# Oklahoma State University
# Committee for the Assessment of General Education
# and
# University Assessment and Testing
# Annual Report, 2022

**Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE)**
Melanie Bayles, Ph.D., Ferguson College of Agriculture (Chair)
Jon Comer, Ph.D., College of Arts and Sciences
Terry Collins, Ph.D., PE, CPEM, College of Engineering, Architecture and Technology
Teresa Lightner, Ph.D., Spears School of Business
Whitney Bailey, Ph.D., College of Education and Human Sciences

**University Assessment & Testing (UAT)**
Ryan Chung, Ph.D., Director
Kelva Hunger, Ph.D., Associate Director, Assessment & Analysis
Kaitlynn Holcomb, B.S., Assessment Specialist
Robin Fitzgerald, B.A., Assessment Specialist

# Contents

# Tables and Figures

## Executive Summary

For the 2021-2022 General Education Outcomes Assessment, OSU piloted evaluating ethics and professionalism. In addition to evaluating written student artifacts by means of the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric, OSU also assessed students' professionalism through supervisor and faculty mentor behavioral ratings using the OSU Professional Skills Rubric.

Key Findings:
- In total, 48 student artifacts were assessed using the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric by a team of two reviewers. The rubric consisted of four categories and one overall rating, making for 240 total possible data points.

  - Overall, 51.3% ($n$ = 123) of student ratings met (score of '3'; 36.3%; $n$ = 87) or exceeded (score of '4' or '5'; 15.0%; $n$ = 36) expectations.

- In total, 7 students' behaviors were rated using the OSU Professional Skills Rubric by supervisor raters. The rubric consisted of 11 categories, making for 77 total possible data points.

  - Overall, 100.0% ($n$ = 77) of student ratings met (score of '3'; 97.4%; $n$ = 75) or exceeded (score of '4' or '5'; 2.6%; $n$ = 2) expectations.

Recommendations:
- Since this was a pilot year for the assessment of Professionalism and Ethics, many things were learned throughout the preparation and data collection process. The newly developed OSU Ethical Reasoning and OSU Professional Skills Rubrics worked well for those providing the review and ratings, but they will continue to be evaluated for their usability and their applicability. The process for collecting ethics artifacts and professionalism ratings will continue to be improved upon.

  - For ethics artifacts, a focus on identifying courses which contain assignments that are not completed using group/team work, but rather are completed individually will be a priority.
  - For professionalism ratings, beginning collection and recruiting early on in the academic year will be essential to acquire more data.

- Moving forward, a main focus will be to acquire more data for both Ethics and Professionalism. Although too few artifacts/ratings were collected this year to make any meaningful conclusions, this was a successful pilot year in that we have created and established many important materials for recruitment, data collection, and analysis (e.g., the OSU Rubrics). Because important recruitment materials have been developed, the recruitment process for the next assessment year for Professionalism and Ethics will begin earlier in the academic year and as a result, more data points will be acquired.

Assessment of general education is a critical aspect of our work to continuously improve our institution. We are fortunate that Oklahoma State University provides substantial resources to assess students' learning and to consider ways in which learning might be improved. Our challenge moving forward is clear: to make the most of this investment by using these results to make meaningful changes to our programs.

Thank you for your time and support of general education assessment. Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

Sincerely,

Ryan Chung, Ph.D.
Director
University Assessment and Testing
Oklahoma State University

**Overview**

**Introduction**

General Education at Oklahoma State University (OSU) is intended to:
   A.  Construct a broad foundation for the student's specialized course of study,
   B.  Develop the student's ability to read, observe, and listen with comprehension,
   C.  Enhance the student's skills in communicating effectively,
   D.  Expand the student's capacity for critical analysis and problem solving,
   E.  Assist the student in understanding and respecting diversity in people, beliefs, and societies, and
   F.  Develop the student's ability to appreciate and function in the human and natural environment.

Full details of the General Education program can be found at:
https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessgened.html

Oklahoma State University has assessed general education for more than 10 years. Three approaches have typically been used to evaluate the general education program: institutional portfolios, review of the general education course database, and college-, department-, and program-level approaches (i.e. exams, surveys, capstone projects, artifact analysis, etc.). This report focuses on OSU's use of institutional portfolio and performance ratings to assess the general education program. Institutional portfolios provide direct evidence of student achievement of the overall goals of general education. Institutional portfolios are currently in use in four areas that represent the overall goals of the general education program. Performance ratings are a new method of general education assessment that invites internship supervisors and faculty mentors to provide evaluations of their students' performance.

For the 2021-22 academic year, Professionalism and Ethics were assessed; here is the current 4-year cycle:

Current Cycle
   1.  **2021-22 | Professionalism and Ethics** (student artifacts/behavioral ratings) **CURRENT REPORTING YEAR**
   2.  **2022-23 | Written Communication and Critical Thinking** (student artifacts)
   3.  **2023-24 | Diversity** (student artifacts/survey)
   4.  **2023-24 | Information Literacy** (student artifacts)

Recognizing that these goals cannot be achieved only through the completion of courses with general education designations, student artifacts and performance ratings are collected from courses across campus that reveal students' achievement in each institutional portfolio area. These student artifacts are then assessed by a panel of OSU faculty members using rubrics, each of which has a different number of categories used in the scoring process.

In 2022, for the review of ethics artifacts, OSU used the newly developed OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric. Artifacts rated with this rubric can receive ratings on a scale from 1 to 5. For this year, OSU also assessed professionalism by collecting performance ratings by internship supervisors and faculty mentors overseeing students. Raters provided their assessment of the student's performance via the OSU Professional Skills Rubric. Observations rated with this rubric can receive ratings of 1 through 5.

## Artifact Analysis

**Assessment Administration**

*Ethics*

Following a review of the Spring 2022 course catalog, instructors of courses that were identified as potentially having a written assignment in ethics (including capstone courses) were solicited for participation in submitting student artifacts to be used in the ethics artifact review. Instructors were contacted by their respective college CAGE representative and given information on what type of assignment would be usable, the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric, instructions on how to provide the artifacts, and insurance that the artifacts would be anonymized and in no way identifiable back to the student.

This is the first pilot year for General Education Assessment of Ethics at OSU. University Assessment and Testing, along with CAGE, reviewed many example ethics rubrics as part of the process for creating and developing our own OSU rubric for assessing ethics. The OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric was modified from the Nicholls State University Ethical Reasoning Rubric.

In the assessment of ethics artifacts, four categories of the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric were assessed. The four categories were:
   A. Ethical Knowledge
   B. Ethical Issue Identification
   C. Ethics in Different Contexts/Settings
   D. Application of Ethical Perspectives

An additional E. Overall category was also given by the raters.

For more information about the above four categories or to view the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric, refer to: https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessgenedrubrics.html.

***Professionalism***

Following a review of the Spring 2022 course catalog, instructors of courses that were identified as potentially having a curriculum related to professional development (including internships) were solicited for participation in submitting evaluations of student performance to be used in the professionalism review. Instructors were contacted by their respective college CAGE representative and given information on what type of course would be applicable, the OSU Professional Skills Rubric, instructions on how to submit the ratings, and insurance that the ratings would be anonymized and in no way identifiable back to the student.

University Assessment and Testing, along with CAGE, decided to adapt the Professional Skills Assessment for Undergraduate Students rubric from the OSU Department of Plant and Soil Sciences. The OSU Professional Skills Rubric was developed and used for assessing professionalism.

The OSU Professional Skills Rubric consists of 12 categories:
  A. Interest in Learning
  B. Judgment
  C. Enthusiasm
  D. Courtesy
  E. Personal Appearance
  F. Relationships with Other Employees
  G. Integrity
  H. Speed of Completing Responsibilities
  I. Ability to perform without supervision
  J. Willingness to receive guidance[1]
  K. Dependability and Reliability
  L. Thoroughness in Completing Tasks

For more information about the above twelve categories or to view the OSU Professional Skills Rubric, refer to: https://uat.okstate.edu/assessment/assessgenedrubrics.html.

---

[1] Excluded from data collection

**Analyses and Findings**

*Ethics*

*Key Findings*

In total, 48 student artifacts were assessed using the OSU Ethical Reasoning Rubric by a team of two reviewers. The rubric consisted of four categories and one overall rating, making for 240 total possible data points.

- Overall, 51.3% (*n* = 123) of student ratings met (score of '3'; 36.3%; *n* = 87) or exceeded (score of '4' or '5'; 15.0%; *n* = 36) expectations.

Below are the results for each rubric category:
    A.  Ethical Knowledge:
          47.9% of the students' artifacts were rated as Meets Expectations ('3'; *n* = 23), and 12.5% of the artifacts were rated as Exceeds Expectations ('4' or '5'; *n* = 6).
    B.  Ethical Issue Identification:
          33.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as Meets Expectations ('3'; *n* = 16), and 25.0% of the artifacts were rated as Exceeds Expectations ('4' or '5'; *n* = 12).
    C.  Ethics in Different Contexts/Settings:
          33.3% of the students' artifacts were rated as Meets Expectations ('3'; *n* = 16), and 10.4% of the artifacts were rated as Exceeds Expectations ('4' or '5'; *n* = 5).
    D.  Application of Ethical Perspectives:
          25.0% of the students' artifacts were rated as Meets Expectations ('3'; *n* = 12), and 12.5% of the artifacts were rated as Exceeds Expectations ('4' or '5'; *n* = 6).
    E.  OVERALL: (Rated category; not an average)
          41.7% of the students' artifacts were rated as Meets Expectations ('3'; *n* = 20), and 14.6% of the artifacts were rated as Exceeds Expectations ('4' or '5'; *n* = 7).

Analysis tables follow.

*Table 1.* Collection of Ethics Artifacts

| College[2] | Course Prefix and Number | Course Name | Number of Artifacts Submitted | Number of Artifacts Rated | Number of Artifacts Included in Analysis |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| CEAT | ECEN 4013 | Design of Engineering Systems | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| SSB | ACCT 4553 | Ethics for Public Accountants | 24 | 24 | 24 |
| **Total Number of Ethics Artifacts:** | | | **48** | **48** | **48** |

*Table 2.* Student Demographics Associated with Ethics Artifacts[3]

| Demographic Variable | Category | # of students (% of total) |
|---|---|---|
| Class[4] | Senior | 77 (100.0) |
| | Total | *n* = 77 |
| College | AGRI | 1 (1.3) |
| | CEAT | 24 (30.4) |
| | SSB | 54 (68.4) |
| | Total | *n* = 79 |
| Gender | Female | 31 (38.8) |
| | Male | 49 (61.2) |
| | Total | *n* = 80 |
| OSU GPA | < 2.0 | 0 (0.0) |
| | 2.0 to 2.49 | 3 (3.7) |
| | 2.50 to 2.99 | 9 (11.1) |
| | 3.00 to 3.49 | 29 (35.8) |
| | 3.50 to 4.00 | 38 (46.9) |
| | Missing | 2 (2.5) |
| | Total | *n* = 81 |

---

[2] Colleges: CEAT = College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology; SSB = Spears School of Business

[3] Due to the need for ethics artifact collection, some group assignments were used; this explains the larger number of students included in the assessment compared to the number of artifacts.

[4] One student could not be assigned to class because of missing information.

_Table 3._ Ethics Artifact Scores for Each Rubric Category

| | SCORE: $n$ (%) | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | $n$ |
| A[5] | 0 (0.0) | 19 (39.6) | 23 (47.9) | 5 (10.4) | 1 (2.1) | 48 |
| B | 1 (2.1) | 19 (39.6) | 16 (33.3) | 12 (25.0) | 0 (0.0) | 48 |
| C | 6 (12.5) | 21 (43.8) | 16 (33.3) | 5 (10.4) | 0 (0.0) | 48 |
| D | 9 (18.8) | 21 (43.8) | 12 (25.0) | 5 (10.4) | 1 (2.1) | 48 |
| Overall | 3 (6.3) | 18 (37.5) | 20 (41.7) | 6 (12.5) | 1 (2.1) | 48 |

**_Professionalism_**

_Key Findings_

In total, 7 students' behaviors were rated using the OSU Professional Skills Rubric by supervisor raters. The rubric consisted of 11 categories, making for 77 total possible data points.

- Overall, 100.0% ($n$ = 77) of student ratings met (score of '3'; 97.4%; $n$ = 75) or exceeded (score of '4' or '5'; 2.6%; $n$ = 2) expectations.

Below are the results for each rubric category:

A. For the following categories (A. Interest in Learning, B. Judgement, D. Courtesy, E. Personal Appearance, F. Relationships with Other Employees, G. Integrity, H. Speed of Completing Responsibilities, I. Ability to perform without supervision, K. Dependability and Reliability, and L. Thoroughness in Completing Tasks):
- 100.0% ($n$ = 7) Exceeded Expectations ('4' or '5') and 0.0% ($n$ = 0) Met Expectations ('3').
B. For the category C. Enthusiasm:
- 71.4% ($n$ = 5) Exceeded Expectations ('4' or '5') and 28.6% ($n$ = 2) Met Expectations ('3').

Analysis tables follow.

---

[5] A = Ethical Knowledge; B = Ethical Issue Identification; C = Ethics in Different Contexts/Settings; D = Application of Ethical Perspectives

*Table 4.* Student Demographics Associated with Professionalism Behavioral Ratings

| Demographic Variable | Category | # of behavioral ratings (% of total) |
|---|---|---|
| Class | Sophomore | 1 (14.3) |
| | Junior | 1 (14.3) |
| | Senior | 5 (71.4) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |
| College | AGRI | 6 (85.7) |
| | SSB | 1 (14.3) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |
| Gender | Female | 5 (71.4) |
| | Male | 2 (28.6) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |
| OSU GPA | < 2.0 | 0 (0.0) |
| | 2.0 to 2.49 | 1 (14.3) |
| | 2.50 to 2.99 | 1 (14.3) |
| | 3.00 to 3.49 | 1 (14.3) |
| | 3.50 to 4.00 | 4 (57.1) |
| | Total | *n* = 7 |

**Overall Implications and Future Direction**

- Assessment data collected from the general education assessment process has been and will continue to be shared broadly (both internally and publicly) to encourage discussion and consideration of additional curricular, programmatic, and/or assessment changes that may result in improvement to the general education assessment program and/or to student achievement of the general education goals.
- Specifically, the General Education Advisory Council (GEAC), the Committee for the Assessment of General Education (CAGE), and the Assessment and Academic Improvement Council (AAIC) meet together once per year to discuss general education assessment results, consider needed changes, and provide recommendations for improvement.
- Assessment data from the general education assessment process are used in three main ways:
    1. to implement improvement initiatives (e.g., faculty, staff, and instructor professional development; modification of assessment processes),
    2. to monitor recent curricular changes, and
    3. to consider and discuss additional modifications to the general education program (e.g., modifying general education curriculum, syllabi, instructional methodologies, general education course designations, or designation goals/criteria).
- Since this was a pilot year for the assessment of Professionalism and Ethics, many things were learned throughout the preparation and data collection process. The newly developed OSU Ethical Reasoning and OSU Professional Skills Rubrics worked well for those providing the review and ratings, but they will continue to be evaluated for their usability and their applicability. The process for collecting ethics artifacts and professionalism ratings will continue to be improved upon.
    o For ethics artifacts, a focus on identifying courses which contain assignments that are not completed using group/team work, but rather are completed individually will be a priority.
    o For professionalism ratings, beginning collection and recruiting early on in the academic year will be essential to acquire more data.

    Moving forward, a main focus will be to acquire more data for both Ethics and Professionalism. Although too few artifacts/ratings were collected this year to make any meaningful conclusions, this was a successful pilot year in that we have created and established many important materials for recruitment, data collection, and analysis (e.g., the OSU Rubrics). Because important recruitment materials have been developed, the recruitment process for the next assessment year for Professionalism and Ethics will begin earlier in the academic year and as a result, more data points will be acquired.
- We will continue to streamline the General Education assessment for each cycle and eventually integrate the information in the Nuventive Improvement Platform assessment management system for ease of distribution and transparency of information. This will also make longitudinal comparisons and examination of trends much easier.