**Executive Summary**

**Entry-Level Assessment**

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist academic advisors in making placement decisions that will give students the best possible chance of academic success. Three methods assess a student's readiness for college-level coursework at OSU: scores from ACT subject tests, results from a predictive statistical model called Entry Level Placement Analysis (ELPA), and scores from COMPASS (ACT's Computer Adaptive Placement and Support System) placement tests. ELPA is a multiple regression model that uses high school grades, high school class rank and size, and ACT scores to predict student grades in entry-level courses. The predictions are based on the success of past OSU freshmen with similar academic records. All new students are assessed using ACT subject area and composite scores (or SAT equivalent) and results of ELPA. Students scoring below the designated ACT cutscores (19 in each subject area) and with predicted grades from ELPA of less than "C" in a particular subject area are recommended for remedial coursework. Students may waive a remedial course requirement by passing a COMPASS test. All students undergo entry-level assessment prior to enrollment.

In 2000-2001, entry-level assessment was conducted for all admitted and enrolled new freshmen and new transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours (n=3,606). After all entry-level assessment was completed in 2000-2001, 614 enrolled new students (17.0% of the total number enrolled) were recommended to take at least one remedial course. Additional entry-level assessment studies conducted in 2000-2001 included the *CIRP Freshman Survey* and the *College Student Inventory*.

Minor changes were made to the entry level assessment process in 2000-2001. The regression equations used in entry-level placement analysis were revised to incorporate high school curricular data into the predictive models.

**General Education Assessment**

The purpose of assessment of general education at OSU is to evaluate student achievement of institutionally recognized competencies in general education, including communication, analytical, and critical thinking skills. OSU students typically take general education courses throughout their undergraduate program. For this reason, the process is no longer referred to as 'Mid-Level Assessment' because assessment of general education focuses on student attainment of competencies in general education throughout the undergraduate curriculum and not necessarily at the mid-point of students' careers.

In 2000-2001, the General Education Assessment Task Force pilot tested the use of institutional portfolios to assess student achievement of one general education learner goal. An institutional portfolio is a collection of students' work, produced throughout the curriculum, that is used to evaluate students' achievement of a particular learning outcome. For example, the 2001 institutional portfolio consisted of examples of students' writing that were randomly selected assignments from a variety of OSU courses; these writing 'artifacts' were evaluated to assess students' skills in written communication. Faculty members evaluate the students' work using uniform scoring criteria that measure the extent to which students demonstrate proficiency with respect to the learning outcome being considered. Separate portfolios will be used to evaluate different general education learning outcomes.

The Task Force pilot tested this process in 2001 by developing and evaluating an institutional portfolio to assess students' skills in written communication, one of the general education learner goals. Examples of students' work that demonstrated skills in written communication were randomly selected assignments from 26 OSU general education and upper division classes. Five pieces (artifacts) of students' work were randomly selected from a single class assignment from each class (i.e., each artifact was produced by a different student). The task force developed and tested a scoring rubric to evaluate the artifacts in the portfolio. The final rubric consisted of a 5-point scale with descriptors for each of the five levels; a score of '5' indicated superior communication skills. The final evaluation process required that three reviewers assess and score each artifact independently, and then the reviewers met to develop consensus scores for each artifact.

A total of 86 randomly selected students participated in general education assessment in 2000-2001, although the process was transparent to these students. The final portfolio contained 86 artifacts of students' work that were used for assessment of the skills in written communication (some artifacts were dropped from the initial portfolio because the types of assignments did not lend themselves to this assessment). Information on the students' work that identified the students was eliminated after minimal demographic information was collected from institutional records for analysis purposes. Because information on particular students is not retained, the process does not allow student tracking. Rather, the process is aimed at providing a holistic assessment of students' achievement of the learner goals for general education.

Results from the pilot test were summarized, but the small sample size prevented extensive or conclusive analysis. Overall, 65% of artifacts received a score of 3 (the mid-point) or higher, and 98% of the artifacts received a score of 2 or higher. The frequency of scores of 3 or higher was highest for seniors and lowest for freshmen, suggesting maturity of writing skills with year class. In the future, data collection will allow more extensive analysis, including comparison of scores among colleges, degree programs, year classes, and other factors.

The Task Group was encouraged by the process and by the results. In 2002, they propose to develop three institutional portfolios. One portfolio will be used to assess skills in written communication (adding to the data collected in 2001), and new portfolios will be developed to assess student skills in oral and graphical communication and to evaluate students' skills in problem solving in the areas of mathematics and physical and natural sciences.

### **Program Outcomes Assessment**

Every degree program at OSU, including undergraduate and graduate degrees, is required to have a program outcomes assessment plan and to submit annual reports describing assessment activity. The plans and reports are prepared according to the organizational level that best suits each program; annual program outcomes assessment reports, therefore, may be submitted by colleges, schools, departments, or by individual degree programs depending on the organizational level that faculty from these programs have elected.

Academic units use a variety of methods to assess student-learning outcomes. The most commonly used assessment methods for undergraduate programs reported in 2000-2001 were:

- Capstone course projects, papers, presentations evaluated by faculty
- Senior projects & presentations
- Professional jurors or evaluators to evaluate projects, portfolios, exhibits, or performances

- Course-embedded assessments & Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)
- Exams – local comprehensive exams, local entry-to-program exams
- Exams – standardized national exams, certification or licensure exams,
- Exit interviews
- Internships – evaluations from supervisors, faculty members, student participants
- Portfolios - reviewed internally or externally
- Student competitions - intercollegiate
- Surveys - alumni
- Surveys - employers / recruiters
- Surveys – students, esp. seniors
- Surveys – faculty
- Tracking enrollment data, student academic performance (GPA in particular courses), degree completion rates
- Alumni employment tracking

In addition to these outcomes assessment methods, the Office of University Assessment coordinates alumni and student surveys and provides program-specific results to academic units for use in program outcomes assessment. Academic units use results of these surveys for program outcomes assessment.

Graduate programs reported the following outcomes assessment methods *in addition to* the methods described above:

- Qualifying exams
- Theses / dissertations / creative component papers, projects, presentations, and defenses
- Comprehensive exams
- Tracking research activity / publications / professional presentations / professional activity

Uses of assessment results are unique to each program but can be generally categorized as sharing assessment information with faculty members, developing curriculum changes, as needed, in response to assessment findings, and using assessment results to justify curriculum changes have recently been implemented. The most commonly cited uses of assessment results in 2000-2001 were:

- Changes in course content
- Addition / deletion of courses
- Changes in course sequences
- Changes in degree requirements or degree sheet options
- Development of tutorial and academic services for students
- Justification of past curriculum changes and to show program improvement resulting from those changes
- To further refine the assessment methods or to implement new assessment methods
- Changes in advising processes
- To facilitate curriculum discussions at faculty meetings, curriculum committee meetings, and faculty retreats
- Changes to student facilities such as computer labs and science labs
- Development of program-based websites to provide students with academic and program information

### **Student and Alumni Satisfaction Assessment**

Several surveys were conducted in 2000-2001 to assess student and alumni satisfaction, including the *2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs*, the *2000 National Survey of Student Engagement*, and the *Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory* (Tulsa campus only).

The *2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs* was conducted to evaluate career tracks, continued education, and general satisfaction of recent OSU alumni, and to assess achievement of program outcomes as perceived by alumni. A total of 677 telephone interviews (a 37% response rate) were completed with OSU graduate program alumni who graduated in calendar years 1995 and 2000. An estimated 65% of the survey participants were living in Oklahoma and 35% were living out of state. Ninety-six percent of alumni reported that they were satisfied with their overall educational experience at OSU. Alumni survey data were summarized for each academic program for use in program outcomes assessment. The survey's Common Questions addressed employment, continued education, and general satisfaction. Participating academic programs also developed program-specific survey questions for their alumni.

OSU participated in the *2000 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE)*, an initiative of the Pew Charitable Trusts that is nationally coordinated by the Indiana University Center for Post-Secondary Research & Planning. A total of 516 OSU seniors and first-year students participated in this survey in spring 2000 and results were available in fall 2000. OSU student data were compared with data from 13,507 students from 41 other U.S. Research I and II institutions. The survey primarily targeted issues related to how students spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Part of the survey, however, specifically addressed student satisfaction with their educational experiences. NSSE results indicated that OSU excels in terms of providing a supportive campus environment, fostering quality relationships for students within the academic community, and general satisfaction of the student body. The University plans to participate in this survey again in 2002.

The OSU-Tulsa Office of Academic Affairs coordinated the *Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory* for the Tulsa campus. This is the first year of formal assessment of student satisfaction for OSU students who are primarily on the Tulsa campus. A total of 213 self-selected students from the OSU-Tulsa campus participated in the survey. These students reported higher degrees of satisfaction with Instructional Effectiveness, Safety and Security, Registration Effectiveness, Concern for the Individual, Campus Climate, Support Services, Service Excellence, Student Centeredness, and Responsiveness to Diverse Population when compared to peer institutions. They also reported a lower degree of satisfaction with Campus Life when compared to peer institutions. OSU-Tulsa has taken several steps to enhance student satisfaction although students reported higher levels of satisfaction with most issues when compared to peer institutions. These developments are primarily in the areas of academic advising, registration processes, campus life and student centeredness, and instructional effectiveness. Future assessment efforts will focus on the impact of these developing programs on students' educational experiences.

## **Graduate Student Assessment**

Graduate student assessment is considered a part of the Program Outcomes Assessment conducted in each academic unit. Graduate student assessment methods, numbers of students assessed, results of assessments, and changes that occurred or are planned as a result of graduate program outcomes assessment are described and summarized in the section on Program Outcomes Assessment.

In addition to the graduate student assessment that occurs in each academic program, the Office of University Assessment also conducted a Graduate Program Alumni Survey in 2001. Results of this survey were provided to the Graduate College and each academic program received a summary of their alumni responses. The Graduate College and Assessment Office also coordinate an online Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey in alternate years; this survey is aimed at currently enrolled graduate students and will be conducted again in 2002.

## **What's New in Assessment at OSU in 2000-2001:**

- *Review of Outcomes Assessment Programs.* The most significant new development in assessment at OSU in 2000-2001 was the Assessment Council's new process of reviewing outcomes assessment programs for each academic unit. The reviews facilitate program outcomes assessment by providing information and recommendations to academic units about their assessment programs. In 2000-2001, the Council reviewed and provided constructive feedback regarding assessment efforts in 26 academic units. The reviews have resulted in revised assessment plans, new assessment initiatives, and better outcomes assessment reporting.
- *OSU Assessment Presentations at National Conferences.* OSU is increasingly represented on programs for national assessment conferences. In June 2001, two OSU presentations were given at the American Association of Higher Education's National Assessment Conference. Paul Bischoff (History Department), Nigel Jones (School of Architecture), and Julie Wallin (Office of University Assessment) presented, "Developing and communicating general education learner goals at a large public university," and Alfred Carlozzi (Graduate College), Julie Wallin, and Pamela Bowers (Student Affairs) presented "Using campus-wide resources to develop, implement, and use results from an online graduate student satisfaction survey."
- *Developing an Institutional Portfolio to Assess General Education.* The General Education Assessment Task Force has implemented and pilot tested a holistic, university-wide approach to assessing general education using institutional portfolios. This year, the task force developed and pilot tested an institutional portfolio to evaluate students' skills in written communication. The results of the written communication skills assessment will be shared with the Assessment Council, General Education Advisory Council, Instruction Council, and Academic Affairs leaders.
- *Assessment Meetings with OSU Administrative Leaders.* Dr. John Vitek, Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs and Julie Wallin, Director of University Assessment, met with all OSU Deans and Department Heads in fall 2000 to discuss roles and responsibilities regarding assessment, the purpose of assessment, assessment expectations, and the status of OSU's assessment program. The meetings were part of a campus-wide effort to increase awareness of assessment as a tool for self-study and program development.
- *OSU Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs.* The Office of University Assessment coordinated a university-wide survey of alumni of OSU graduate programs in 2000-2001. The survey provided data on careers, continued education, and satisfaction of alumni of OSU graduate programs who received their degrees in 1995 or 1999. A total of 677 telephone interviews were completed from a target population of 1,835 alumni, a response rate of 37%.
- *OSU-Tulsa Student Satisfaction Survey.* The OSU-Tulsa campus conducted its first formal evaluation of student satisfaction in spring 2001. The Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory was used to evaluate student satisfaction with a variety of topics related to academic experiences and student services. The survey results will be used in developing student programs and services on the rapidly growing OSU-Tulsa campus.

Additional information about these developments is available from the OSU Assessment Program Website at [www.okstate.edu/assess](http://www.okstate.edu/assess).



## **Introduction**

Assessment at Oklahoma State University is a part of the institution's commitment to continuous program improvement and to sustaining and enhancing academic quality and the student experience. OSU's assessment program has developed and expanded considerably over the past several years as demonstrated by increased numbers of presentations at national conferences by OSU faculty members about assessment at OSU, increased involvement of faculty members in assessment committees and assessment projects, university-wide coordination of alumni and student surveys to provide feedback to academic units for assessment purposes, and increased involvement of the Assessment Council in providing constructive feedback to academic units about their outcomes assessment programs.

Assessment at OSU results from the coordinated efforts of many individuals. Faculty members, department heads, and deans who are involved in assessment in their academic units form the foundation of successful assessment at OSU. The Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs oversees assessment at OSU by chairing the OSU Assessment Council, supervising the Office of University Assessment, and conveying assessment information to campus leaders. The Assessment Council guides the development of assessment at OSU and approves use of student assessment fees. The Office of University Assessment conducts university-wide surveys and special assessment projects, provides funding and information for the development of successful assessment programs, and coordinates the dissemination of assessment information and annual reporting. Institutional Research administers entry-level assessment and provides data for assessments at other levels. The Division of Student Affairs collaborates on assessments of student and alumni satisfaction. The Admissions Office, University Testing Services, and the OSU Bureau for Social Research also assist in collecting assessment data.

This eighth annual OSU Assessment Report is prepared in compliance with the State Regents' *"Policy Statement on Assessment of Students for the Purposes of Instructional Improvement and State System Accountability"* and annual guidelines from the OSRHE. The report summarizes all assessment activity from the Stillwater and Tulsa campuses of Oklahoma State University. As instructed by the State Regents', the report provides responses to specific questions in the areas of entry level assessment, mid-level assessment, program outcomes assessment, assessment of student and alumni satisfaction, and assessment of graduate programs. The report also provides an overview of OSU special assessment projects and new developments in assessment for 2000-2001.



## **Entry-Level Assessment**

The purpose of entry-level assessment is to assist academic advisors in making placement decisions that will give the student the best possible chance of academic success.

### **1. What methods were used for entry-level course placement? What were the instruments and cut-scores used for each subject area and course?**

The Office of University Assessment, Institutional Research, Admissions, and University Testing Services jointly accomplish entry-level assessment at OSU. Three methods assess student's readiness for college level coursework: the ACT (consisting of four subtests in English, Reading, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning), results of the Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA; developed by OSU), and the COMPASS placement test (Computer Adaptive Placement and Support System, produced by ACT).

Each first-time entering student (new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours) receives a Student Assessment Report that is produced by the Entry Level Placement Analysis program. This report summarizes:

- the student's academic information (ACT scores, high school GPA and class rank),
- the results of ELPA (described below),
- curricular and performance deficiencies that require remediation, and
- recommendations and requirements for course placement.

The recommendations and requirements for course placement follow OSU guidelines and have been approved by the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education.

*ACT Scores.* ACT subscores in Reading, English, Mathematics, and Science Reasoning are used for the first level of assessment. An ACT subscore of 19 or above (or SAT equivalent) automatically qualifies a student for college-level coursework (1000-level university courses) in that subject area. The ACT subscore in Reading is used to indicate readiness for introductory college courses that require extensive reading (Sociology, Political Science, Psychology, History, Economics, and Philosophy).

*Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA).* All students, regardless of ACT subscores, are also assessed using Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA), a multiple-regression model that uses high school grades (overall grades and grades in each subject area), high school class rank, and ACT composite and subject area scores to predict student grades in selected entry-level OSU courses. These predictions are based on the success of past OSU freshmen with similar academic records. The predictive models for ELPA are updated annually. For each student, ELPA produces a predicted grade index (PGI) that represents the grade that the student is predicted to obtain in selected entry-level courses. A PGI of 2.0 or higher indicates a predicted grade of 'C' or better. The PGI serves to alert the student and advisor of potential problems when predicted grades are low. The PGI is also used to recommend college level placement for students with ACT subscores below 19. Students with ACT subscores below 19 may be cleared for enrollment in 1000-level university courses if their predicted grade in the subject area (from ELPA) is 2.0 or higher.

*COMPASS.* Students with ACT subscores below 19 and with predicted grades of less than 2.0 in a particular subject area (from ELPA) may take the ACT COMPASS placement test to qualify for college-level courses. COMPASS placement tests are available in the subject areas of Mathematics,

Reading, and English. Students may also take a science placement test that combines elements from the COMPASS mathematics and reading subject tests.

The cut-scores for the COMPASS tests in each subject area are shown in Table 1.1

<b>Table 1.1.</b> Cut-scores for the COMPASS placement test.		
<b>Subject Area:</b>	<b>Compass Score</b>	<b>Course Placement</b>
Mathematics	Algebra 0-35	Beginning Algebra
	Algebra 36-54	MATH 0123
	Algebra 55-100	MATH 1513, 1483, or 1493
English	English 0-55	ENGL 0123
	English 56-100	ENGL 1113
Reading (Sociology, History, Political Science, Psychology, Economics, and Philosophy)	Reading 0-70	CIED 0123
	Reading 71-100	No restrictions
Science (Biology, Chemistry, Geography, Geology, and Physics)	Reading 0-70 <i>or</i> Algebra 0-55	UNIV 0111
	Reading 71-100 <i>and</i> Algebra 55-100	No restrictions

**2. How were instruments administered? Which students were assessed? Describe how and when they were assessed, including options for the students to seek retesting, tutoring, or other academic support.**

All first-time entering students (new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 hours) are assessed using Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA) and all students are provided a Student Assessment Report describing the entry-level assessment results. The Student Assessment Reports are produced by the Office of Institutional Research and are distributed to students by the Admissions Office. The reports are included in each student's file and are available when the student meets with their advisor for enrollment; hence, this assessment primarily occurs just prior to the spring and fall enrollment periods.

In 2000-2001, a total of 3,606 admitted and enrolled new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours were assessed via entry-level placement analysis.

Students who were not cleared for 1000-level courses have several options. They may enroll in the remedial (zero-level, non-credit) course that is recommended; they may take the ACT test again, or they may take the COMPASS placement test to demonstrate proficiency in the subject area. Students may take the COMPASS test in any subject area twice free of charge at University Testing and Evaluation Services. Students may prepare for the COMPASS placement test by visiting the ACT COMPASS website and viewing sample questions and information on COMPASS test content.

Entry-level assessment process also includes evaluation of educational readiness, educational goals, study skills, values, self-concept, and motivation, as per the State Regent's Assessment Policy. These important aspects of the entry-level are included in the assessment process when students meet with their advisors prior to enrollment.

Many resources are available to OSU students for academic support. The *Math Learning Resources Center* provides individual tutoring in mathematics. The *Writing Center* provides tutors, writing coaches, a grammar hotline, and assistance with word processing. *University Counseling* provides services to help students improve their study habits, deal with test anxiety, develop better time management skills, and explore careers. The *College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology* provides students with additional academic support by offering 'Academic Excellence Workshops' that provide tutoring in entry-level calculus, physics, chemistry, and engineering science courses for all students enrolled in these classes. *University Academic Services (UAS)* also offers information and free tutoring to students. In 2000-2001, UAS offered free tutoring services to all OSU students. The *College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources* also offers a special program, Freshman in Transition (FIT), aimed at providing new students with academic support services to facilitate their first year experience. This is described in detail in the section on Special Assessment Projects.

### 3. What were the analyses and findings from the 2000-01 entry-level assessment?

In 2000-2001, Student Assessment Reports were produced for all admitted and enrolled new freshmen and new transfers with fewer than 24 credit hours (n= 3,606). Each Student Assessment Report contained the student's high school data, ACT scores, results of ELPA, and course placement recommendations and requirements. Table 3.1 shows the number of enrolled students who had performance deficiencies in each subject area based on ACT scores (i.e., ACT subscores <19) and the number of these deficiencies that were cleared using ELPA (i.e., cleared based on high school performance in particular core curriculum areas).

**Table 3.1.** Number of enrolled new students with ACT scores below 19 in each subject area and number of these students who were cleared for college-level coursework by Entry-Level Placement Analysis (ELPA) in 2000-2001.

<b>Subject Area</b>	<b># of Students with ACT Subscores &lt;19*</b>	<b># of Students Cleared for College-Level Coursework by ELPA</b>
English	548	313
Mathematics	770	237
Reading	528	236
Science	374	71

\*Some students had ACT subscores <19 in more than one subject area.

Students who were required to take remedial classes after the ELPA assessment could take a COMPASS placement test in their area(s) of deficiency. The number of students who took the COMPASS test in each subject area are described in Table 3.2.

**Table 3.2.** Number of students who took COMPASS placement tests in 2000-2001.

<b>Subject Area</b>	<b># of Students who took a COMPASS placement test*</b>	<b># of Students who Passed</b>
English	166	113
Mathematics	217	17
Reading	167	151

\*Some students took COMPASS tests in more than one area

After all entry-level assessments were completed, 614 enrolled new students (17.0 % of the total number enrolled) were recommended to take at least one remedial course. This percentage is consistent with previous years; in 1999-2000, 15.9% of new students were recommended for at least one remedial course, and in 1998-1999, 18.8% of new students were recommended for at least one remedial course.

Of the 3,606 enrolled new students in 2000-2001, 136 (3.8%) were recommended to enroll in remedial English classes; 520 (14.4%) in remedial math classes; 151 (4.2 %) in remedial science classes, and 156 (4.3%) in remedial reading classes. These findings are also similar to previous years.

**4. How was student progress tracked? Describe analyses of student success in both remedial and college-level courses, effectiveness of the placement decisions, evaluation of cut-scores, and changes in the entry-level assessment process as a result of findings.**

*Tracking of student success in remedial and college-level courses.* Annual trends in grades, drops, withdraws, and failure rates in common freshman courses are monitored as each new semester of data is added to the database by Institutional Research. Results of this tracking are shared each semester with the Directors of Student Academic Services.

The Office of University Assessment and Office of Institutional Research work cooperatively to evaluate the entry-level assessment, track student success in remedial and college-level courses, and share this information with the Directors of Student Academic Services. Tracking conducted in 2001 indicated that students who successfully completed a remedial course (i.e., achieve a grade of 'C' or higher) in a particular subject area had success rates in 1000-level courses in the same subject area that were similar to the success rates of students who did not have any performance deficiencies. In comparison, students who did not successfully complete a remedial course when a performance deficiency was indicated were less likely to successfully pass a college-level course in that subject area. This supports the current placement decision process and suggests that remedial coursework assists students in successfully completing introductory-level courses at OSU.

*Evaluation of cut-scores.* No changes were made in cut-scores in 2000-2001.

*Changes in entry-level assessment.* Minor changes were made to ELPA in 2000-2001. The regression equations used in the ELPA statistical model to predict success in entry-level courses were revised to incorporate grade information from high school subject-areas.

The use of COMPASS placement tests for Science placement also changed in 2000-2001. Prior to fall 2000, the DOS version of the COMPASS software was modified to create a science placement test from portions of the COMPASS reading and math tests. The Windows version of the COMPASS software did not allow this modification. The Directors of Student Academic Services and the Vice President for Academic Affairs approved (for fall 2000) a policy regarding science placement testing where students may satisfy a science performance deficiency by meeting one of these criteria:

1. Students who are clear for enrollment in college-level math *and* college-level reading-intensive courses (sociology, psychology, history, political science, economics, or philosophy) may enroll in college-level science courses.
2. Students who pass the COMPASS math *and* COMPASS reading tests may enroll in college-level science courses.
3. Students who achieve an ACT Science subscore of 19 or higher may enroll in college-level science courses.

## 5. What other studies of entry-level assessment have been conducted at the institution?

***The CIRP Freshman Survey.*** The CIRP Freshman Survey is conducted at OSU as part of a nationwide survey conducted jointly by the American Council on Education and the University of California at Los Angeles' Higher Education Research Institute. The survey was conducted periodically from the mid-1960's to the early 90's at OSU and then annually from 1991 through 2000. Starting in fall 2000, the CIRP survey will be conducted in alternate years at OSU. The Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs administers the CIRP survey with financial support from the Office of University Assessment.

In fall 2000, a total of 1,915 of first-time, full-time freshmen participated in the CIRP survey during the first week of fall semester (about 62% of new OSU freshmen). The study provides information about the expectations, attitudes, and high school experiences of OSU freshmen and freshmen nationwide. Results of the CIRP survey are used (1) to identify areas that may become problems for students during their first year; (2) as discussion items in orientation classes and by academic advisors working with new freshmen, and (3) in developing programs for students by providing current information about what is important to students, what they hope to accomplish, what they are concerned about, and how they intend to become involved in the campus community.

***Evaluation of Camp Cowboy.*** Camp Cowboy is an orientation experience for new students offered in the summer. Evaluations of the five sessions of Camp Cowboy 2000 were completed by 324 of the 343 camp participants for a return rate of about 94%. A report summarizing the results of the evaluations and providing comparisons of the five camps was completed for the Campus Life office. Evaluation focused primarily on overall satisfaction with the camp and with specific components of the experience.

The ***College Student Survey***, a follow-up survey to the CIRP survey aimed at seniors, was also administered in spring 2001. Results of this survey will be presented in the 2001-2002 Annual Assessment Report.

***The College Student Inventory.*** The College Student Inventory (CSI) is part of the Retention Management System developed by Noel-Levitz, Inc. The survey is given to new students during their first few days on campus and measures specific motivational variables that are closely related to persistence and academic success in college. This survey was administered to all new freshmen in the College of Human Environmental Sciences. The college combines the CSI data with other background and academic information and tracks the academic success of these students. Information from the survey is used in student-advisor conferences and is used to identify problems that could impede academic success. Overall results of the CSI are used to identify the factors that contribute to persistence or withdrawal among incoming students and to develop programs and strategies to enhance student retention. Retention of freshmen to sophomores in CHES, and in all OSU colleges, is increasing.

## 6. What instructional changes occurred or are planned due to entry-level assessment?

Entry-level assessment information is used in a variety of ways in OSU colleges.

- Continued support for the Student Assessment Reports and results of entry-level placement analysis indicates that results of entry-level assessment are integral to the process of advising new students prior to enrollment.
- Colleges report using the results of the CIRP Freshman Survey and other OSU student surveys in their freshmen orientation courses as a means of stimulating discussion about student study habits, attitudes, and expectations about college. This year, the *Freshman Success @ OSU* brochure was revised to include current OSU student survey information; the brochure is used as a tool to disseminate assessment information to OSU students.
- The *Freshmen in Transition* (FIT) program for College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources students is in its second year and is aimed at developing a supportive academic community for new students (see Special Assessment Projects). This program resulted partly from several years of data collected from the College Student Inventory.
- The College of Human Environmental Sciences uses the results of the College Student Inventory to enhance one-on-one advisement of students and to develop courses, programs, and services for new students.



## **General Education Assessment**

The purpose of assessment of general education at OSU is to evaluate student achievement of institutionally recognized competencies in general education, including communication, analytical, and critical thinking skills. OSU students typically take general education courses throughout their undergraduate program. For this reason, the process is no longer referred to as 'Mid-Level Assessment' because assessment of general education focuses on student attainment of competencies in general education throughout the undergraduate curriculum and not necessarily at the mid-point of students' careers. The OSU faculty General Education Assessment Task Force has adopted a holistic approach to assessing student achievement of the expected learning goals of the General Education Program. This committee's philosophy for assessment of general education is that effectiveness of the general education program should be demonstrable across the curriculum, not only in general education courses.

In addition to the holistic approach to the assessment of general education learner goals described in this section, many individual academic programs incorporate various types of mid-level assessment of reading, writing, mathematics, and critical thinking skills into their program assessment efforts. These are described in the program outcomes assessment reports for each academic program (Appendix A). A good example of mid-level assessment as part of an academic unit's overall program assessment is in the College of Human Environmental Sciences, where critical thinking skills and dispositions are formally assessed at the sophomore / junior level.

### **7. What measures were used to assess reading, writing, mathematics, critical thinking, and other institutionally recognized general education competencies? Describe how assessment activities were linked to the institutional general education program competencies.**

#### **General Education Learner Goals:**

In 1999-2000, the OSU faculty General Education Assessment Task Force identified six major learning goals for the OSU General Education Program. These learning goals now form the basis for the general education assessment process. The learning goals are:

1. Students will communicate original thought in written composition, speech, and graphic representations.
2. Students will identify, evaluate critically, and seek solutions to complex problems.
3. Students will use the tools of mathematics and physical or biological sciences to solve problems and interpret the results.
4. Students will have knowledge of the relationship between historic and contemporary issues and will understand contemporary issues with sensitivity to a rapidly changing, diverse, and complex world.
5. Students will have an understanding of the beliefs that guide human actions and their consequences.
6. Students will have an understanding of how the content knowledge from general education courses applies to the practice of their discipline and to other disciplines, to society, and to their own lives.

### Institutional Portfolios to Assess General Education Learner Goals

Student achievement of the general education learner goals is evaluated through the use of institutional portfolios. We define an institutional portfolio as a collection of students' work, produced throughout the curriculum, that is used to evaluate students' achievement of a particular learning outcomes. Faculty members evaluate the students' work in the portfolio using uniform scoring criteria that measure the extent to which students demonstrate proficiency with respect to the learning outcomes being considered. Separate portfolios will be used to evaluate different general education learner goals.

In 2001, the Task Force determined that written communication skills should be the first general education goal to be assessed, and a portfolio was developed to pilot test the process of developing and using a rubric to evaluate student work in an institutional portfolio.

Collection of Student Work: Examples of student work that demonstrated skills in written communication were randomly selected from assignments from 26 OSU general education and upper division classes in 2000-2001. Five 'artifacts' of students' work were randomly selected from a single class assignment from each class (i.e., each artifact was produced by a different student). The 26 courses represented a convenience sample because faculty members "volunteered" writing artifacts from their courses. The assignments included term papers; short writing assignments, essays, and essay questions on exams. The artifacts were copied and returned to the instructor immediately.

Development of the scoring rubric: Two members of the Task Force developed an initial rubric for evaluating the artifacts of student work and submitted it to the entire committee for evaluation. The rubric was tested and modified through a process where each committee member read and evaluated a set of artifacts using the rubric and then the entire committee met to discuss results. The process resulted in further modifications and clarifications to the rubric, and the process was repeated until the task group members agreed that the members were evaluating the artifacts in a similar manner. The rubric development process is described in detail in the General Education Assessment Task Force Annual Report for 2001 (Appendix A).

Assessment of writing artifacts: After the final rubric was accepted, the task group split into two groups of three, and each group evaluated the remaining artifacts of student work. The final evaluation process required that three reviewers assess and score each artifact independently, and then the reviewers met to develop consensus scores for each artifact.

**8. Which and how many students participated in general education assessment?  
Describe how the instruments were administered and how students were selected.  
Describe strategies to motivate students to participate meaningfully.**

A total of 86 randomly selected student participated in general education assessment in 2000-2001, although the process was transparent to these students. Some artifacts (44 out of the total 130 that were collected) were omitted from the portfolio after the committee decided to not use in-class writing or short-answers on exams to evaluate written communication skills and some artifacts were dropped because of copying errors. The goal for future portfolios is to have at least 100 artifacts of student work available for scoring.

The artifacts were coded immediately after they were copied, and information that identified the individual student was eliminated after minimal demographic information was collected from institutional records for analysis purposes. This information included the students' graduation credit hours, transfer credit hours, major, gender, and ACT scores, but did not include any information that could be used to identify the individual student. Because information on particular students is not retained, the process does not allow student tracking.

One of the biggest advantages of using institutional portfolios to assess general education is that it utilizes student work that is already produced in the curriculum, thereby eliminating the need to motivate student participation.

### 9. How was student progress tracked into future semesters and what were the findings?

The institutional portfolio approach to general education assessment does not allow tracking of individual students into future semesters. The process is aimed at providing a holistic assessment of students' achievement of the learner goals in general education.

### 10. What were the analyses and findings from the 2000-01 mid-level assessment?

Results of this year's assessment of student skills in written communication are considered tentative because of the small number of student artifacts (n=86) in the portfolio and because the portfolio represents only one year of information. Over time, more artifacts of student work collected from greater numbers and kinds of courses will allow more definite conclusions about student written communication skills.

The preliminary analysis and findings from the 2001 institutional portfolio are described in the Task Force's annual report (Appendix A). The overall distribution of artifact scores from the final 86 artifacts included in the 2001 portfolio assessment of written communication skills were as follows:

Artifact Score:	1	2	3	4	5	Total
Number:	2	28	36	15	5	86
Percent:	2.3%	32.6%	41.9%	17.4%	5.8%	

The artifacts were scored using a 5-point rubric where a 5 indicated excellent skills in written communication (the rubric is shown in Appendix A).

Parametric and non-parametric statistical tests indicated no significant differences in artifact scores among colleges or among classes. Again, the sample sizes may be too small at this time to detect meaningful differences. Initial results show that the occurrence of scores of 3 or higher was highest for seniors and lowest for freshmen, suggesting maturity of writing skills with year class even though a statistically significant difference was not evident. Preliminary analysis also indicated significant correlations between artifact scores and ACT scores, gpa, and major, but the small samples sizes prevent meaningful discussion of those findings. Future years of data collection will allow more conclusive analysis.

**11. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the general education program due to mid-level assessment?**

The General Education Assessment Task Force intends to establish a means whereby interpretive data will be disseminated both to the administration and to faculty for the purpose of considering revisions of the general education program. In fall 2001, results from this initial process of institutional portfolio assessment will be shared with the General Education Advisory Council, the Assessment Council, and the Instruction Council.

The General Education Assessment Task Force will repeat the assessment of written communication skills next semester and also plans to evaluate skills in oral communication and to evaluate problem-solving skills in the sciences and mathematics.



## **Program Outcomes Assessment**

### **12. Attach a table listing the assessment measures and number of individuals assessed for the degree program or department.**

Table 12.1 summarizes the assessment methods and number of individuals assessed for each undergraduate and graduate degree program at OSU. Details about assessment methods and numbers of individuals assessed are provided in the individual assessment reports or report summaries submitted by each college, department, or degree program (Appendix B).

Academic units use a variety of methods to assess student-learning outcomes. The most commonly reported assessment methods in 2000-2001 were:

- Capstone course projects, papers, presentations evaluated by faculty
- Senior projects & presentations
- Course-embedded assessments & Classroom Assessment Techniques (CATs)
- Exams – local comprehensive exams, local entry-to-program exams
- Exams – standardized national exams, certification or licensure exams,
- Exit interviews
- Internships – evaluations from supervisors, faculty members, student participants
- Portfolios - reviewed internally or externally
- Professional jurors or evaluators to evaluate projects, portfolios, exhibits, or performances
- Student competitions - intercollegiate
- Surveys - alumni
- Surveys - employers / recruiters
- Surveys – students, esp. seniors
- Surveys – faculty
- Tracking enrollment data, student academic performance (GPA in particular courses), degree completion rates
- Alumni employment tracking

In addition to the common program outcomes assessments described above, many programs have developed unique assessments methods for their programs. For example, the Forestry Department uses a required ‘summer camp’ educational work experience to evaluate student achievement of program learning outcomes, and the College of Education’s Professional Education Unit uses a tutorial software for assessment.

Graduate programs reported the following assessments *in addition to* the methods described above:

- Qualifying exams
- Theses / dissertations / creative component papers, projects, presentations, and defenses
- Comprehensive exams
- Tracking research activity / publications / professional presentations / professional activity

**Table 12.1. Assessment methods and numbers of individuals assessed** for each college, department, and degree program at OSU, including graduate degrees, reported for 2000-2001. Details assessment methods and individuals assessed are described in the individual assessment reports provided in this report.

**College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources**

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
<b><u>Ag Education, Communication, and 4-H Youth Development</u></b>		
B.S., Ag Communication option	• Intern Performance - evaluations by intern supervisors	• 30
	• Capstone course w/ senior project	• 30
	• National competition (National ACT Critique & Contest)	• 18
	• Senior exit interviews	• 29
B.S., Ag Education, Professional Service option	• Internships - evaluations by visiting faculty and student reports, presentations, surveys	• 22
	• related to the internship experience	
	• Senior exit interviews	
B.S., Ag Education, Teaching option	• Portfolios - traditional	• 25
	• Portfolios – digital	• 18
	• Results from State Licensure exams – OSAT test	• 41
	• Results from State Licensure exams - OPTE test	• 26
<b><u>Agricultural Economics</u></b>		
B.S., M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey (Alumni of Graduate Programs)	• 15
	• Exit interviews	• 55
	• Transcript analysis	• 145
<b><u>Animal Science</u></b>		
B.S.	• Capstone course assignments used to evaluate communication skills (papers and oral presentations)	• Approx. 200
	• Student satisfaction survey in capstone course	
	• Intercollegiate academic competition - Animal Science Quadrathlon	
	• Intercollegiate Judging Teams	
	• Certification Exams (American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists)	
M.S., PhD.	• Thesis or dissertation with defense	• 12 (MS)
	• Final exam seminar and thesis defense	• 6 (PhD)
	• Comprehensive exams (PhD)	
	• Certification Exams (American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists)	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

<b><u>Biochemistry &amp; Molecular Biology</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Standardized exams - American Chemical Society exam in Biochemistry</li> <li>Student exit interviews</li> <li>Grades in key courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>15 (BS, CAS)</li> <li>14 (BS, CASNR)</li> <li>14</li> </ul>
M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Student degree completion tracking</li> <li>Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>217 (MS), 145 (PhD)</li> <li>9</li> </ul>
<b><u>Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Senior exit surveys</li> <li>Senior exit interviews</li> <li>Capstone Design Course surveys</li> <li>Fundamentals of Engineering Examination (national)</li> <li>Alumni survey</li> <li>Core curriculum grades</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8</li> <li>6</li> <li>16</li> <li>29</li> <li>14</li> </ul>
<b><u>Entomology and Plant Pathology</u></b>		
B.S., M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit interviews - written and oral</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>13</li> </ul>
<b><u>Environmental Science</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit interviews</li> <li>Student tracking - academic performance and degree completion</li> <li>Capstone course w/ student projects evaluated by clients</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>12</li> </ul>
<b><u>Forestry</u></b>		
B.S., M.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Exit interviews</li> <li>Capstone course – student performance, faculty questionnaires, student questionnaires,</li> <li>Post-summer camp retention and graduation rates</li> <li>Alumni survey (1994-1998)</li> <li>Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10</li> <li>10</li> <li>all</li> </ul>
<b><u>Horticulture and Landscape Architecture</u></b>		
B.S., Horticulture options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Tracking student graduation rates and academic performance</li> <li>Intercollegiate competitions (Horticulture Judging Contest)</li> <li>Exit interviews</li> <li>Internships – student and employer evaluations</li> <li>Alumni Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>23</li> <li>8</li> <li>12</li> <li>17</li> <li>22</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

B.S., Landscape Architecture (LA) and Landscape Contracting (LC) options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tracking student enrollment, graduation rates, and employment status</li> <li>• Records of visiting lecturers / critics</li> <li>• Professional jurors – evaluation of student projects</li> <li>• Records of student portfolio reviews</li> <li>• Capstone course evaluation</li> <li>• Exit interviews</li> <li>• Design Competition</li> <li>• Internships</li> <li>• Learning styles inventory</li> <li>• Portfolios – digital</li> <li>• Study abroad survey</li> <li>• Intercollegiate competitions (ALCA field day)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 84 LA, LC</li> <li>• 84 LA, LC</li> <li>• 43 LA, LC</li> <li>• 8 LA</li> <li>• 8 LA</li> <li>• 10 LA, LC</li> <li>• 12 LA</li> <li>• 7 LA, LC</li> <li>• 14 LA, LC</li> <li>• 18 LA</li> <li>• 8 LA</li> <li>• 12 LC</li> </ul>
M.Ag., M.S. (Hort and Hort-related degrees)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exams – preliminary, qualifying, and final</li> <li>• Thesis, formal reports, informal reports, or creative component</li> <li>• Publications in print</li> <li>• Professional presentations</li> <li>• Exit interviews</li> <li>• Student awards, scholarships, honorary societies</li> <li>• Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 to 12 (depending on the method)</li> </ul>
<b><u>Plant and Soil Sciences</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Entry level placement tracking for all graduates</li> <li>• Tracking participation, leadership, and awards in student organizations</li> <li>• Intercollegiate competitions (several)</li> <li>• Tracking student progress through the degree program</li> <li>• Exit interviews (informal)</li> <li>• Senior seminar course</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 20 graduating seniors</li> <li>• 80 undergraduates</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods &amp; Number Assessed

## College of Arts and Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
<b><u>Art Department</u></b>		
B.A., Art History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• OK Conference of Art Historians</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 0</li> </ul>
B.A., B.F.A., Studio Art	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portfolio Review by outside evaluator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3</li> </ul>
B.F.A., Graphic Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Portfolio Review by outside evaluator</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 17</li> </ul>
<b><u>Botany Department</u></b>		
M.S. Botany	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4</li> </ul>
<b><u>Chemistry Department</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alumni survey (PhD only)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6 BS</li> </ul>
M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit interviews</li> <li>• Graduate student research symposia</li> <li>• Input from Colleges served by the Department</li> <li>• Research reports from capstone course (BS only)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 MS</li> <li>• 6 PhD</li> </ul>
<b><u>Communication Sciences and Disorders Department</u></b>		
B.S. in CSD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capstone course grades, observation summaries, and projects</li> <li>• Alumni surveys</li> <li>• Senior surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 23 &amp; 27 students in capstone courses</li> <li>• 20 seniors</li> <li>• 37 alumni</li> </ul>
M.A. in Speech	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student representation on curriculum &amp; clinic committees</li> <li>• Exit written and oral interviews</li> <li>• Evaluation of students in internship placements</li> <li>• National certification examination</li> <li>• Alumni and employer surveys</li> <li>• Employment tracking</li> <li>• Professional society surveys</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8-37, depending on method</li> </ul>
<b><u>Computer Science Department</u></b>		
B.S., M.S., PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Senior-level course surveys</li> <li>• Alumni surveys</li> <li>• Internship evaluations (employer surveys)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15</li> <li>• 8</li> <li>• 5</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

<b><u>English Department</u></b>		
M.A., PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit interviews</li> <li>• Alumni Survey</li> <li>• Admission and graduation rates</li> <li>• Student research, publications, and awards</li> <li>• Graduate evaluations by faculty</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3</li> <li>• 23</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
<b><u>Foreign Languages and Literatures Department</u></b>		
B.A. in French, German, Russian, or Spanish	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitoring grades in required advanced courses</li> <li>• Exit interviews</li> <li>• Scores and pass rates from Teacher Certification exams</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 80</li> <li>• 14</li> <li>• 8</li> </ul>
<b><u>Geography Department</u></b>		
B.A. or B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Written exit exam</li> <li>• Written exit interview</li> <li>• Oral exit interview</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15</li> </ul>
M.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit interview</li> <li>• Faculty review</li> <li>• Transcript/Plan of study review</li> <li>• Alumni survey</li> <li>• Oral Proposal and Final Defenses</li> <li>• Theses/Creative components completed</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2</li> <li>• 36</li> <li>• 18</li> <li>• 36</li> <li>• 11</li> <li>• 7</li> </ul>
<b><u>School of Geology</u></b>		
B.S. and M.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capstone course performance</li> <li>• Exit survey</li> <li>• Job placement survey</li> <li>• Graduation and retention rates</li> <li>• Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey</li> <li>• Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs</li> <li>• Thesis defense outcome</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 B.S.</li> <li>• 5 B.S. and 4 M.S.</li> <li>• 8 B.S. and 10 M.S.</li> <li>• 8 B.S. and 10 M.S.</li> <li>• 6 M.S.</li> <li>• 10 M.S.</li> </ul>
<b><u>History Department</u></b>		
B.A., History	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of majors in required survey courses</li> <li>• Analysis of upper-division history electives taken</li> <li>• Evaluation of performance in capstone courses, including review of student portfolios</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 104</li> </ul>
<b><u>School of Journalism &amp; Broadcasting</u></b>		
B.A., B.S. Journalism / Broadcasting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Capstone (terminal) course performance</li> <li>• Language exam (freshman/sophomore and junior/senior)</li> <li>• Internship evaluation</li> <li>• Alumni survey</li> <li>• Accreditation review</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 112</li> <li>• 251</li> <li>• 47</li> <li>• (not available)</li> <li>• entire program</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

M.S. Mass Communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Interviews</li> <li>• Comprehensive exams</li> <li>• Creative component</li> <li>• Thesis</li> <li>• Dissertation</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2</li> <li>• 11</li> <li>• 2</li> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 1</li> </ul>
<b><u>Mathematics Department</u></b>		
B.S., Math	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Survey</li> <li>• Grades in core courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5</li> <li>• 13</li> </ul>
M.S. and Ph.D.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Comprehensive exams</li> <li>• Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 21 M.S. and 2 Ph.D.</li> <li>• 17</li> </ul>
<b><u>Microbiology and Molecular Genetics Department</u></b>		
B.S., MS, PhD in Microbiology; B.S. in Cell & Molecular Biology, and BS in Med Technology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit interview</li> <li>• Mail questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12 B.S. and 1 Ph.D.</li> <li>• 3</li> </ul>
<b><u>Music Department</u></b>		
B.A. Music in Education, Performance, and Business	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student teaching evaluations</li> <li>• Oklahoma Subject Area Test</li> <li>• Admission to Professional Education Program – interview</li> <li>• Alumni survey</li> <li>• Senior recital</li> <li>• Vocal juried audition</li> <li>• Instrumental juried audition</li> <li>• Keyboard juried auditions</li> <li>• NATS adjudicated performance</li> <li>• Departmental exit survey</li> <li>• Graduate student satisfaction survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 12</li> <li>• 9</li> <li>• 25</li> <li>• 58</li> <li>• 13</li> <li>• 34</li> <li>• 68</li> <li>• 13</li> <li>• 10</li> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 4</li> </ul>
<b><u>Philosophy Department</u></b>		
B.A.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Questionnaire</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 4</li> </ul>
<b><u>Physics Department</u></b>		
B.S., M.S., PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit interviews &amp; informal feedback from graduating students</li> <li>• Alumni Survey</li> <li>• Graduate student satisfaction survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5 B.S., 1 M.S., 4 Ph.D.</li> <li>•</li> </ul>
<b><u>Political Science Department</u></b>		
B.A. and B.S., Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student Survey</li> <li>• Exit Interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 33</li> <li>• 2</li> </ul>
M.A. Political Science		

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

<b><u>Psychology Department</u></b>		
B.A. and B.S., Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Web-based senior survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 55</li> </ul>
<b><u>Sociology Department</u></b>		
B.S., Sociology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Interview</li> <li>• Questionnaire</li> <li>• Alumni survey</li> <li>• Internship</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 27</li> <li>• 31</li> <li>• 14</li> <li>• 35</li> </ul>
M.S., PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alumni survey</li> <li>• Preliminary exams</li> <li>• Comprehensive exams</li> <li>• TA teaching observations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 27</li> <li>• 4</li> <li>• 9</li> </ul>
<b><u>Statistics Department</u></b>		
B.S., M.S., and PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mid-level assessment of B.S. Statistics students and students served by undergraduate Statistics courses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About 8,000 (database includes all students enrolled in mid-level stats courses from 1987 through 1999)</li> </ul>
<b><u>Theatre Department</u></b>		
B.A. Theatre, M.A. Speech (Theatre)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Semester performance juries and portfolio</li> <li>• Post production reviewers</li> <li>• Internship and graduate school placement</li> <li>• Graduate student satisfaction survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 45</li> <li>• 25</li> <li>• 23</li> <li>• 7</li> </ul>
<b><u>Zoology Department</u></b>		
B.S., Zoology, Biology, Wildlife, and Physiology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Faculty survey of senior student performance</li> <li>• Performance of seniors in key courses</li> <li>• Retention of declared majors</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9 faculty reviewers</li> <li>• 1098 grades reviewed</li> <li>• 380 students evaluated</li> </ul>
M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Student performance in qualifying and final exams</li> <li>• Presentations and awards</li> <li>• Graduate student satisfaction survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 15 faculty reviewers</li> <li>• 15 faculty reviewers</li> <li>• 28 graduate students</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

**College of Business Administration**

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Number of Individuals Assessed
<b>College-Wide Assessments</b>		
Undergraduate students (B.S., Finance, Management, Marketing, Accounting, Economics, MIS, and Double Majors)	• Satisfaction surveys (EBI)	• 248
Graduate students (MS Accounting, MS Economics, MS MSIS, MSTM)	• Satisfaction surveys	• 82
Graduate students (MBA)	• Satisfaction surveys (EBI)	• 39
Doctoral students (PhD., Marketing, Management, Finance, Accounting, Economics)	• Satisfaction survey	• 38
Doctoral Students (All)	• Group Meeting	• 27
Doctoral Students (Economics)	• Focus Groups	• 7
All	• Online satisfaction survey	• 29

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

**College of Education**

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed	
<b><u>School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology</u></b>			
M.S., Ph.D., Counseling Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>enrollment data</li> <li>grade point average</li> <li>student course satisfaction as evaluated by student course evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1107 students and 25 faculty</li> </ul>	
M.S., Ed.D., Ph.D., Educational Psychology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>internship placement rates and student performance as evaluated by internship/practicum supervisors</li> <li>graduation rates</li> <li>student performance on State Licensure and National Certification examinations</li> </ul>		
B.S., M.S. Ed.D., Health & Human Performance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>placement rates of graduates within their chose field</li> <li>student satisfaction surveys</li> <li>current accreditation status of various SAHEP programs</li> </ul>		
B.S., M.S., Ed.D., Leisure Studies			
<b><u>School of Educational Studies</u></b>			
Aviation and Space, B.S., M.S., and PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The BS is assessed by the COE office of Student Services along with the other COE undergraduate programs</li> <li>The MS is assessed by the faculty reviewing the creative component</li> <li>The Ed.D. is assessed by looking at the comprehensive examinations and reviewing the responses of the students. Each student is given eight questions to answer over a two day period</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BS</li> <li>MS</li> <li>Ed.D.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> <li>10</li> <li>6</li> </ul>
Human Resources / Adult Education M.S., Ed.D.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of student addresses</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>106</li> </ul>	
Research, Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics – M.S. and PhD. in ABS / Ed Psych	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Alumni Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>8</li> </ul>	
Student Development, M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Program completion rates</li> <li>Tracking student gpa's</li> <li>Comprehensive Exams – numbers successfully passed</li> <li>Dissertations / Theses / Creative Components – numbers completed</li> </ul>	(not provided)	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Educational Leadership (3 areas of emphasis)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative</li> <li>• Qualitative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 176</li> <li>• 20</li> </ul>
MS in Higher Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative</li> <li>• Qualitative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 11</li> <li>• 2</li> </ul>
MS in Education Administration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Qualitative</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1</li> </ul>
<b>School of Curriculum &amp; Educational Leadership</b>		
Bachelor of Science in: Elementary Education, Secondary Education, Technical and Industrial Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Certification Examinations for Oklahoma Educators</li> <li>• Professional Education Portfolio</li> <li>• Student Assessment of Professional Education Programs Survey</li> <li>• College of Education Alumni Survey</li> <li>• Survey of Math and/or Reading Tutors</li> <li>• Course Evaluation Survey</li> <li>• Program Advisory Committees</li> <li>• Evaluation of Effectiveness of Cooperating Teachers</li> <li>• Resident Year Teacher Survey</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 827</li> <li>• 611</li> <li>• 11</li> </ul>
Master of Science in Teaching, Learning, and Leadership. Options: Curriculum and Leadership Studies Elementary/Middle/Secondary/ K-12 Education Occupational Education Studies Reading and Literacy Special Education Technical and Industrial Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Certification Exams</li> <li>• Comprehensive Exams</li> <li>• Theses</li> <li>• Graduate Examination Evaluations</li> <li>• Graduate Assistant Evaluation of Faculty</li> <li>• Course Evaluation Surveys</li> <li>• Internship Assessments and Documentation and Portfolios</li> <li>• Follow-up Studies</li> <li>• Creative Component Projects</li> <li>• Graduate Program Coordinators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 58</li> <li>• 36</li> <li>• 21</li> <li>• 24</li> <li>• 20</li> <li>• 5</li> </ul>
Doctor of Education (Ed.D.). in Curriculum and Instruction, Options: Curriculum and Supervision Elementary Education Secondary Education Reading Education Occupational Education Studies Reading Education Information/Communication Education Special Education	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State Certification Exams</li> <li>• Qualifying Exams</li> <li>• Dissertations</li> <li>• Graduate Examination Evaluations</li> <li>• Graduate Assistant Evaluation of Faculty</li> <li>• Internship Assessments and Documentation and Portfolios</li> <li>• Follow-up Studies</li> <li>• Graduate Program Coordinators</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 8</li> <li>• 3</li> <li>• 2</li> <li>• 1</li> <li>• 9</li> <li>• 1</li> <li>• 1</li> <li>• 0</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

**College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology**

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
<b><u>School of Architecture</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•</li> <li>• Survey of professionals who served on capstone course juries</li> <li>• Exit interviews</li> <li>• Internal program review and self-study</li> <li>• Portfolios of cumulative student work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 65</li> <li>• 16</li> <li>• 13</li> </ul>
Master of Arch, Master of Arch Eng	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit interviews</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2</li> </ul>
<b><u>School of Chemical Engineering</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamentals of Engineering Exam</li> <li>• Senior Survey in fall semester</li> <li>• Exit interviews fall and spring</li> <li>• End of course survey – student response to objectives</li> <li>• End of course evaluation by the faculty</li> <li>• Course evaluations</li> <li>• Feedback by Celanese visitors on student design problem</li> <li>• External academic contests</li> <li>• Student activity in School’s activities</li> <li>• AIChE National Data</li> <li>• Alumni feedback</li> <li>• Industrial feedback (IAC and recruiters)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 19</li> <li>• 35</li> <li>• 33</li> <li>• 7x35</li> <li>• 7x35</li> <li>• 10x40</li> <li>• 1x35</li> <li>• 3</li> <li>• 100</li> <li>• unknown</li> <li>• 25</li> <li>• 20</li> </ul>
M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fundamentals of Engineering Exam</li> <li>• Exit interviews fall and spring</li> <li>• GRE Scores</li> <li>• Course teaching evaluations (all graduate ChE courses)</li> <li>• Course grade distributions (Core ChE courses)</li> <li>• Probation events</li> <li>• Research publication/presentation activity</li> <li>• Safety citations</li> <li>• Faculty opinion on quality of student performance</li> <li>• Faculty end-of-course assessment</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2</li> <li>• 5</li> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 7x12</li> <li>• 5x10</li> <li>• 0 out of 33</li> <li>• 33</li> <li>• 33</li> <li>• 7</li> <li>• 6x10</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

<b><u>Civil and Environmental Engineering</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Surveys (2)</li> <li>• Exit Interviews</li> <li>• Faculty evaluations</li> <li>• FE Exam</li> <li>• Grades</li> <li>• Student Advisory Committee</li> <li>• Employee Input</li> <li>• Board of Visitors</li> </ul>	• 29
M.S., Civil Eng	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Interviews</li> <li>• Theses/Reports Defense</li> <li>• Grades</li> <li>• Faculty Input</li> <li>• Board of Visitors</li> </ul>	• 31
M.S., Env Eng	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit Interviews</li> <li>• Theses/Report Defense</li> <li>• Grades</li> <li>• Faculty Input</li> <li>• Board of Visitors</li> </ul>	• 14
PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Theses Defense</li> <li>• Qualifying Exam</li> <li>• Committee Input</li> </ul>	• 1
<b><u>Construction Management Technology</u></b>		
B.S., CMT	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Exit surveys of graduates for F00 &amp; S01 semesters</li> <li>• Course evaluations for F00, &amp; S01 semesters</li> <li>• Employer reviews of student performance in internships, Sum 00</li> <li>• AIC Graduate Placement Surveys for F99 &amp; S00 semesters</li> <li>• National CQE Level I for F00 semesters</li> <li>• Regional ASC student competitions, S01</li> <li>• Employer Satisfaction survey, F00</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 42</li> <li>• 540</li> <li>• 38</li> <li>• 42</li> <li>• 13</li> <li>• 18</li> <li>• 11</li> </ul>
<b><u>Electrical Engineering Technology</u></b>		
B.S., EET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alumni Survey</li> <li>• Competencies Exam</li> <li>• Industrial Advisory Council</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 850</li> <li>• 25</li> <li>• 7</li> </ul>
<b><u>Fire Protection and Safety Technology</u></b>		
B.S. FPST	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Survey of Employers</li> </ul>	• 13

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

<b><u>School of Industrial Engineering and Management</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial Advisory Council</li> <li>• Fundamentals Examination (national in scope)</li> <li>• Undergraduate student focus group</li> <li>• Senior Exit Survey/Interview</li> <li>• Capstone Projects (teams/projects)</li> <li>• Class grades</li> <li>• Course evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10</li> <li>• 6</li> <li>• 6</li> <li>• 18</li> <li>• 14</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
M.S., M.I.E., M.M.S.E., and PhD	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Industrial Advisory Council</li> <li>• Alumni survey</li> <li>• Graduate Student Focus Group</li> <li>• Graduate Exit Survey/Interview</li> <li>• Thesis and dissertation defenses</li> <li>• Class grades</li> <li>• Course evaluations</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10</li> <li>• 15</li> <li>• 6</li> <li>• 6</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> <li>• All</li> </ul>
<b><u>School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering</u></b>		
B.S. in Mechanical Engineering, all options	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Performance of seniors on national Fundamentals of Engineering Exam</li> <li>• Capstone design course performance of seniors</li> <li>• Exit interviews with all graduating seniors</li> <li>• Feedback from employers</li> <li>• Employment statistics</li> <li>• Feedback from MAE Industrial Advisory Board</li> <li>• Course evaluations by junior and senior students.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 200</li> </ul>
M.S. in Mechanical Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final defenses of reports and theses by all degree candidates</li> <li>• Course evaluations by all M.S. students</li> <li>• Alumni survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 34</li> <li>• 125</li> <li>• 10</li> </ul>
Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final defenses of reports and theses by all degree candidates</li> <li>• Course evaluations by all Ph.D. students</li> <li>• Alumni survey (OSU)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 5</li> <li>• 15</li> <li>• 4</li> </ul>
<b><u>Mechanical Engineering Technology</u></b>		
B.S., MET	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alumni Survey</li> <li>• Exit Interviews</li> <li>• Fluid Power Certification</li> <li>• Fundamentals Examination (national in scope)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 141</li> <li>• 20</li> <li>• 10</li> <li>• 6</li> </ul>

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

**College of Human Environmental Sciences**

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
<b><u>College-Wide Assessments</u></b>		
Entering	• College Student Inventory (CSI)	• 288
Undergraduates	• Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI)	• 288
Midlevel	• Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI)	• 339
Undergraduates	• Critical Thinking Skills Test (CTST)	• 339
HES Internship / Student Teacher Programs	• Internship/Student Teacher Supervisor Survey	• 113
Seniors AY 2000-2001	• Senior Surveys	• 235
HES Juniors / Seniors	• Electronic Portfolio Development Pilot Project	• 7
Graduate Programs (all)	• Alumni Survey (OSU)	
<b><u>Design, Housing, &amp; Merchandising (DHM)</u></b>		
B.S.	• Academic and Design Portfolios	• 76
	• Internship Supervisor Survey by Dept.	• 61
	• Internship Supervisor Survey by College	• 27
	• Senior Survey	• 52
	• Embedded Course Projects	• 411
	• Two Advisory Boards	• overall program
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	
<b><u>Family Relations &amp; Child Development (FRCD)</u></b>		
B.S.	• Senior Survey	• 136
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	
<b><u>Hotel &amp; Restaurant Administration</u></b>		
B.S.	• Internship Supervisor Survey	• 16
	• Senior Survey	• 28
	• Capstone Course Embedded Assessment (Assessment of Hospitality Business Skills)	• 69
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

---

<b><u>Nutritional Sciences</u></b>		
B.S.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Senior Exit Interview</li><li>• Registered Dietician Exam</li><li>• Internship / Student Teacher Supervisor Survey</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 25</li><li>• 37</li><li>• 23</li></ul>
M.S., PhD.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• ADA Site Visit (accreditation team visit)</li><li>• Alumni Survey</li></ul>	

---

**13. What were the analyses and findings from the 2000-2001-program outcomes assessment?**

Analyses and findings are described in the individual assessment reports or report summaries submitted by each college, department, or degree program (Appendix B).

**14. What instructional changes occurred or are planned in the programs due to program outcomes assessment?**

The uses of assessment results are described in the individual outcomes assessment reports submitted by each college, department, or degree program (Appendix B). The uses of assessment results are unique to each program but can be generally categorized as sharing assessment information with faculty members, discussing and developing appropriate curriculum changes that are indicated by assessment findings, and using assessment results to justify curriculum changes have recently been implemented.

The most commonly cited uses of assessment results in 2000-2001 were:

- Changes in course content
- Addition / deletion of courses
- Changes in course sequences
- Changes in degree requirements or degree sheet options
- Development of tutorial and academic services for students
- Justification of past curriculum changes and to show program improvement resulting from those changes
- To further refine the assessment methods or to implement new assessment methods
- Changes in advising processes
- To facilitate curriculum discussions at faculty meetings, curriculum committee meetings, and faculty retreats
- Changes to student facilities such as computer labs and science labs
- Development of program-based websites to provide students with academic and program information



## **Student and Alumni Satisfaction Assessment**

Student and alumni satisfaction assessment is conducted to evaluate student and alumni perceptions of academic and campus programs and services. This information is applied to the program development and improvement processes. The primary methods are student and alumni surveys. Whenever possible, survey data are summarized for each OSU academic program so that individual programs may use the information for program outcomes assessment. Hence, many individual academic programs report the program-specific results of the university-wide student or alumni surveys as part of program outcomes assessment. This section of the report describes the overall results of the university-wide student and alumni surveys. The section also describes a student satisfaction survey (the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory) that was conducted exclusively on the OSU-Tulsa campus for the purpose of developing and improving student programs on that campus. The Dr. Raj Basu, Vice President of Academic Affairs at OSU-T, provided the information on the OSU-Tulsa student satisfaction assessment.

### **15. What assessment activities were used to measure student satisfaction? Describe the measures used, which students were assessed, how many students, and how they were selected.**

Two surveys provided information on student and alumni satisfaction this year: the 2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs and the 2000 National Survey of Student Engagement.

#### **2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs**

The 2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs was conducted to identify institutional strengths and areas for improvement as indicated by recent graduates; to track the careers and continuing education of recent OSU graduates; and to assess achievement of learning outcomes as perceived by alumni from individual academic programs. The survey was conducted in January 2001 and targeted 1,835 alumni of graduate programs who graduated in 1995 or 1999; this target population represented all graduate program alumni for these two academic years. The survey was administered as a telephone interview and included common questions (related to employment, continuing education, and general satisfaction) and program-specific questions developed by faculty members in each program.

#### **2000 National Survey of Student Engagement**

OSU participated in the 2000 National Survey of Student Engagement along with 41 other Research I and II institutions and a total of 275 other colleges and universities nationwide. Details about the survey methods and results are described in the Special Assessment Projects section (pp. 41-42); survey results related to student satisfaction are presented in this section. A total of 516 OSU students participated in this survey, including 259 first-year students and 256 seniors. Students were randomly selected to participate; the survey was mailed to participants, and students could respond via a paper-and-pencil instrument (returned via U.S. mail) or complete the survey over the Internet.

### **Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (OSU-Tulsa campus)**

Student Satisfaction Assessment on the OSU-Tulsa campus was conducted by Noel-Levitz, a preeminent consulting firm, that has provided comprehensive assessment services to over 1500 colleges and universities since 1984.

Student satisfaction on OSU –T was measured using twelve composite scales. The scales measure Academic Advising Effectiveness, Campus Climate, Campus Life, Campus Support Services, Concern for the Individual, Instructional Effectiveness, Recruitment and Financial Aid Effectiveness, Registration Effectiveness, Responsiveness to Diverse Population, Safety and Security, Service Excellence, and Student Centeredness.

Two hundred and thirteen students self-selected participation in the assessment. For comprehensive demographic information, please refer to sections 2-1, 2-2, and 2-3 of the Student Satisfaction Inventory. For comprehensive information on measures, please refer to sections 2-18 through 2-32 of Student Satisfaction Inventory.

### **Other Assessments of Student Satisfaction**

In addition to these university-wide surveys, 54 academic units conducted program-specific student surveys in 2000-2001 that included assessment of student satisfaction. Results of these surveys are described in the individual assessment reports submitted by each college, department, or degree program (Appendix B). Satisfaction with student services are also assessed by nearly all OSU student service programs using locally-developed survey instruments. Results of these program-specific assessments are not included in this report.

## **16. What were the analyses and findings from the 2000-2001 student satisfaction assessment?**

### **The 2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs**

*Response Rate.* Out of the initial target population of 1,835 graduate program alumni, 677 telephone interviews were completed, resulting in a response rate of 37%. When adjusted for alumni for whom a telephone number could not be determined and alumni who could not be reached in the U.S., the response rate to the survey was 66%.

*Residency.* An estimated 65% of the alumni who participated in the survey were living in Oklahoma, and 35% were contacted out-of-state. Because the survey did not attempt to reach alumni who were not in the U.S., the number of alumni who no longer live in Oklahoma may be underestimated.

*Employment.* Almost 90% of alumni reported that they were employed. Most alumni reported working for educational institutions or organizations (44%); 26% were employed by large corporations, and 12% were employed by small businesses or corporations. Alumni most frequently reported that their annual salary was in the range of \$35,001 to \$45,000 per year. Approximately 83% of employed alumni reported that they were very satisfied/satisfied that their OSU education had prepared them for their current position.

*Continuing Education.* Eleven percent of alumni were enrolled in graduate programs or professional schools. Fifty-five percent of these were enrolled in OSU graduate programs. Eighty-one percent were pursuing doctoral degrees and 11% were pursuing master's degrees. Seventy-seven percent of alumni who were attending graduate or professional school stated that they were very satisfied/satisfied that their OSU education had prepared them for their continued education.

*Overall Satisfaction.* Over 96% of alumni reported that they were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their overall educational experience at OSU.

### **2000 National Survey of Student Engagement**

About 15% of the National Survey of Student Engagement focused specifically on student satisfaction. Comparison of OSU student responses with responses of students from other Research I & II institutions indicates that OSU excels in terms of providing a supportive campus environment, fostering quality relationships for students within the academic community, and general satisfaction of the student body. OSU students provided significantly more positive scores in terms of their relationships with other students, with faculty members, and with administrative personnel and offices as compared with responses of students from other Research I & II institutions. Over 92% of first-year students and 88% of seniors evaluated their overall educational experience at OSU as 'good' or 'excellent'. These findings are consistent with OSU student responses on other national surveys of student satisfaction (e.g., the 1995 –1999 OSU participation in the Noel Levitz Student Satisfaction Inventory). A complete summary of the findings from this survey is given in the Special Assessment Projects section (pp. 41-42).

### **Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (OSU-Tulsa campus)**

Findings of the student satisfaction assessment are outlined in sections 2-7 through 2-43 of the Student Satisfaction Inventory. Students at OSU-Tulsa reported **higher** degrees of satisfaction with Instructional Effectiveness, Safety and Security, Registration Effectiveness, Concern for the

Individual, Campus Climate, Campus Support Services, Service Excellence, Student Centeredness, and Responsiveness to Diverse Populations when compared to peer institutions. Students reported a lower degree of satisfaction with Campus Life at OSU – Tulsa when compared to peer institutions. There was no significant difference in satisfaction between OSU –T and peer institutions in the areas of Academic Advising and Recruitment and Financial Aid.

While students at OSU –T reported higher degrees of satisfaction on the vast majority of issues when compared to students at peer institutions, there was a performance gap between student expectations and satisfaction with the twelve measures of student satisfaction. However, the performance gap was statistically non-significant for every measure of student satisfaction. These results are summarized in section 2-7 of the Student Satisfaction Inventory.

## **17. What changes occurred or are planned due to student satisfaction assessment?**

### **The 2001 Survey of Alumni of Graduate Programs**

Results of the graduate program alumni survey were provided to the Graduate College, the central administrative offices, and to faculty in each academic program in July 2001. Hence, the data and appropriate uses of results are still being considered and will be reported in the 2001-2002 Annual Assessment Report.

### **2000 National Survey of Student Engagement**

The positive results regarding student satisfaction at OSU supports the continued campus-wide efforts to make OSU programs and services student-centered and student-friendly. In particular, the survey results indicate that efforts to improve the experiences of OSU first year students are paying off in terms of positive freshmen perceptions of friendly and supporting relationships among students and between students and faculty / staff. Survey results justify the continuation of programs aimed at enhancing students' first-year experiences.

The results of the National Survey of Student Engagement have generated discussion among faculty and campus leaders about OSU students' reported educational experiences, how students spend their time, and how our programs facilitate student learning and students' personal development. Faculty leaders have supported OSU's continued participation in this national survey, and some individual academic units have incorporated elements of NSSE survey items in their departmental student surveys so that they may obtain more of this type of feedback from students in their programs.

### **Noel-Levitz Student Satisfaction Survey (OSU-Tulsa campus)**

OSU – Tulsa has taken or is taking several steps to enhance student satisfaction despite the fact students reported higher levels of satisfaction on the vast majority of issues when compared to peer institutions, and there was no statistical difference between student expectations and satisfaction (section 2-7).

Academic Advising. OSU –Tulsa is in the process of developing a comprehensive student center. This center will house the recruiting, academic advising, financial aid, and career services functions to provide students with a “one-stop” location that meets all their needs. Further, the Students Center will be located in close proximity to the Admissions and Enrollment offices. By co-locating these important services, OSU –Tulsa will focus better on student needs, increase communications between student services staff, and minimize the amount of time students spend on such issues.

To meet the academic needs of students, OSU–T has doubled the number of academic advisors from year 2000-01 to 2001-02. Increase in the number of academic advisors has been at both undergraduate and graduate levels. It is expected that the number of academic advisors will increase as programs at OSU-T continue to grow in enrollment.

Registration. Several measures have been taken to assist students with the registration process and ensure that students spend a minimal amount of time on such activities. In addition to adding more personnel to the crucial admissions and enrollment functions, OSU-T is in the process of integrating its registration system with the system at OSU – Stillwater. This integration will allow

students at OSU, Tulsa and Stillwater, significantly faster access to their transcripts, class schedules, bursar notices, financial aid records, etc.

Campus Life and Student Centeredness. Introduction of the shuttle service between the Tulsa and Stillwater campuses of OSU will make it more convenient for students to take classes at both places. The shuttle service will also allow students in Tulsa to participate in campus activities such as sporting events, homecoming, etc. that are unavailable on the Tulsa campus.

Since the appointment of a Chief Student Affairs Officer last year, the office of Student Affairs has provided career planning, resume workshops, career fairs, salary negotiation seminars, etc. to assist students with career development needs. Additionally, the office of Student Affairs is helping various student bodies on campus organize themselves so that students may have a voice in campus activities. A Wellness center to help meet students' recreation needs has also been established.

Instructional Effectiveness. Over the past two years OSU-T has quadrupled the number of resident faculty. In addition to 27 resident-faculty, approximately 150 faculty from the Stillwater campus commute every week to meet the instructional needs of students. OSU-T has worked diligently to expand its course offerings and this is reflected in approximately 78 more classes being taught during Spring 2002 than Spring 2001.

Finally, OSU-Tulsa has spent significant amounts of monies during the 2000-01 year to enhance its instructional facilities. All classrooms are equipped with multi-media equipment. Additionally, the campus has made significant improvements to its various engineering, behavioral, and computer laboratories. Last, discussions on the building of a new research and teaching facility are underway.

### **Uses of Results from Past OSU Student & Alumni Surveys**

Surveys focusing on student and alumni satisfaction are conducted regularly at OSU and results are summarized and distributed to leaders, administrators, faculty members, and student groups across campus. It frequently takes one or two years for uses of assessment results to become evident because of the time required to consider the evidence and incorporate this information into program changes.

The online Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, conducted in spring 2000, was described in the 1999-2000 Annual Assessment Report. This year, additional information was available about how results from that survey were used by the Graduate College and by individual academic programs. The following summarizes the uses of results from this survey:

- Survey results were summarized for a variety of user groups in the form of reports, fliers, and email attachments. User groups included the Graduate College, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Graduate Faculty Council, International Students & Scholars Office, and others. Results were also summarized for each college and department so that faculty could view the responses and comments of students from their programs (results were reported in aggregate only). This report summarization and distribution process was an effective tool for engaging faculty members in dialogue about the survey results by providing faculty with the information of most interest to them (i.e., responses from students enrolled in their programs).
- Most academic units reported discussing the survey results at faculty meetings. At least one academic program reported substantial changes to their program requirements as a result of

concerns raised by the survey responses. One college used the results as a basis for a faculty retreat focusing on graduate student issues.

- The Graduate College used the results to streamline steps in the enrollment process that students identified as unnecessary and time consuming. The Graduate College also used the results as a basis for discussion with individual programs about particular issues raised by students' comments from the survey. The Graduate College will conduct this survey again in spring 2002.
- The Graduate and Professional Student Association used the results as part of their petition to the university for health insurance coverage. Health insurance was the most frequently cited concern in comments students provided on the questionnaire. Health insurance is now available to graduate students employed by the institution.



## **Graduate Student Assessment**

- 18. What assessment activities were used to measure graduate students? Describe the measures used, which students were assessed, how many students, and how they were selected.**

[see below]

- 19. What were the analyses and findings from the 2000-2001 graduate student assessment?**

[see below]

- 20. What changes occurred or are planned due to graduate student assessment?**

[see below]

---

### **Responses to questions #18 – 20:**

Graduate student assessment is part of **Program Outcomes Assessment** for each academic unit; graduate degree programs are listed among the degree programs assessed for each college, school, or department. Graduate student assessment methods, numbers of students assessed, results of assessments, and uses of results of assessment are described and summarized in the Program Outcomes Assessment section (pp. 19-35 and Appendix B).

To include graduate students in surveys aimed at evaluating student and alumni satisfaction, the Office of University Assessment also coordinates separate surveys of graduate students and graduate program alumni.

In 2001, a **Survey of Graduate Program Alumni** was completed. Results are described and summarized in the section on Student & Alumni Satisfaction Assessment (pp. 36-39), and program-specific results are described in the outcomes assessment report for each program. Some programs did not incorporate the alumni survey information in their current reports because the results were not distributed until July; the results will be included in the 2001-2002 annual assessment reports.

The first online **Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey** was conducted in spring 2000, and the survey results were described in the 1999-2000 Annual Assessment Report. In 2000-2001, many programs began using survey results as the basis of program changes. The uses of survey results are described above in the section on Student & Alumni Satisfaction Assessment (pp. 36-39).



## **Special Assessment Projects**

The Office of University Assessment conducts and provides financial support for special assessment projects aimed at evaluating the effectiveness of academic or student programs, results of strategies developed to improve student learning, or factors that contribute to the educational impact of the university experience on students. Special projects that are conducted within a single academic discipline are generally reported in the program's Outcomes Assessment Report. Special projects that are conducted at the college-, university-, or other program levels are described here.

### **OSU Participation in the 2000 National Survey of Student Engagement**

The 2000 National Survey of Student Engagement (NSSE) was designed to obtain, on an annual basis, information from colleges and universities about student participation in programs and activities that institutions provide for their learning and personal development. The results provide an estimate of how undergraduates spend their time and what they gain from attending college. Survey items represent empirically confirmed "good practices" in undergraduate education. The NSSE is an initiative of The Pew Charitable Trusts and is administered and coordinated by the Indiana University Center for Post-Secondary Research & Planning under the direction of Dr. George D. Kuh, an internationally recognized scholar in the area of student affairs research.

A total of 516 randomly selected OSU first-year students and seniors completed the survey during the 2000 spring semester. OSU student data were compared with data from 13,057 students from 41 Research I & II institutions nationwide.

In general, OSU students provided survey responses that were statistically similar to the responses of students from other Research I & II institutions. Out of the 60 survey items, responses from only thirteen survey items were significantly different ( $\alpha=0.001$ ) between OSU students and students from other Research I & II institutions.

*Areas of Excellence.* The survey results indicate that OSU excels in terms of providing a supportive campus environment, fostering quality relationships for students within the academic community, and general satisfaction of the student body. OSU students, and first-year students in particular, provided significantly more positive scores in terms of their relationships with other students, with faculty members, and with administrative personnel and offices as compared with responses of students from other Research I & II institutions. Over 92% of first-year students and 88% of seniors evaluated their overall educational experience at OSU as 'good' or 'excellent'.

*Possible Areas for Improvement.* OSU students had significantly lower or less positive scores than students at peer institutions in some aspects of their academic experiences. Compared with students at other Research I & II institutions,

- Significantly fewer OSU seniors report that coursework emphasizes synthesis of ideas or making judgments about the value of information,
- Significantly more OSU seniors report that coursework emphasizes memorizing facts,
- OSU freshmen and seniors have significantly fewer assigned textbooks and readings,
- OSU seniors have significantly fewer writing assignments,
- OSU freshmen make significantly fewer class presentations and are less likely to perceive that their education has contributed to their ability to speak effectively, and
- OSU seniors use email less frequently, and OSU freshmen use technology (email and the internet) less frequently in completing assignments.

The positive results regarding student satisfaction at OSU supports the continued campus-wide efforts to make OSU programs and services student-centered and student-friendly. In particular, the survey results indicate that efforts to improve the experiences of OSU first year students are paying off in terms of positive freshmen perceptions of friendly and supporting relationships among students and between students and faculty / staff.

The results of the National Survey of Student Engagement have generated interesting discussion among faculty and campus leaders about OSU students' reported educational experiences, how students spend their time, and how our programs facilitate student learning and personal development. Faculty leaders have supported OSU's continued participation in this national survey, and some individual academic units (e.g., several engineering departments) incorporated elements of NSSE survey items in their own student surveys so that they may obtain more of this type of feedback from students within their programs.

### **Assessment of the CASNR Freshmen in Transition (FIT) : A Living Group Program**

Freshmen in Transition (FIT) is a retention program implemented in fall 2000 and aimed at new students in College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (CASNR) programs. In 2000-2001, 72 new CASNR students participated in the program. Participants were provided academic, social, service, and leadership opportunities in a theme housing community environment. Participants attend Camp Cowboy, are required to participate in 13 different activities during the year, and attended special tutoring sessions provided in residence.

The expected outcomes of the FIT program are increased academic achievement, retention, leadership and service capacity, and timely graduation of participants. Students in the FIT program are compared with other CASNR students using the following measures: the Student Development Task and Lifestyle Assessment, interviews, and transcript analysis. The assessment is designed to be a longitudinal cohort study and, as such, will continue until 2003-2004.

### **Other Assessment Studies**

- The **Honors College** conducts an annual assessment of its program by surveying student participants and faculty about the quality of the program. Results of this assessment can be obtained from the Honors College or the Office of University Assessment.
- Each unit within the division of **Student Affairs** (Residential Life, Career Services, Personal Counseling, Student Union, Colvin Center, Wellness Center, and Health Center) conducts assessment of their student programs and services. Results of these assessments can be obtained from the Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs.
- The **Core Alcohol and Drug Survey** was conducted in spring 2001 by the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs. The survey will provide information about the level of alcohol and drug use among undergraduates and related attitudes and behavior. The survey was mailed to a random sample of undergraduates, and follow-up phone calls were made to encourage participation. By the end of the semester, 264 surveys were completed and returned, for a 33% response rate. A report will be prepared in fall 2001.

## Appendix A. OSU General Education Assessment Task Force, 2001 Annual Report

- I. Members, 2001: Paul Bischoff, John Gelder, Frances Griffin, Jeff Hattey, Nigel Jones, Brenda Masters, Julie Wallin (ex officio), Matthew Portillo (graduate assistant).
- II. General Education Task Force charge: The Assessment Office formed the Task Force in May 2000 for the purpose of creating and implementing a plan to assess the effectiveness of the general education program at Oklahoma State University. General education assessment is required by the North Central Association (now the Higher Learning Commission) and by the Oklahoma state regents. The NCA has been clear in stating that general education assessment will be evaluated during OSU's accreditation review in 2005. The lack of general education assessment programs at other OSU campuses has resulted in less than favorable evaluations in the recent past. At the time of the appointment of the first committee in the summer of 2000, assessment of the general education program was primarily accomplished through indirect means. [See *General Education Assessment Task Group Report and Proposal, October 2000.*]
- III. The 2000 Task Force theory and charge for 2001: The 2000 General Education Task Force established a series of priorities for 2001. [See *General Education Assessment Task Group Report and Proposal, October 2000.*] The initial committee rewrote the general education program description for OSU in order to create assessable general education goals for the program as a whole and for individual general education areas (Humanities, Social Sciences, Analytical and Quantitative, Natural Sciences, and International Dimension). The revision of the program was submitted to the General Education Advisory Council and the Assessment Council for their consideration and comment. After consultation with both committees, a revised document was approved and sent to the deans (Instruction Council and Deans' Council). The new document was finally approved and became official university policy in February 2001.
  - A. After consideration of both practical problems and educational philosophy, the task force determined that assessment of general education should be carried out through use of institutional portfolios and that writing should be the first general education goal to be assessed. (*Students will communicate original thought in written composition, speech, and graphic representations.* Oklahoma State University General Education Course Area Designations—Criteria and Goals)
  - B. To facilitate this assignment, the Assessment Office collected writing artifacts from OSU students during the spring semester, 2001. The committee's philosophy for the collection of student work was that effectiveness of the general education program should be demonstrable across the curriculum, not only in general education courses. Writing artifacts were collected from courses across the university curriculum and from as many colleges as possible. Collection was not limited to general education courses. Several courses included in the sample were capstone, or senior-level courses. The Assessment Office contacted individual faculty who volunteered to participate in the collection of work. In the first collection of student work there was no attempt to match collection to the general student demographic profile. The process remained invisible to students, whose anonymity was protected by the process. Five artifacts

were randomly selected from a single class assignment from classes whose instructors volunteered to participate in the first institutional portfolio. Courses that provided examples of student work for this portfolio are listed in Table 1.

- IV. Assessment of written communication skills: The first objective of the 2001 Task Force was to determine the specific procedures for evaluation of student artifacts for writing, oral and graphic communication. In its initial meeting, the 2001 Task Force for Assessment established three subcommittees: 1) a group to create a rubric for the evaluation of student writing samples, 2) a group to begin creation of a demographic data base to allow interpretation of assessment results, and 3) a group to consider the feasibility of assessing oral presentations and graphic representations.
- A. The first subcommittee authored and submitted a proposed rubric for the entire committee's consideration. The rubric went through a series of modifications during the process of assessment until it reached its final form. (See Appendix A)
  - B. The second subcommittee began the process of creating a database that would permit broader interpretation of portfolio data. The database will contain for analysis purposes information on student class, college, major, and transfer credit hours. These data can be correlated with artifact scores that reflect the written communication skills evaluation.
  - C. The third subcommittee compiled a list of courses in the university that require oral presentations as part of the course syllabi. The subcommittee also reported on the nature of student graphic representation at the university. Because of the perceived difficulty of obtaining assessable artifacts of oral presentations prior to the end of the year, the subcommittee recommended that the Task Force concentrate solely on the assessment of written work during 2000-2001.
- V. Assessment of writing artifacts: Following participation in a workshop at the American Association of Higher Education Assessment Conference conducted by Jeff Seybert of Johnson County Community College, a recognized authority in the construction and evaluation of university portfolios for writing, the committee determined to follow the Johnson County model with modifications.
- A. The entire committee met to normalize the assessment process utilizing the first draft of the writing evaluation rubric. Each member of the committee read a group of randomly selected artifacts, gave an evaluation based on the rubric scoring system, then discussed the rationale for their evaluation with other committee members. Discussion of the effectiveness and clarity of the rubric led to modifications in that document. In subsequent meetings, it became clear that the committee was evaluating student work consistently and that the rubric and process yielded scores with minimal variation among reviewers. A final version of the rubric was developed that accurately reflected the committee's actual system of evaluation. [See Appendix A.]

- B. Once the committee had normalized its scoring of student work and an effective rubric had been developed, the committee broke into two groups of three committee members. Each group took half of the remaining artifacts for evaluation. Each group evaluated work individually, then met as a single committee to develop consensus scores for each piece of writing. A single score for each writing sample was reported for the entire group. Comparison of the two sub-groups scores demonstrated conclusively the successful normalization procedure. Distribution of scores within the two groups was virtually identical. [See Table 2.] These final scores were then submitted to the Assessment Office for analysis. [See Appendix B.]
- VI. Proposed program for 2002: The current Task Force created an agenda and a series of recommendations for the 2001-2002 committee.
- A. The committee recommends that membership on the Task Force consist of six members serving staggered terms of three years. Two members should rotate off each year. It is clearly necessary that a majority of the committee be experienced both in terms of assessment philosophy and also the techniques established for actual assessment of student work products at OSU. Having to get a completely new group up to speed each year would significantly hamper the actual work of assessment, which will increasingly take up the committee's time.
- B. It was determined that the committee should continue to assess written, oral, and graphic communication to produce a series of assessments over time. This will be necessary for adequate interpretation of assessment results. Because processes are already established, collection of student artifacts and the assessment can begin quickly. It was also recommended that the committee begin to assess oral presentations. Using lists of courses that require oral presentations, the Assessment Office will contact instructors to determine which courses routinely videotape student presentations. The committee considered taping selected presentations, but determined that the process might discriminate against those students selected for videotaping. In order to maintain the invisibility of the process to students, it was deemed preferable to collect work only in those courses where recording was already being done. A new rubric will need to be created to allow assessment of oral presentations. Graphic communication can be assessed indirectly (student web sites, use of library net facilities, for example). As oral presentations frequently incorporate graphic elements, it may also be possible to include assessment of graphic communication in the assessment of oral communication. That cannot be determined until after the process is farther along.
- C. In addition to assessment of written, oral, and graphic communication, the Task Force will undertake the assessment of the use of scientific and mathematical tools to solve problems and interpret results. [*Students will use the tools of mathematics and physical or biological sciences to solve problems and interpret the results.* General Education Course Area Designations—Criteria and Goals.] The committee will need to establish what student work products will be utilized in the assessment procedure as well as establish a rubric for scoring artifacts. In order to facilitate the process prior to the summer of 2002, it will be necessary for the committee to begin work during

the fall and spring semesters. This represents an enlargement of the committee's work assignment. Prior to this term, the committee was intended to work solely in the summer. Current committee members have made this commitment.

- D. As the process of assessment begins to expand to all areas of general education, the number of faculty members involved will need to be increased. The committee recommends that in addition to the current group of six members, who will continue to serve as an executive and steering committee for assessment, the Assessment Office appoint twelve additional faculty members, who will be responsible only for assessing student work artifacts in the summer. Each year the committee recommends taking on three assessment projects. Each project will require the work of six faculty members—two from the Task Force and four additional faculty members from the group proposed above. In this manner, the six members of the Task Force will be utilized throughout the assessment procedure. The Task Force members will continue to take responsibility for identifying areas to be assessed, creation of rubrics, and management of the assessment groups. Management will include explanation of the process, introduction of the rubrics, and normalization of the scoring procedure within each group. Expansion of the number of faculty involved in the assessment procedure will also make assessment more comprehensible to the faculty, as a whole. It will also be possible to identify faculty for future service on the Task Force.
- E. The Task Force will continue in partnership with the Assessment Office to modify and rationalize the assessment database to produce interpretive results that can be made available to both administration and the faculty.
- F. The Task Force has recommended that a regional conference for Big XII schools be held on the topic of general education assessment. OSU will host the conference, tentatively at the OSU/Tulsa facility. The committee hopes to invite one of the major authorities on assessment within the HLC (Higher Learning Council of the NCA, the evaluating body in 2005) to speak at the conference. That person will be asked to conduct a preliminary survey of general education assessment at OSU to provide feedback prior to the 2005 visit. Plans remain tentative

VIII. **Professional Activities:** Members of the Task Force attended two national conventions during the past academic year: the annual meeting of the Higher Learning Council of the NCA in Chicago and the American Association of Higher Education Assessment Conference in Denver. At the latter convention, Julie Wallin, Nigel Jones, and Paul Bischoff made a presentation entitled "Development and Communication of Higher Education Learner Goals at a Large Public University". [See Appendix C.]

**Table 1.** Student work artifacts used in the 2001 portfolio to evaluate students' skills in written communication were randomly selected from assignments from the following spring semester 2001 courses. Five artifacts were randomly selected from the entire set of a single class assignment. Only artifacts from the courses indicated with \*\* were used in the final portfolio because the Task Force determined that in-class writing assignments and short answers from exams were not appropriate for this assessment. The artifacts used in the final portfolio were provided by 19 courses; of these, 12 courses were upper division, 6 were lower division, and 6 had general education designations (H=humanities and I=international).

Course Number	Gen Ed Designation (if any)	Course Name
ARCH 2003	HI	Architecture and Society
ARCH 4083 **	H	History and Theory of English and Early American Architecture
ARCH 6083		History & Theory of Contemporary Architecture
BCOM 3113 **		Written Communication
BCOM 3113 **		Written Communication
BCOM 3333 **		Business Report Writing
ENGL 1113 **		English Composition
ENGL 1213 **		Composition II
ENGL 2413 **	H	Introduction to Literature
ENGL 2883	H	Survey of American Lit II
ENGL 3123 **	H	Classical Mythology
ENGL 3410 **	H	Popular Fiction
FLL 2203 **	H	Masterworks of Western Culture: Modern
GEOG 3033	N	Meteorology
HES 3002 **		Contemporary Issues in Human Env Sciences
HIST 1613	H	Western Civilization to 1500
HIST 3233 **	H	Medieval Europe, 1000-1350
HNRS 1023 **	H	The Middle Ages & Renaissance
NSCI 2111 **		Professional Careers in Nutritional Sciences
NSCI 4373 **		Creative Teaching of Nutrition
PHIL 1213	H	Philosophies of Life
PHIL 3833 **	H	Biomedical Ethics
PHIL 4733 **		Philosophy of Biology
PLNT 1213		Principles of Crop Science
SOIL 4463		Soil and Water Conservation
ZOOL 3123 **	N	Human Heredity

**Table 2.** Distribution of artifact scores for the two groups of reviewers. Each member of the group read and scored each artifact independently, and each group then met to develop a consensus score. The artifacts reviewed by Group 1 were not the same as the artifacts reviewed by Group 2, but the distributions of consensus scores were similar between groups.

Distribution of artifact scores for Group 1:

Artifact Score:	Number	Percent
5	4	10.8
4	5	13.5
3	16	43.2
2	11	29.7
1	1	2.7

Distribution of artifact scores for Group 2:

Artifact Score:	Number	Percent
5	1	2.7
4	10	27.0
3	15	40.5
2	10	27.0
1	1	2.7

Group 1 scores for each reviewer and the consensus score reached by the group:

Artifact Number	Reviewer A	Reviewer B	Reviewer C	Group 1 Consensus Score
2	4	5	5	5
3	3	4	4	3
4	3	4	3	3
5	2	2	3	2
6	2		2	2
7		3	3	3
8	2	3	3	2
9	2	4	3	3
18	1	2	1	1
19	3	3	3	3
20	1	2	2	2
21	4	3	3	3
22	4	4	4	4
23	3	3	2	2
24	5	3	4	5
25	3	2	3	2
26	2	3	3	3
27	2	3	3	2
28	5	3	3	5
29	3	3	3	3
30	2	3	3	3
32	3	3	3	3
33	2	2	4	2
36	2	4	4	3
38	3	4	3	3
39	3	4	4	3
41	3	4	4	4
42	2	3	3	2
43	2	4	5	3
44	5	3	4	5
46	3	3	3	3
47	4	4	3	4
48	3	2	3	2
49	3	4	4	4
50	3	3	3	3
57	3	3	1	2
58	3	4	4	4

Group 2 scores for each reviewer and the consensus score reached by the group:

Artifact Number	Reviewer D	Reviewer E	Reviewer F	Group 2 Consensus Score
59	4	4	4	4
60	5	4	3	4
61	4	3	3	3
62	3	3	3	3
64	3	2	2	2
65	3	2	2	2
71	3	?	3	3
72	2	2	2	2
73	1	4	2	1
74	3	3	2	2
75	4	4	4	4
101	4	3	3	3
102	4	2	3	3
103	4	3	3	3
105	4	3	3	3
106	3	2	2	2
108	3	4	3	3
109	3	2	2	2
110	4	3	3	3
111	2	2	2	2
112	5	4	3	4
114	3	2	2	2
115	3	2	2	2
116	4	3	4	4
117	5	3	3	3
118	3	2		3
119	5	5	4	5
121	3	4	3	3
122	5	3	4	4
123	4	3	3	3
124	3	2	2	2
125	4	4	4	4
126	4	4	4	4
127	5	3	3	3
128	5	3	3	3
129	4	4	3	4
130	4	3	4	4

**Appendix A.** Rubric for evaluating students' skills in written communication.

Score:	Characteristics:
5	<p><b>Content &amp; Organization</b></p> <p>Topic/thesis is clearly stated and well developed; details/wording is accurate, specific, appropriate for the topic &amp; audience, with no digressions; evidence of effective, clear thinking; completely accomplishes the goals of the assignment</p> <p>Paragraphs are clearly focused and organized around a central theme; clear beginnings and endings; appropriate, coherent sequences and sequence markers</p>
	<p><b>Style &amp; Mechanics</b></p> <p>Word choice appropriate for the task; precise, vivid vocabulary; variety of sentence types; consistent and appropriate point of view and tone</p> <p>Standard grammar, spelling, punctuation; no interference with comprehension or writer's credibility</p>
4	Exhibits all characteristics of '3' and some characteristics of '5'
3	<p><b>Content &amp; Organization</b></p> <p>Topic is evident; some supporting detail; wording is generally clear; reflects understanding of topic and audience; generally accomplishes goals of the assignment</p> <p>Most paragraphs are focused; discernible beginning and ending paragraphs; some sequence markers</p>
	<p><b>Style &amp; Mechanics</b></p> <p>Generally appropriate word choice; variety in vocabulary and sentence types; appropriate point of view and tone</p> <p>Some non-standard grammar, spelling, and punctuation; errors do not generally interfere with comprehension or writer's credibility</p>
2	Exhibits all characteristics of '1' and some characteristics of '3'
1	<p><b>Content &amp; Organization</b></p> <p>Topic is poorly developed; support is only vague or general; ideas are trite; wording is unclear, simplistic; reflects lack of understanding of topic and audience; minimally accomplishes goals of the assignment</p> <p>Most paragraphs are rambling and unfocused; no clear beginning or ending; inappropriate or missing sequence markers</p>
	<p><b>Style &amp; Mechanics</b></p> <p>Inappropriate or inaccurate word choice; repetitive words and sentence types; inappropriate or inconsistent point of view and tone</p> <p>Frequent non-standard grammar, spelling, punctuation interferes with comprehension and writer's credibility</p>

**Appendix B.** Preliminary results from the 2001 institutional portfolio - assessment of students' skills in written communication

*Artifacts.* A total of 86 artifacts of students' work were included in the analysis of results from 2001. The portfolio originally included 130 artifacts, but some artifacts were not included in the analysis because the task force decided not to consider in-class writing assignments. Some artifacts were also dropped because of incomplete copying or because the students were no longer at OSU. The final 86 artifacts were produced by students from the following classes and colleges:

	CASNR	CAS	CBA	COE	CEAT	CHES	UAS	Total	Percent
Freshman	4	5	5	0	0	0	1	15	17.4%
Sophomore	0	13	1	2	0	4	0	20	23.3%
Junior	0	7	2	3	0	8	0	20	23.3%
Senior	0	10	9	0	7	5	0	31	36.0%
Total	4	35	17	5	7	17	1	86	
Percent	4.7%	40.7%	19.8%	5.8%	8.1%	19.8%	1.2%		

*Artifact Scores.* Each artifact was scored using a 5-point rubric (Appendix A) where a score of 5 indicated excellent skills in written communication.

Overall distribution of artifact scores:

	Artifact Score:					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Number:	2	28	36	15	5	86
Percent:	2.3%	32.6%	41.9%	17.4%	5.8%	

Distribution of artifact scores by class:

	Artifact Score:					Total
	1	2	3	4	5	
Class:						
Freshman	1	8	5	0	1	15
Sophomore	0	6	11	2	1	20
Junior	0	7	8	3	2	20
Senior	1	7	12	10	1	31
Total	2	28	36	15	5	86

Results of this year's assessment of students' skills in written communication are tentative because of the relatively small number of artifacts (n=86) and because the portfolio represents only one year of information. In preliminary analysis, parametric and non-parametric statistical tests indicated no significant differences in artifact scores among colleges or among classes. Sample sizes may be too small, however, to detect meaningful differences. The 2001 data indicate that the occurrence of scores of 3 or higher was greatest for seniors and lowest for freshmen, suggesting maturity of writing skills with class even though a statistically significant difference among classes was not evident. Preliminary analysis also indicated significant correlations between artifact scores and ACT scores, gpa, and major, but the small samples sizes prevent meaningful discussion of those findings at this time. These types of analyses will be pursued in subsequent years of data collection. Over time, more artifacts of student work collected from greater numbers and kinds of courses will allow more definite conclusions about students' skills in written communication.

**Appendix C.** Slides from the presentation, “Developing and Communicating General Education Learner Goals at a Large Public University”, given at the American Association of Higher Education Assessment Conference, June 2001

**APPENDIX B. PROGRAM OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORTS  
FOR EACH ACADEMIC UNIT**

*Program outcomes assessment annual reports may be prepared and submitted at the college, school, department, or program level.*