Oklahoma State University

Assessment Report
1999 - 2000

Submitted to
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
October 2000

Office of University Assessment
210 PIO Building
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, OK 74078-6043
405-744-6687
email: wallinj@okstate.edu

Oklahoma State University Assessment Report
1999 - 2000

Contents

Oklahoma State University Assessment Report
1999 - 2000

submitted to
The Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education
October 2000

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 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 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 required to take remedial coursework. Students may waive a remedial course requirement by passing a COMPASS (Computer Adaptive Placement and Support System) test. All students undergo entry-level assessment prior to enrollment.

In 1999-2000, entry-level assessment was conducted for all admitted and enrolled new freshmen and new transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours (n=3,264). After all entry-level assessment was completed in 1999-2000, 520 enrolled new students (15.9% of the total number enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course.

Minor changes were made to ELPA in 1999-2000. The regression equations used in the ELPA statistical model to predict success in entry-level courses were revised to reflect current student data, and the format of the Student Assessment Reports was modified to provide advisors with clear and pertinent entry-level assessment information for each student.

Additional entry-level assessment studies conducted in 1999-2000 included the *CIRP Freshman Survey* and the *College Student Inventory*.

Mid-Level Assessment

Assessment of General Education competencies was conducted at the program-level in 1999-2000. At the same time, a faculty-lead Task Group on General Education Assessment developed a plan for assessing OSU's General Education Program holistically. Both assessment approaches are described.

Approximately 2,180 OSU students participated in programmatic mid-level assessment in 1999-2000. College of Human Environmental Sciences sophomores and juniors were assessed using the *California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI)* and *California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST)*; these assessments were aimed at evaluating mid-level critical thinking skills.

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology students were assessed at mid-level using grades from general education and 1000- and 2000-level courses in the major as criteria for admission to each degree program; this assessment is aimed at evaluating mid-level competencies of general education learning goals. College of Education / Teacher Education students were assessed at mid-level using grades in liberal arts courses or achievement on the *Pre-Professional Skills Test*. Critical thinking and writing skills were assessed at mid-level for all History Department students in the required HIST 3973. The Zoology Department concluded a mid-level assessment project in 2000 aimed at evaluating the educational impact of changes in the introductory biology curriculum on students entering mid-level zoology courses. The assessments consisted of the *Biology Attitude Scale* (Russell and Hollander, 1975) and a 10-Question *Content Knowledge Survey* and was aimed at evaluating student general education competencies in the natural sciences. Also, freshmen and sophomores in the School of Journalism & Broadcasting were given standardized language pre-tests at the beginning of the semester and post-tests at the end of the semester aimed at evaluating student mid-level communication skills.

To accomplish a more holistic assessment of OSU's General Education Program, a Task Group on General Education Assessment developed assessable learner goals for OSU's General Education Program and developed two methods for assessing general education. The first method is the development and use of a General Education Course Database that will allow for holistic review of the General Education Program by identifying the extent to which general education learning goals are covered in the course offerings and by identifying the extent to which students are exposed to coursework aimed at particular general education learning goals. The database will also give an overview of classroom-based assessments of general education learner goals. The second method is the development of an institutional portfolio that will allow faculty to review student work and evaluate students' attainment of general education learner goals. If the Assessment Council and General Education Advisory Council approve the proposed methods, pilot tests for these methods will begin in spring 2001.

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 the faculty members from particular programs; 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 1999-2000 were:

- Capstone courses
- Course-embedded assessments
- Exams - comprehensive exit
- Exams - national / state
- Exit interviews
- Faculty evaluations of student work
- Graduate employment tracking
- Internships
- Portfolios
- Professional jurors or evaluators
- Senior projects
- Student competitions - intercollegiate
- Surveys - alumni
- Surveys - employers / recruiters
- Surveys - graduating seniors
- Tracking enrollment data
- Tracking student academic performance
- Tracking degree completion rates

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

- Qualifying exams
- Theses, dissertations, creative component projects

- Comprehensive exams
- Tracking research activity, publications, professional presentations, professional activity

The most commonly reported use of assessment results was presenting the assessment findings to faculty members and discussing the implications of the data in terms of identifying program strengths and potential areas for improvement. All academic units find the results of outcomes assessment, particularly surveys of current students and alumni, useful in enhancing recruitment, increasing retention, and updating their curricula. Out of 57 academic units (i.e., colleges, schools, departments, or programs) reporting on program outcomes assessment, 50 reported using their assessment results to make *specific changes* to their academic program in 1999-2000. Reported uses of assessment results changes ranged from small changes in course content to major curriculum changes involving adding and deleting courses, major changes to course content, changing course sequences, or changing course requirements. This year about half of academic units reported curriculum changes that involved increased use of computer and information technology, increased use of multimedia in the classroom, or increased opportunities for students to gain 'real world' experience in their disciplines via internships or interactions with professionals in the field. Some academic units also reported acting on assessment results by implementing changes in student advising, orientation programs, academic support programs, computer facilities, and lab facilities.

Student Satisfaction Assessment

Three major surveys were conducted in 1999-2000 to assess student and alumni satisfaction: (1) the 2000 Survey of Alumni of Baccalaureate Programs, (2) the 2000 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, and (3) the College Student Survey.

The *2000 Survey of Alumni of Baccalaureate 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 1,584 telephone interviews were completed with OSU baccalaureate program alumni who graduated in 1998-1999, resulting in a 54% response rate. Ninety-seven percent of alumni reported that they were satisfied with their overall educational experience at OSU, and 95% reported that they were satisfied with the quality of instruction in their major. Approximately 94% of alumni were employed or in graduate school. Of those who were employed, 93% reported that their OSU education had prepared them well or very well for their current position. Among types of employers reported, 40% of alumni reported working for large corporations, 29% reported working for small businesses, 12% reported working for educational institutions, 9% reported working for government, 5% worked for non-profits, and 4% were self-employed.

The *2000 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey* was conducted to gauge student perceptions of graduate programs and services and to identify areas where improvements may be needed. The survey was locally developed and web-based; a total of 1,025 graduate students completed the online survey. The survey included 76 questions that covered topics ranging from relationships with faculty and advisors to student health insurance issues. Sixty-seven percent of graduate students reported that they were very satisfied/satisfied with their overall educational experience

at OSU, and an additional 22% stated that they were somewhat satisfied. Graduate students indicated very high satisfaction with advisors, faculty, and quality of instruction.

The *College Student Survey* was administered to OSU seniors as a follow-up to the CIRP freshman survey. The survey included 22 questions related to student satisfaction with campus programs and services. A total of 295 OSU seniors completed the survey. Seniors indicated highest satisfaction with their interactions with other students, overall college experience, courses in their major, and class sizes. Lowest satisfaction scores were given to career counseling, student housing, tutorial help, and computer training / assistance.

Results of these three surveys are shared with academic leaders and student service leaders across campus, and results are integrated into decisions regarding program development and student services.

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. The Graduate College and Office of University Assessment also conducted a survey of Graduate Student Satisfaction in 2000. Results of this assessment of graduate student satisfaction are described in the section on Student and Alumni Satisfaction Assessment.

What's New in Assessment at OSU in 1999-2000:

- *The Assessment Council Policy Statement on Program Outcomes Assessment*. The Assessment Council adopted a revised policy statement on program outcomes assessment in spring 2000. The policy statement re-asserts the purpose of assessment and provides academic units with specific expectations for outcomes assessment (see Appendix A).

- *The Task Group on the Assessment of General Education*. A task group of seven faculty members was formed in spring 2000 to continue the development of a plan for General Education assessment at OSU. Their work is described in the section on mid-level assessment.

- *The 2000 OSU Alumni Survey*. This survey provided data on the career tracks, continued education, and general satisfaction of recent OSU graduates. It also provided responses to program-specific questions for the purpose of program outcomes assessment. A total of 1,584 telephone interviews were completed from a target population of 2,910 alumni of baccalaureate programs from 1998 and 1999, resulting in a response rate of 54%.

- *The 2000 Online Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey*. This university-wide survey of OSU-Stillwater graduate students was the first web-based, locally developed survey administered campus-wide at OSU. A total of 1,025 graduate students completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 29%. A telephone follow-up survey was also conducted to evaluate the effectiveness of using web-based surveys for OSU students.

- *The Oklahoma State University Assessment Website*. The Office of University Assessment developed a website to distribute assessment information to OSU faculty and to showcase OSU's assessment accomplishments. The website contains 205 linked pages with information about assessment at OSU, tools for faculty assessment coordinators, and links to internet resources for developing and improving assessment programs (www.okstate.edu / assess).

- *Assessment Workshops*. In an effort to provide faculty with information that may assist in developing effective assessments in their academic programs, the Assessment Council and Office of University Assessment invite guest speakers to present information on assessment topics. In 1999-2000, two assessment workshops were sponsored: a workshop on developing electronic portfolios (given by Dennis Pack from Winona State University) and a workshop on using classroom grades for program-level assessment (given by Virginia Anderson from Towson University).

<u>Introduction</u>

Assessment at Oklahoma State University-Stillwater is a part of the institution's commitment to continuous program improvement and to sustaining and enhancing academic quality and the student experience. One of the most important assessment developments at OSU in 1999-2000 was the Assessment Council's development of a revised "Policy Statement on Program Outcomes Assessment". The statement re-asserted the purpose of assessment and the expectations for program outcomes assessment at OSU. Although directed at outcomes assessment, the basic philosophy of the revised policy statement applies to assessment in general:

> "…Assessment of student learning in all academic units can be a beneficial tool for facilitating dialogue about the curriculum and encouraging continuous programmatic improvement throughout a campus. Assessment refers to the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development (Palomba and Banta 1999). Assessment is not a review of faculty performance. Program Outcomes Assessment provides feedback to an academic unit on the performance of its curriculum; thereby allowing informed decisions regarding the need for changes. Assessment is, therefore, an integral part of the commitment at OSU to sustain and enhance academic quality and the student educational experience." (OSU Assessment Council Policy Statement on Outcomes Assessment, 2000)

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 faculty Assessment Council guides the development of assessment at OSU and evaluates 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 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 seventh 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. As instructed, 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.

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 computerized 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. Starting in spring 2000, Student Assessment Reports also included average high school grades in core curriculum areas and this information was considered in making course recommendations.

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, 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 or require 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 COMPASS computerized 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

Table 1.1. Cut-scores for the COMPASS computerized placement test.

Subject Area:	Compass Score	Course Placement
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)	Science 0-59	UNIV 0111
	Science 60-100	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 with a Student Assessment Report describing the assessment results. The Student Assessment Reports are produced by the Admissions Office and are included in each student's file so that the information is 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 1999-2000, a total of 3,264 admitted and enrolled new freshmen and transfer students with fewer than 24 credit hours were assessed.

Students who are 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. The ACT or COMPASS tests may be taken on campus at University Testing and Evaluation Services, 111 N. Murray. Students may prepare for the COMPASS placement test by visiting the ACT COMPASS website and viewing sample questions and information on COMPASS test contents.

Many resources are offered 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 1999-2000, UAS offered free tutoring services to all OSU students as part of a special assessment project (see Special Assessment Projects).

3. What were the analyses and findings from the 1999-00 entry-level assessment?

In 1999-2000, Student Assessment Reports were produced for all admitted and enrolled new freshmen and new transfers with fewer than 24 credit hours (n=3,264). Each 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).

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 in 1999-2000.

Subject Area	# of Students with ACT Subscores <19*	# of Students Cleared for College-Level Coursework by ELPA
English	469	304
Mathematics	686	275
Reading	575	325
Science	530	207

*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 1999-2000.

Subject Area	# of Students who took a COMPASS placement test*	# of Students who Passed
English	125	101
Mathematics	169	6
Reading	123	100
Science	139	14

*Some students took COMPASS tests in more than one area

After all entry-level assessments were completed, 520 enrolled new students (15.9% of the total number enrolled) were required to take at least one remedial course. Of the 3,264 enrolled new students, 88 (2.7%) were required to enroll in remedial English classes; 407 (12.5%) in remedial math classes; 311 (9.5%) in remedial science classes, and 167 (5.1%) in remedial reading classes. Compared with 1998-1999, a smaller percentage of new freshmen were required to take remedial classes in 1999-2000. In 1998 - 1999, 18.8% of enrolled new students were placed in remedial courses, compared with 15.9% in 1999-2000.

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 drop, withdraw, and failure rates in common freshman courses are monitored as each new semester of data is added to the database. Freshmen grades in entry-level courses and the percentage of students that make final grades of less than "C" are also monitored. Institutional Research and University Academic Services conduct this tracking.

In spring 2000, Institutional Research conducted additional tracking of students who were required or recommended by ELPA to enroll in remedial courses in fall semester 1999. This tracking was conducted to determine the success of students placed in remedial courses and to evaluate student completion of performance deficiencies. The study tracked students through fall semester 1999 only. Results show that most students successfully complete their remedial course(s) in their first semester at OSU, and results support the continued use of ELPA and its associated entry level placement policies. This tracking will continue in 2000-2001.

Evaluation of cut-scores. As described in the last annual report, an OSU committee and ACT consultants reviewed cut-scores for the ACT COMPASS placement test in 1998-1999. The review resulted in no changes to COMPASS cut-scores.

Changes in entry-level assessment. Minor changes were made to ELPA in 1999-2000. The regression equations used in the ELPA statistical model to predict success in entry-level courses were revised to reflect the most current student data, and modifications to these predictive models are consistent with our approved Institutional Assessment Plan. This is consistent with our approved 1994 Institutional Assessment Plan. Starting in spring semester 2000, data on average grades in high school core curriculum areas were included on the Student Assessment Reports. Starting in spring 2001, we will be able to include this information in Entry Level Placement Analysis. We are currently studying how to best incorporate the high school core curriculum grade data in the ELPA models.

COMPASS testing was also modified starting with summer semester 2000 because of the upgrade of the COMPASS testing software to the new Windows-compatible version. These changes resulted in dropping the Science compass placement test and adopting a new policy of using COMPASS math and reading scores for science placement decisions. These changes will be described in detail in the 2000-2001 annual report.

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

The CIRP Freshman Survey. The CIRP Freshman Survey is conducted annually 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. At OSU, the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs administers the CIRP survey with financial support from the Office of University Assessment. 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.

Approximately 60% (n=1,752) of new OSU freshmen participated in the CIRP survey during the first week of fall semester. The study provides information about the expectations, attitudes, and high school experiences of OSU freshmen and freshmen nationwide. In 1999, the national press release for the survey focused on the high percentage of freshmen that report feeling a high degree of stress. Results from OSU students were similar to the national comparison group, with 44% of OSU freshmen women and 22% of freshmen men reporting feeling 'overwhelmed by all I have to do". Other highlights of the survey included increases in perceptions of academic disengagement, increases in high school grade inflation, increases in number of older first-time freshmen, declines in drinking and smoking in the previous year, and decreased commitment to social activism. Details of the results of the 1999 CIRP survey are provided on the OSU Assessment Website (www.okstate.edu/assess).

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 Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources and in the College of Human Environmental Sciences. Both colleges combine the CSI data with other background and academic information and track 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 these colleges is increasing.

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

The use of entry-level assessment information in the development of programs for new students is increasing in all colleges. Feedback from advisors regarding the Student Assessment Reports indicates that results of entry level assessment are widely used and provide important information for entry-level course placement decisions. Colleges report using the results of the CIRP Freshman Survey in their freshmen orientation courses as a means of stimulating discussion about student study habits, attitudes, and expectations about college. The College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources developed a new *Freshmen in Transition* program 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 also reports using 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.

Mid-Level Assessment

Mid-Level Assessment at OSU is considered synonymous with assessment of General Education learning outcomes. As such, this assessment is aimed at evaluating student learning of institutionally recognized general education competencies, including communication, analytical, and critical thinking skills.

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.

In 1999-2000, mid-level assessment was conducted at the program-level in many colleges and departments. These assessments are described below in the section, "Programmatic Mid-Level Assessment". At the same time, the University Assessment Council and General Education Advisory Council formed a task group of seven faculty members to develop a plan for assessing OSU's General Education Program holistically. The work of this committee is described in the section, "University-wide General Education Assessment".

Programmatic Mid-Level Assessment

College of Human Environmental Sciences. The College of Human Environmental Sciences has used the *California Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CCTDI*) and *California Critical Thinking Skills Test (CCTST*) to evaluate critical thinking skills for CHES students since 1999. The development of critical thinking and creative problem solving activities has been established as an essential competency for CHES students. The standardized test is administered at mid-level and assesses the ability of students to succeed as critical thinkers.

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology. The College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology uses grades from general education and 1000- and 2000-level courses in the major as criteria for admission to each degree program. Hence, CEAT students are assessed at mid-level on the basis of their successful completion of general education and introductory courses. Grades from these courses serve as indicators of mid-level general education competencies.

College of Education, Professional Education Unit. For full admission to the Professional Education Unit, students must achieve a 3.0 in liberal arts courses or pass the *Pre-Professional Skills Test*. This mid-level assessment is required for all students in this program.

History Department. The History Department uses HIST 3973, Historical Methods and Interpretations, to assess its majors who have accumulated 45-70 credit hours. The course includes preparation of a research paper that is added to the student's portfolio and is used to assess critical thinking and writing skills necessary for the major.

Zoology Department. The Zoology Department concluded a mid-level assessment project in 2000 aimed at evaluating the educational impact of changes in the introductory biology curriculum on students entering mid-level science courses. The assessments consisted of the *Biology Attitude Scale* (Russell and Hollander, 1975) and a 10-Question *Content Knowledge*

Survey and was aimed at evaluating student achievement of general education learning goals for the natural sciences.

School of Journalism & Broadcasting. Freshmen and sophomores in the School of Journalism & Broadcasting are given standardized language pre-tests and post-tests to evaluate student mid-level writing skills.

University-wide General Education Assessment

Since the State Regents required assessment of mid-level competencies in 1991, OSU has used a variety of methods to accomplish this mandate university-wide, including standardized instruments, locally-developed tests of writing and critical thinking, a university-wide study of undergraduate writing, and program-specific assessments aimed at mid-level competencies. Although these methods provided useful mid-level assessment information, none have resulted in a viable means of assessing general education competencies for all OSU students on a continuous basis.

The OSU Assessment Council has formed a General Education Assessment Task Group consisting of seven faculty members representing the Assessment Council, the General Education Advisory Council, and departments extensively involved in general education instruction. Task group members were provided a summer stipend to continue the development of a plan for General Education assessment. The main accomplishments of this task group, to date, are the development of assessable general education learner goals and a proposal describing two methods for assessing general education. The assessment methods are described below. Pilot tests for these methods are planned for spring 2001.

Learner Goals for General Education. The Task Group has developed assessable learner goals for the General Education program. Establishment of these learner goals is an important first step that forms the basis of subsequent proposed assessments.

The General Education Course Database. This database is proposed to be a web-based system of data collection where data is provided by instructors of general education courses. Instructors will identify which of the established general education learning goals are targeted in their course(s) and what methods are used in the classroom to evaluate student achievement of general education learning goals. The database will allow for holistic review of the General Education Program by identifying the extent to which general education learning goals are covered in the course offerings and by identifying the extent to which students are exposed to coursework aimed at particular general education learning goals. The database will also give an overview of classroom-based assessments of general education learner goals.

The Institutional Portfolio. The Task Group also proposed the use of an institutional portfolio as a direct method of assessing the degree to which students are meeting the general education learner goals. The portfolio will consist of randomly selected pieces of student work (artifacts) that will be used to evaluate students' attainment of the goals of general education. Evaluation teams will use accepted scoring rubrics for each learning goal to evaluate artifacts. Results will be presented to the General Education Advisory Council, the Assessment Council, home departments of the courses, and faculty teaching the courses. These groups will use this evaluative information as a basis for determining and implementing program changes.

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

Programmatic Mid-Level Assessment

Approximately 2,180 OSU students participated in programmatic mid-level assessment in 1999-2000.

College of Human Environmental Sciences.   A total of 372 CHES students participated in mid-level assessment of critical thinking skills in 1999-2000. This standardized instrument is a required part of a required course for all junior-level students.

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology. All CEAT students are assessed using mid-level grade point averages in order to continue in their CEAT degree program. In 1999-2000, this assessment involved approximately 650 students.

History Department. All history students are required to take HIST 3973. In 1999-2000, this assessment involved 18 students.

Zoology Department. A total of 552 students participated in the mid-level assessment coordinated by the Zoology department. Students were asked to complete the standardized assessment instrument during their class and lab periods.

School of Journalism & Broadcasting. The School of Journalism & Broadcasting's mid-level assessment is also part of a required class for undergraduates in this program. In 1999-2000, 186 students took the post-test portion of this language exam.

College of Education, Professional Education Unit. All students who wish to enter the Teacher Education Program must meet the mid-level assessment criteria described above. In 1999-2000, this assessment involved approximately 400 students.

University-wide General Education Assessment

The proposed methods for assessing the General Education Program, if approved, will be pilot tested in spring 2001.

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

Programmatic Mid-Level Assessment

All programs with mid-level assessment criteria track student degree completion rates and time to degree completion after completing mid-level assessments.

University-wide Assessment of General Education

The proposed university-wide general education assessment methods are aimed at assessing the general education program as a whole and not the progress of individual students. If accepted, these assessments will not include tracking individual students.

10.   What were the analyses and findings from the 1999-00 mid-level assessment?

Programmatic Mid-Level Assessment

Analyses and findings of programmatic mid-level assessments are included in the program outcomes assessment reports for each academic program (this report, pages 69-200).

University-wide Assessment of General Education

The proposed methods for assessing the General Education Program, if approved, will be pilot tested in 2000-2001.

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

Programmatic Mid-Level Assessment

Uses of programmatic mid-level assessment results for program improvement are included in the program outcomes assessment reports for each academic program (this report, pages 69-200).

University-wide Assessment of General Education

The proposed methods for assessing the General Education Program, if approved, will be pilot tested in 2001. The proposal for general education assessment includes details on 'closing the feedback loop', or how data assessment results will be shared with campus leaders to effect change. Proposals call for review of assessment data by the General Education Advisory Council, the Assessment Council, and by department heads and faculty members involved in the general education curriculum.

Program Outcomes Assessment

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

Tables 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 students assessed are given in the individual assessment reports or report summaries submitted by each college, department, or degree program (this report, pages 69-200).

Academic units use a variety of methods to assess student-learning outcomes. The most commonly used assessment methods for undergraduate programs reported in 1999-2000 were:

- Capstone courses
- Course-embedded assessments
- Exams - comprehensive exit
- Exams - national / state
- Exit interviews
- Faculty evaluations of student work
- Graduate employment tracking
- Internships
- Portfolios

- Professional jurors or evaluators
- Senior projects
- Student competitions - intercollegiate
- Surveys - alumni
- Surveys - employers / recruiters
- Surveys - graduating seniors
- Tracking enrollment data
- Tracking student academic performance
- Tracking degree completion rates

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' work experience to evaluate student achievement of program learning outcomes, and the College of Educations' Professional Education Unit has a tutorial software that is used for assessment purposes.

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

- Qualifying exams
- Theses / dissertations / creative component projects

- Comprehensive exams
- Tracking research activity / publications / professional presentations / professional activity

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Table 12.1. Assessment methods and numbers of individuals assessed for each college, department, and degree program at OSU, including graduate degrees, reported for 1999-2000. 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
Ag Education, Communication, and 4-H Youth Development		
B.S., Ag Communication option	• Intern Performance - evaluations by intern supervisors • Capstone course w/ senior project • National competition (National ACT Critique & Contest) • Senior exit interviews • Alumni survey	• 35 • 33 • 27 • 25 • 26
B.S., Ag Education, Professional Service option	• Internships - evaluations by visiting faculty, and student reports, presentations, surveys related to the internship experience • Senior exit interviews	• 19 • 19
B.S., Ag Education, Teaching option	• Portfolios - traditional • Portfolios - digital	• 25 • 2
Agricultural Economics		
B.S.	• Senior exit interviews • Student Surveys • Class discussions • Student grade report tracking • Employer and recruiter surveys - informal • Alumni survey	• 70 • 70 • 70 • 60 • NA • 84
M.S., PhD.	• Student grade report tracking • Student degree completion tracking • Comprehensive exams	• 37 (MS) • 19 (PhD)

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Animal Science

B.S.	• Capstone course w/ senior papers and oral presentations • Student survey in capstone course • Intercollegiate academic competition - Animal Science Quadrathlon • Intercollegiate Judging Teams • Certification Exams (American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists)	• Approx. 240
M.S., PhD.	• Thesis or dissertation with defense • Final exams • Comprehensive exams - written and oral • Certification Exams (American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists)	• 9 (MS) • 5 (PhD)

Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

B.S.	• Standardized exams - American Chemical Society exam in Biochemistry • Student exit interviews	• 8 (BS, CAS) • 11 (BS, CASNR)
M.S., PhD.	• Student publications • Comprehensive exams • Student degree completion tracking	• 11 (MS) • 11 (PhD)

Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering

B.S., M.S.	• Grades in selected courses are used as assessment criteria in the areas of basic and engineering science, engineering analysis and design skills, written and oral communications skills, leadership and teamwork, • Exit interviews • Input from student club advisors (faculty) • Alumni employment and continuing education tracking	• 8 (BS) • 2 (MS)
M.S.	Same as above, plus • Research thesis or research report • Final exams • Student presentations and participation in professional meetings	

Entomology and Plant Pathology

M.S., PhD.	• Exit interviews - written and oral	• 8

Environmental Science

B.S.	• Exit interviews • Student tracking - academic performance and degree completion • Capstone course w/ student projects evaluated by clients	• 20

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Forestry

B.S., M.S.		
	• Exit interviews	• 6
	• Capstone course	• 14
	• Faculty evaluations for capstone course	• 8
	• Senior surveys	• 11
	• Post-summer camp retention and graduation rates	• all camp participants
	• Alumni survey - satisfaction survey, graduates of last 5 years	• 80 alumni

Horticulture and Landscape Architecture

B.S., Horticulture options		
	• Tracking student graduation rates and academic performance	• 22 – 25
	• Intercollegiate competitions (Horticulture Judging Contest)	• 7
	• Exit interviews	• 8
	• Internships – student and employer evaluations	• 22

B.S., Landscape Architecture (LA) and Landscape Contracting (LC)options		
	• Tracking student enrollment, graduation rates, and employment status	• 82 LA, 28 LC
	• Records of visiting lecturers / critics	• 82 LA, 28 LC
	• Professional jurors – evaluation of student projects	• 43 LA, 12 LC
	• Records of student portfolio reviews	• 11 LA
	• Capstone course evaluation	• 11 LA
	• Exit interviews	• 5 LA, 1 LC
	• Design Competition	• 11 LA
	• Internships	• 7 LA, 1 LC
	• Learning styles inventory	• 32 LA, 13 LC
	• Portfolios – digital	• 11 LA
	• Alumni survey	• 12 LA
	• Intercollegiate competitions (ALCA field day)	• 12 LC

M. Ag., M.S. , and PhD, Horticulture options		
	• Exams – preliminary, qualifying, and final	• All Horticulture MS and PhD students
	• Thesis, formal reports, informal reports, or creative component	
	• Publications in print	
	• Professional presentations	
	• Exit interviews	
	• Student awards, scholarships, honorary societies	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Plant and Soil Sciences

B.S.	• Entry level placement	• 18 graduating seniors
	• Participation, leadership, and awards in student organizations	• 80 undergraduates
	• Intercollegiate competitions (several)	
	• Student tracking	
	• Exit interviews	
	• Employer, internship cooperator satisfaction data	
	• Senior seminar course	
	• Unofficial external certification exams	

College of Arts and Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
Art Department		
B.A., Art History	• OK Conference of Art Historians	• 0
B.A., Studio Art	• Portfolio Review by outside evaluator	• 2
B.F.A., Graphic Design	• Portfolio Review by outside evaluator	• 14
B.F.A., Studio Art	• Portfolio Review by outside evaluator	• 5
Botany Department		
B.S., Botany	• Exit questionnaire	• 7 (6 undergrad, 2 grad)
B.S., Biology	• Alumni survey (B.S. only)	• 62
M.S. Botany		
Chemistry Department		
B.S.	• Alumni survey (PhD only)	• 7 BS
M.S., PhD.	• Exit interviews	• 4 MS
	• Graduate student research symposia	• 11 PhD
	• Input from Colleges served by the Department	
	• Research reports from capstone course (BS only)	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Communication Sciences and Disorders Department		
B.S. in CSD	• Capstone course grades	• 17 seniors and 42 alumni
	• Alumni and senior surveys	
M.A. in Speech	• Student representation on curriculum & clinic committees	• 8-29, depending on method
	• Exit written and oral interviews	
	• Grades / evaluation of students in internship placements	
	• National certification examination	
	• Alumni and employer surveys at 3 and 5 years post-graduation	
	• Employment tracking	
Computer Science Department		
	• Student survey	• 26
English Department		
B.A., English	• Senior survey, available on the internet	• 7
Foreign Languages and Literatures Department		
B.A. in French, German, Russian, or Spanish	• Monitoring grades in required advanced courses	• 92
	• Exit interviews	• 15
	• Scores and pass rates from Teacher Certification exams	• 4
Geography Department		
B.A. or B.S.	• Written exit exam	• 3
	• Written exit interview	• 1
	• Oral exit interview	• -
School of Geology		
B.S. and M.S.	• Exit surveys	• 9 B.S. and 2 M.S.
History Department		
B.A., History	• Performance of majors in required survey courses	• 111
	• Analysis of upper-division history electives taken	
	• Evaluation of performance in capstone courses, including review of student portfolios	
School of Journalism & Broadcasting		
B.A., B.S. Journalism / Broadcasting	• Course evaluations	• 935
	• Language exam (freshman/sophomore and junior/senior)	• 31/31 and 99/87
	• Internship evaluation	• 79
	• Alumni survey	• 47
	• Accreditation review	• -

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

M.S. Mass Communication	• Course evaluations • Exit interviews • Comprehensive exams • Creative component • Course evaluations / OSU-Tulsa	• 55 • 6 • 6 • 3 • 45
Mathematics Department		
B.S., Math	• Grade data in core courses • Senior exit questionnaire • Alumni Survey	• All math B.S. seniors • 12 alumni
Microbiology and Molecular Genetics Department		
B.S., Microbiology and B.S., Cell & Molecular Bio	• Exit interview • Mail questionnaire	• 12 (Microbiology) • 3 (Cell & Molecular Biology)
Music Department		
B.M. education	• Student teaching evaluations • Oklahoma Subject Area Test • Admission to Professional Education Program – interview • Alumni survey • Music Theory barrier exam	• 8 • 7 • 12 • ongoing • 22
B.M. performance	• Senior recital • Vocal juried audition • Instrumental juried audition • Keyboard juried auditions • NATS adjudicated performance • Ensemble Selection from juried audition • Alumni survey • Music Theory barrier exam	• 10 • 90 • 70 • 24 • 20 • 1 • ongoing • 22
Physics Department		
B.S., M.S., PhD	• Exit interview form for graduating students	• 2 B.S., 4 M.S., 3 PhD.
Psychology Department		
B.A. and B.S., Psychology	• Web-based senior survey • Analysis of GRE Psychology subject test scores	• 62 • 9

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

PhD., Clinical Psych, Experimental Psych, and Social Psych	• Mailed survey		• 47 Clinical Psychology • 8 Experimental Psychology • 10 Social Psychology
Sociology Department			
B.S., Sociology	• Telephone interviews with students who transfer in or out of the program • Telephone interviews with graduating seniors • Telephone interviews with alumni		• 32 • 25 • 15
Statistics Department			
B.S., M.S., and PhD	• Electronic student surveys (M.S. and PhD) • Mid-level assessment of B.S. Statistics students and students served by undergraduate Statistics courses		• 7 M.S., 11 PhD. • About 10,000
Theatre Department			
B.A. Theatre, M.A. Speech (Theatre)	• Semester performance juries and portfolio • Post production reviewers • ACTF Irene Ryan acting competition • Internship and graduate school placement • Alumni Survey		• 58 • 37 • 2 • 14 • -
Zoology Department			
B.S., Zoology, Biology, Wildlife, and Physiology	• Alumni survey • Mid-level assessment to evaluate academic impact of curricular changes to introductory biology courses		• 101 • 552

College of Business Administration

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	
College-wide assessments		
Undergraduate students (B.S., Finance, Management, Marketing, Accounting, Economics, MIS, and Double Majors	• Satisfaction survey	• 240
Graduate students (M.S., Accounting, Economics)	• Satisfaction survey	• 24

30

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Graduate students (long distance) (MBA, MSTM)	• Online satisfaction survey	• 82
Doctoral students (PhD., Marketing, Management, Finance, Accounting, Economics	• Satisfaction survey	• 19
CBA Recruiters	• Online satisfaction survey	• 8

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

College of Education

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology		
M.S., Ph.D., Counseling Psychology M.S., Ed.S., Ph.D., Educational Psychology B.S., M.S. Ed.D., Health & Human Performance B.S., M.S., Ed.D., Leisure Studies	• Enrollment data • Student course evaluations • Internship placement rates and internship performance • Graduation rates • State Licensure and National Certification examinations • Placement rates of graduates in their chosen field • Alumni surveys • Employer surveys • Programmatic accreditation reviews	• 124 students and alumni; 12 faculty; 76 internship/practicum supervisors and/or employers
School of Educational Studies		
Human Resources / Adult Education graduate programs	• Survey this year's graduates • Document Analysis • Transcript Analysis • Course Schedule Analysis • Analysis of Admittance Records • Analysis of Course Grade Reports • Review of Course Evaluations • Interview Faculty Re: Office Hours	• 12 • - • 24 • - • 24 • 46 • 58 • -
Research, Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics graduate programs	• Examination of documents for student demographic profile, academic performance, and enrollment trends	• 21

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Student Development, graduate programs	• Program completion rates • Student academic performance (grades) • Tracking completion of comprehensive exams • Tracking completion of dissertations / theses/ creative components	• 31
Educational Leadership Program – Ed.D., M.S. Higher Ed,	• Tracking enrollment and graduation data • Alumni interviews (Ed.D.)	

School of Curriculum & Educational Leadership

Professional Education Unit, all bachelor's programs	• Follow-up survey of Oklahoma State Teacher Education Program Graduates • Learning Plus, a computer-based instructional and assessment program to assist students in preparing for the PPST exam • Portfolio assessment	• 335 • 50 • 138

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed

<u>School of Architecture</u>

B.S.	• Survey of professionals who served on capstone course juries • External accreditation review by the National Architecture Accrediting Board • External accreditation review by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology • Alumni Survey • Exit interviews • Internal program review and self-study • Portfolios of cumulative student work	• 38 • 264 • 70 • 20 • 22
Master of Arch, Master of Arch Eng	• Exit interviews • Professional participation on Creative Component Juries	•

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

School of Chemical Engineering

B.S.		
	Fundamentals of Engineering Exam	22
	Senior Survey in fall semester	35
	Exit interviews fall and spring	36
	End of course survey – student response to objectives	1x35
	End of course evaluation by the faculty	1x35
	Course evaluations	10x40
	Feedback by Celanese visitors on student design problem	1x35
	External academic contests	3
	Student activity in School's activities	100
	AIChE National Data	many
	Alumni feedback	10
	Industrial feedback (IAC and recruiters)	20

M.S., PhD.		
	Fundamentals of Engineering Exam	1
	Exit interviews fall and spring	6
	GRE Scores	12
	Course teaching evaluations (all graduate ChE courses)	7x15
	Course grade distributions (Core ChE courses)	5x12
	Probation events	45
	Research publication/presentation activity	45
	Safety citations	45
	Faculty opinion on quality of student performance	3
	Faculty end-of-course assessment	6x12

Civil and Environmental Engineering

B.S.		
	Surveys (2)	48
	Exit Interviews	
	Faculty evaluations	
	FE Exam	
	Grades	
	Student Advisory Committee	
	Employee Input	
	Board of Visitors	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

M.S., Civil Eng	• Exit Interviews • Theses/Reports Defense • Grades • Faculty Input • Board of Visitors	• 31
M.S., Env Eng	• Exit Interviews • Theses/Report Defense • Grades • Faculty Input • Board of Visitors	• 8
PhD	• Theses Defense • Qualifying Exam • Committee Input	• 4
Construction Management Technology		
All degree programs	• Exit surveys of graduates for F99 & S00 semesters • Course evaluations for S99, F99, & S00 semesters • Employer reviews of student performance in internships, Sum 99 • AIC Graduate Placement Surveys for F99 & S00 semesters • National CQE Level I for S99, F99 & S00 semesters • Regional ASC student competitions, S00 • OUA telephone survey, S00	• 34 • 156 • 40 • 34 • 51 • 18 • 27
Electrical and Computer Engineering		
B.S., Electrical Eng	• Senior Exit Survey (1) • Committee review of labs (2) • Committee review of Circuits class (3)	• 40 • 105 • 50
B.S., Electrical Eng (Computer Eng option)	• Senior Exit Survey (1) • Committee review of labs (2) • Committee review of Circuits class (3)	• 35 • 100 • 50
M.S., Electrical Eng	• Committee review (4)	• 150
PhD, Electrical Eng	• Committee review (4)	• 25

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Electrical Engineering Technology

EET – electronics and computer	• Alumni Survey	• 843
	• Competencies Exam	• 14
	• Senior Projects – students in EET 4832	• 14

Fire Protection and Safety Technology

| All degrees | • Survey of Alumni | • 29 |
| | • Feedback from alumni listserv | • na |

School of Industrial Engineering and Management

B.S.	• Alumni Survey (recent baccalaureate graduates)	• 17
	• Fundamentals Examination (national in scope)	• 14
	• Undergraduate student focus group	• 6
	• Senior Exit Survey/Interview	• 22
	• Capstone Projects (teams/projects)	• 10
	• Class grades	• All
	• Course evaluations	• All
M.S., M.I.E., M.M.S.E., and PhD	• Graduate student focus group	• 6
	• Exit Survey/Interview	• 11
	• Thesis and dissertation defenses	• All
	• Class grades	• All
	• Course evaluations	• All

School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering

B.S. in Mechanical Engineering, Majors Mechanical Engineering, Pre-Medical Option, and Aerospace Engineering Option	• Performance of seniors on national Fundamentals of Engineering Exam	• 200
	• Capstone design course performance of seniors	
	• Exit interviews with all graduating seniors	
	• Feedback from employers	
	• Employment statistics	
	• Feedback from MAE Industrial Advisory Board	
	• Course evaluations by junior and senior students.	
M.S. in Mechanical Engineering	• Final defenses of reports and theses by all degree candidates	• 120
	• Course evaluations by all M.S. students.	

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

| Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering | • Final defenses of reports and theses by all degree candidates
• Course evaluations by all Ph.D. students | • 15 |

Mechanical Engineering Technology

| | • Alumni Survey
• Exit Interviews
• Fluid Power Certification | • 115
• 11
• - |

College of Human Environmental Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Numbers of Individuals Assessed
College-Wide Assessments		
Entering Undergraduates	• College Student Inventory (CSI) • Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI)	• 269 • 233
Midlevel Undergraduates	• Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI) • Critical Thinking Skills Test(CTST)	• 179 • 193
BS Graduates (1 year out)	• Undergraduate Alumni Survey	• 141
BS Graduates (5 years out)	• Undergraduate Alumni Survey (Pilot)	• 102
PhD & MS Graduates	• Graduate Student Alumni Survey	• 51
Design, Housing, & Merchandising (DHM)		
B.S.	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out) • Academic and Design Portfolios • Internship Employer Surveys • Senior Survey • Embedded Course Projects • Two Advisory Boards for Interior Design, Apparel	• 34, 26 • 66 • 54 • 49 • 295 • overall program
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Surveys • Embedded Course Projects	• 26 • 31

Table 12.1. Assessment Methods & Number Assessed

Family Relations & Child Development (FRCD)		
B.S.	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out)	• 25, 13
	• Senior Survey	• 82
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	• 24
Hotel & Restaurant Administration		
B.S.	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out)	• 25, 13
	• Senior Survey	• 11
	• Capstone Course Embedded Assessment	• 76
	• Assessment of Hospitality Business Skills	• 25
	• Capstone Course Critical Thinking Skills	• 3
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	•
Nutritional Sciences		
B.S.	• Senior Exit Interview	• 17
	• DPD & Preceptor Survey	• 14
	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out)	• 19, 6
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	• 8
	• Registered Dietician Exam	• 8

13. What were the analyses and findings from the 1999-2000 program outcomes assessment?

Analyses and findings from the 1999-2000 program outcomes assessment activities were unique for each degree program assessed. Details of the analyses and findings from program outcomes assessment are described in the individual assessment reports or report summaries submitted by each college, department, or degree program (this report, pages 69-200).

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

All academic units find the results of outcomes assessment, particularly surveys of current students and alumni, useful for updating their curricula, enhancing recruitment, and increasing retention. Uses of the results of program outcomes assessment information are summarized for each degree program in Table 14.1. Specific details about these instructional changes are described in the individual assessment reports submitted by each college, department, or degree program (this report, pages 69-200).

The most commonly reported use of assessment results was presenting the assessment findings to faculty members and discussing the implications of the data in terms of identifying program strengths and potential areas for improvement. Out of 57 academic units reporting on program outcomes assessment (i.e., colleges, schools, departments, or programs), 50 reported using their assessment results to make specific changes to their academic program in 1999-2000. As shown in Table 14.1, reported changes ranged from small changes in course content to major curriculum changes involving adding and deleting courses, major changes to course content, changing course sequences, or changing course requirements. This year about half of academic units reported curriculum changes that involved increased use of computer and information technology, increased use of multimedia in the classroom, or increased opportunities for students to gain 'real world' experience in their disciplines via internships or interactions with professionals in the field. Some academic units also reported acting on assessment results by implementing changes in student advising, orientation programs, academic support programs, computer facilities, and lab facilities.

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Table 14.1. Uses of assessment results for each college, department, and degree program at OSU reported for 1999-2000. Details assessment methods, results, and uses of results are described in the individual assessment reports provided in this report. Numbers of individuals assessed are included in the individual reports for each academic program.

College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Uses of Assessment Results
Ag Education, Communication, and 4-H Youth Development		
B.S., Ag Communication option	• Intern Performance - evaluations by intern supervisors • Capstone course w/ senior project • National competition (National ACT Critique & Contest) • Senior exit interviews • Alumni survey	• Capstone course modified & improved • Developing new course(s) to address computer applications and editing skills • Modifications to senior interviews to obtain additional information
B.S., Ag Education, Professional Service	• Internships - evaluations by visiting faculty, and student reports, presentations, surveys related to the internship experience • Senior exit interviews	• Curricular improvements in major courses to augment career exploration, leadership development, writing, and presentation skills
B.S., Ag Education, Teaching option	• Portfolios - traditional and digital	• Curriculum area improvements to increase student knowledge of professional organizations and knowledge of Oklahoma Minimum Competencies for effective Instruction • Added requirement for students to videotape student teaching experiences
Agricultural Economics		
B.S.	• Senior exit interviews • Student Surveys • Class discussions • Student grade report tracking • Employer and recruiter surveys - informal • Alumni survey	• Curricular modifications to senior-level courses to include more real world examples, tighter sequencing of topics, and additional integration, problem-solving, and communication skills • Changes to option sheets for majors
M.S., PhD.	• Student grade report tracking • Student degree completion tracking • Comprehensive exams	• Considering additional courses and modifications to current courses • Collaborating on the development of a new graduate program

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Animal Science

B.S.	• Capstone course w/ senior papers and oral presentations • Student survey in capstone course • Intercollegiate academic competition - Animal Science Quadrathlon • Intercollegiate Judging Teams • Certification Exams (American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists)	• Program advising improvements • Increased use of technology in student presentations • Curricular improvements to capstone course, esp. related to student presentations
M.S., PhD.	• Thesis or dissertation with defense • Final exams • Comprehensive exams - written and oral • Certification Exams (American Registry of Professional Animal Scientists)	

Biochemistry & Molecular Biology

B.S.	• Standardized exams - American Chemical Society exam in Biochemistry • Student exit interviews	• Course changes in survey courses to allow more in depth study for majors • Changes to facilities to provide internet resources to classrooms • New faculty members added to strengthen areas in teaching program and provide active and diverse research labs for student research participation
M.S., PhD.	• Student publications • Comprehensive exams • Student degree completion tracking	

Biosystems and Agricultural Engineering

B.S., M.S.	• Grades in selected courses are used as assessment criteria in the areas of basic and engineering science, engineering analysis and design skills, written and oral communications skills, leadership and teamwork, • Exit interviews • Input from student club advisors (faculty) • Alumni employment and continuing education tracking	• New facilities for distance education, new laboratory facilities • Curriculum modifications to enhance student knowledge of biological sciences, written and oral communications skills, and engineering design • Involvement of department placement committee to enhance placement of graduates • Increased emphasis on systematic student and program assessment • Exit interviews and alumni surveys adopted as assessment tools
M.S.	Same as above, plus • Research thesis or research report • Final exams • Student presentations and participation in professional meetings	

Entomology and Plant Pathology

M.S., PhD.	• Exit interviews - written and oral	• Course changes and new course added

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Environmental Science

B.S.	• Exit interviews • Student tracking - academic performance and degree completion • Capstone course w/ student projects evaluated by clients	• Curriculum changes to add GIS and HASWOPER certification opportunities, add an ethics course, and enhance ecology course offerings • Modify general education requirements for majors • Charged a task force of faculty to define major issues in the program and make recommendations

Forestry

B.S., M.S.	• Exit interviews • Capstone course • Faculty evaluations • Senior surveys • Post-summer camp retention and graduation rates • Alumni survey - satisfaction survey, graduates of last 5 years	• Modifications to major courses • New efforts to track transfers in/out of program • New faculty member added in wood products area

Horticulture and Landscape Architecture

B.S., Horticulture options	• Tracking student graduation rates and academic performance • Intercollegiate competitions (Horticulture Judging Contest) • Exit interviews • Internships – student and employer evaluations	• Changes to option sheets • New course added, curriculum improvements noted
B.S., Landscape Architecture and Landscape Contracting options	• Tracking student enrollment, graduation rates, and employment status • Records of visiting lecturers / critics • Professional jurors – evaluation of student projects • Capstone course • Exit interviews • Internships • Learning styles inventory • Portfolios – digital • Alumni survey • Intercollegiate competitions (ALCA field day)	• Curriculum changes including more real world projects, increased use of CAD design tools • Facility improvements proposed to integrate computer teaching into design studios • Continued use of professional mentors
M. Ag., M.S. , and PhD, Horticulture options	• Exams – preliminary, qualifying, and final • Thesis, formal reports, informal reports, or creative component • Publications in print • Professional presentations • Exit interviews • Student awards, scholarships, honorary societies	• Increases in program recognition resulting form increased student publication records will be used to enhance program recruiting • Increased computer facilities for graduates students • Senior faculty asked to mentor new graduate faculty

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Plant and Soil Sciences		
B.S.	- Entry level placement - Participation, leadership, and awards in student organizations - Intercollegiate competitions (several) - Student tracking - Exit interviews - Employer, internship cooperator satisfaction data - Senior seminar course - Unofficial external certification exams	- New initiative to increase student awareness of career opportunities - Continued promotion of participation in student organizations and academic contests - New assessment proposed to evaluate time required for degree completion - Weekly help sessions for students developed to enhance academic success

College of Arts and Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	**Assessment Methods**	**Uses of Assessment Results**
Art Department		
B.A., Art History	OK Conference of Art Historians	- Portfolio exhibitions for seniors are now offered during spring and fall semesters - Student exhibits are now professionally photographed - Assessment for Art History is being developed involving a student paper that would be reviewed by an outside professional
B.A., Studio Art	Portfolio Review by outside evaluator	
B.F.A., Graphic Design	Portfolio Review by outside evaluator	
B.F.A., Studio Art	Portfolio Review by outside evaluator	
Botany Department		
B.S., Botany B.S., Biology M.S. Botany	- Exit questionnaire - Alumni survey (B.S. only)	None reported
Chemistry Department		
B.S. M.S., PhD.	- Alumni survey (PhD only) - Exit interviews - Graduate student research symposia - Input from Colleges served by the Department - Research reports from capstone course (BS only)	- Assessments showed that lecture portion of instructional programs has improved, but the lab portion needs improvement. Efforts are being made to modernize labs. - A new option in Biochemistry was added - The department has worked with CEAT to 'modernize' the curriculum to address new technologies. - Changes are being developed in CHEM 1414, CHEM 3553, and in the graduate curriculum.

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Communication Sciences and Disorders Department		
B.S. in CSD	• Capstone course grades • Alumni and senior surveys	• Department course in sign language was changed from 4000 level to 2000 level to allow students to take more advanced courses through OSU-OKC as part of their program. • Block scheduling has provided maximum flexibility for clinical observations and practicum. • Courses are being upgraded to include multimedia technology. • Department is embarking on a content / sequence analysis of material in the area of normal and disordered child language to see if curriculum changes are needed.
M.A. in Speech	• Student representation on curriculum & clinic committees • Exit written and oral interviews • Grades / evaluation of students in internship placements • National certification examination • Alumni and employer surveys at 3 and 5 years post-graduation • Employment tracking	• Program has changed the entire course scheduling calendar for 2nd year students involved with clinical practicum internships. • Curriculum redesign resulted in core courses for first year students and electives for 2nd year students. • Specific courses have been modified in response to program outcomes assessment.
Computer Science Department		
	• Student survey	• Curriculum changes • Advising are focusing on the needs of transfer students by providing continuously updated information to ensure smooth transition to OSU programs.
English Department		
B.A., English	• Senior survey, available on the internet	• None reported
Foreign Languages and Literatures Department		
B.A. in French, German, Russian, or Spanish	• Monitoring grades in required advanced courses • Exit interviews • Scores and pass rates from Teacher Certification exams	• Continue to implement the introduction of a more proficiency-based introductory text in elementary Spanish
Geography Department		
B.A. or B.S.	• Written exit exam • Written exit interview • Oral exit interview	• Assessment information is used annually to improve undergraduate instruction • Faculty are considering student interest in increased field trips • Career counseling is recognized as a needed area of improvement; the department is working with the new CAS career service counselor • New computers have been installed in student labs in response to student input • Computer lab hours have been expanded to respond to student needs
School of Geology		
B.S. and M.S.	• Exit surveys	• Developing an endowed chair for Geophysics • Additional software added to the student computer lab • Geology Web Site is being revised to include job opportunities

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

History Department		
B.A., History	• Performance of majors in required survey courses • Analysis of upper-division history electives taken • Evaluation of performance in capstone courses, including review of student portfolios	• Assessment results this year reinforce changes in History requirements made in 1995. Curriculum changes to assure majors complete their degree with a breadth of historical understanding is clearly working. • Assessments also indicate that attempts to insure majors complete the B.A. with an understanding of the interpretative nature or historic scholarship, and an understanding of history as a discipline, are proving successful.
School of Journalism & Broadcasting		
B.A., B.S. Journalism / Broadcasting	• Course evaluations • Language exam (freshman/sophomore and junior/senior) • Internship evaluation • Alumni survey • Accreditation review	• Faculty in each sequence are conducting a curriculum review. Several new courses have been proposed. • Based on previous assessments, additional sections of Media and Society were added to meet student demand. • Faculty mentoring program developed and faculty teaching effectiveness programs are encouraged.
M.S. Mass Communication	• Course evaluations • Exit interviews • Comprehensive exams • Creative component • Course evaluations / OSU-Tulsa	• Graduate students are mentored and encouraged to submit articles and make formal presentations • Teaching experiences are now offered to graduate students interested in this area • Focus groups identified need for work on market strategies for the program • Options have been implemented to allow degree concentration on media business, management, and international issues
Mathematics Department		
B.S., Math	• Grade data in core courses • Senior exit questionnaire • Alumni Survey	• None reported
Microbiology and Molecular Genetics Department		
B.S., Microbiology and B.S., Cell & Molecular Bio	• Exit interview • Mail questionnaire	• Plan to increase problem solving approaches to instruction. • Course added to provide practical hand-on laboratory training • Implementing program changes in Cell & Molecular Bio degree program
Music Department		
B.M. education	• Student teaching evaluations • Oklahoma Subject Area Test • Admission to Professional Education Program – interview • Alumni survey • Music Theory barrier exam	• Substantially revised music ed degree plan on basis of NCATE and OCTP assessments • Revisions are being considered for the jury assessments to improve feedback to students

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

B.M. performance	• Senior recital • Vocal juried audition • Instrumental juried audition • Keyboard juried auditions • NATS adjudicated performance • Ensemble Selection from juried audition • Alumni survey • Music Theory barrier exam	• See above.
Physics Department B.S., M.S., PhD	• Exit interview form for graduating students	• Continuing to involve undergraduates in research programs. • New recruiting efforts are planned
Psychology Department B.A. and B.S., Psychology	• Web-based senior survey • Analysis of GRE Psychology subject test scores	• Advising improvements made & appear to be successful based on year-to-year comparison of student satisfaction scores • Dissemination of information for students has been improved via orientation courses, websites, and email • Assessment enforced continuation of extracurricular programs such as Psychology Club, the student listserv, and freshman orientation.
PhD., Clinical Psych, Experimental Psych, and Social Psych	• Mailed survey	• None reported
Sociology Department B.S., Sociology	• Telephone interviews with students who transfer in or out of the program • Telephone interviews with graduating seniors • Telephone interviews with alumni	• Career placement has been identified as an area of concern
Statistics Department B.S., M.S., and PhD	• Electronic student surveys (M.S. and PhD) • Mid-level assessment of B.S. Statistics students and students served by undergraduate Statistics courses	• Students are being advised to better prepare them for the challenges of advanced statistics courses • Enhanced activities are being considered to target at-risk students in STAT 2023
Theatre Department B.A. Theatre, M.A. Speech (Theatre)	• Semester performance juries and portfolio • Post production reviewers • ACTF Irene Ryan acting competition • Internship and graduate school placement • Alumni Survey	• Assessments have confirmed the effectiveness of recent program changes. • The Irene Ryan auditions will be dropped due to lack of student interest. • External reviewers have identified the need for additional training in voice and speech; and curriculum changes are being considered in response to this concern.

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Zoology Department		
B.S., Zoology, Biology, Wildlife, and Physiology	• Alumni survey • Mid-level assessment to evaluate academic impact of curricular changes to introductory biology courses	• Changes in introductory courses have changed student attitudes towards biology, as demonstrated in assessment results • The academic effects of changes to introductory course continue to be monitored • New faculty member added in Genetics • Changes to advising process are being considered

College of Business Administration

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Uses of Assessment Results
College-wide assessments		
Undergraduate students (B.S., Finance, Management, Marketing, Accounting, Economics, MIS, and Double Majors	• Satisfaction survey	**Uses of past assessment results:** • Upgraded computer resources for students • Established a series of presentations and seminars on interview and job search skills • Undergraduate Curriculum Committee is re-assessing communications requirements • Efforts initiated to improve the resources available to Doctoral students
Graduate students (M.S., Accounting, Economics)	• Satisfaction survey	**Uses of current assessment results:** • Assessment and Continuous Improvement Committee will evaluate the sampling process used to conduct student satisfaction surveys with a goal of creating, if necessary, a process that produces a random sample.
Graduate students (long distance) (MBA, MSTM)	• Online satisfaction survey	• The Assessment and Continuous Improvement Committee will continue the undergraduate, graduate, and recruiter surveys in its on-going efforts to assess the activities of the CBA.
Doctoral students (PhD., Marketing, Management, Finance, Accounting, Economics	• Satisfaction survey	• The results regarding the low levels of satisfaction expressed by off-campus Masters students will be forwarded to the Graduate Studies Committee with a recommendation to develop mechanisms to facilitate interaction between distance-learning students and faculty and staff.
CBA Recruiters	• Online satisfaction survey	• The continuing concerns of Doctoral students with respect to the level of research support will be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research and Graduate Studies for further study.

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

College of Education

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Uses of Assessment Results
School of Applied Health and Educational Psychology		
M.S., Ph.D., Counseling Psychology M.S., Ed.S., Ph.D., Educational Psychology B.S., M.S. Ed.D., Health & Human Performance B.S., M.S., Ed.D., Leisure Studies	• Enrollment data • Student course evaluations • Internship placement rates and internship performance • Graduation rates • State Licensure and National Certification examinations • Placement rates of graduates in their chosen field • Alumni surveys • Employer surveys • Programmatic accreditation reviews	• None reported
School of Educational Studies		
Human Resources / Adult Education graduate programs	• Survey this year's graduates • Document Analysis • Transcript Analysis • Course Schedule Analysis • Analysis of Admittance Records • Analysis of Course Grade Reports • Review of Course Evaluations - Interview Faculty Re: Office Hours	• Dialogue is occurring at the college level regarding standardized / flexible curriculum configurations
Research, Evaluation, Measurement, and Statistics graduate programs	• Examination of documents for student demographic profile, academic performance, and enrollment trends	• None reported
Student Development, graduate programs	• Program completion rates • Student academic performance (grades) • Tracking completion of comprehensive exams • Tracking completion of dissertations / theses/ creative components	• None reported

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Educational Leadership Program – Ed.D., M.S. Higher Ed,	• Tracking enrollment and graduation data • Alumni interviews (Ed.D.)	• Faculty have learned to deliver classes that are taught via interactive television and / or on-line technology; current students can now take these classes. • The faculty has developed an academic leadership area of emphasis within the broader educational leadership Ed.D. degree. • The need for classes and research advisement in school finance has been identified. • Ph.D. and Ed.D. Programs in educational leadership have been proposed
School of Curriculum & Educational Leadership		
Professional Education Unit, all bachelor's programs	• Follow-up survey of Oklahoma State Teacher Education Program Graduates • Learning Plus, a computer-based instructional and assessment program to assist students in preparing for the PPST exam • Portfolio assessment	• Additional information about the Learning Plus program has been developed and distributed to provide this tool to more students. • A staff member has been hired to coordinate student portfolio development.

College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Uses of Assessment Results
School of Architecture		
B.S.	• Survey of professionals who served on capstone course juries • External accreditation review by the National Architecture Accrediting Board • External accreditation review by the Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology • Alumni Survey • Exit interviews • Internal program review and self-study • Portfolios of cumulative student work	• Study of undergraduate curricula in architecture and architectural engineering was conducted during spring and fall 1999. Significant changes in curriculum have been proposed and approved which will take effect next year.
Master of Arch, Master of Arch Eng	• Exit interviews • Professional participation on Creative Component Juries	

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

School of Chemical Engineering

B.S.
- Fundamentals of Engineering Exam
- Senior Survey in fall semester
- Exit interviews fall and spring
- End of course survey – student response to objectives
- End of course evaluation by the faculty
- Course evaluations
- Feedback by Celanese visitors on student design problem
- External academic contests
- Student activity in School's activities
- AIChE National Data
- Alumni feedback
- Industrial feedback (IAC and recruiters)

- Improved orientation information
- Greater use of multi media in teaching
- Greater use of simulators and CAD packages for assignments
- Added lab / discussion to CHE4124 and CHE4224
- Specific improvements to the Unit Operations Lab
- Added a bio-medical option to the CHE program
- Added course in biomedical engineering
- Dropped 3-SCh from the program
- Changes in curricula to introduce 'transport phenomena' earlier in curriculum
- Changes to ENSC courses as a result of FE exam assessment
- Chemistry and Math committees working with these departments to refine curricula
- Changing ENGR 1322 to an intro to design course
- P-Chem II requirement changed to Adv Chem Sci elective

M.S., PhD.
- Fundamentals of Engineering Exam
- Exit interviews fall and spring
- GRE Scores
- Course teaching evaluations (all graduate ChE courses)
- Course grade distributions (Core ChE courses)
- Probation events
- Research publication/presentation activity
- Safety citations
- Faculty opinion on quality of student performance
- Faculty end-of-course assessment

- New required course for PhD students CHE 6703
- PhD students now required to give seminar in last semester
- Course content changes in CHE5213 and CHE5743

Civil and Environmental Engineering

B.S.
- Surveys (2)
- Exit Interviews
- Faculty evaluations
- FE Exam
- Grades
- Student Advisory Committee
- Employee Input
- Board of Visitors

- Added two elective courses
- Added multi media to course presentations – CIVE3843
- Field trips added to courses
- Curriculum committee is evaluating need for required speech courses
- Changes to ENGC 1322 to make it discipline specific and retain AUTOCAD
- Two grad level structures courses added

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

M.S., Civil Eng	- Exit Interviews - Theses/Reports Defense - Grades - Faculty Input - Board of Visitors	
M.S., Env Eng	- Exit Interviews - Theses/Report Defense - Grades - Faculty Input - Board of Visitors	
PhD	- Theses Defense - Qualifying Exam - Committee Input	
Construction Management Technology		
All degree programs	- Exit surveys of graduates for F99 & S00 semesters - Course evaluations for S99, F99, & S00 semesters - Employer reviews of student performance in internships, Sum 99 - AIC Graduate Placement Surveys for F99 & S00 semesters - National CQE Level I for S99, F99 & S00 semesters - Regional ASC student competitions, S00 - OUA telephone survey, S00	- Created course in Construction Safety - Combined Mechanical and Electrical Systems courses and added a lab component - Added course w/ Advanced Surveying Module - Increased requirements for developing communication skills - Created capstone course - Added ACCT 2103 as an approved elective - Continued revision of the Computer Estimating course
Electrical and Computer Engineering		
B.S., Electrical Eng	- Senior Exit Survey (1) - Committee review of labs (2) - Committee review of Circuits class (3)	- Results of surveys will be shared with faculty & used to develop curriculum modifications. - Committee appointed to identify problems with new laboratories for undergraduate courses. Committee prepared report and made recommendations. Review of the improvements is planned. - Content of ENSC 2613 reviewed to see if changes were needed to improve retention of material by students. Committee is continuing to discuss this topic. - Graduate programs committee met to review grad programs and found that students were spending too much time on class work and not enough time on research. Committee recommended changes in required number of courses.
B.S., Electrical Eng (Computer Eng option)	- Senior Exit Survey (1) - Committee review of labs (2) - Committee review of Circuits class (3)	
M.S., Electrical Eng	Committee review (4)	
PhD, Electrical Eng	Committee review (4)	

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

Electrical Engineering Technology		
EET – electronics and computer	• Alumni Survey • Competencies Exam • Senior Projects – students in EET 4832	• New course developed for transfer students to facilitate transition into a highly math oriented curriculum.
Fire Protection and Safety Technology		
All degrees	• Survey of Alumni • Feedback from alumni listserv	• New lab facility is being developed to provide better facilities for fire alarm experiences. • Instructors were given survey results and are making appropriate course-specific changes. • Faculty were surprised that alumni perceived that certification was not emphasized. Based on this, the department will reassess emphasis on certification as communicated to students.
School of Industrial Engineering and Management		
B.S.	• Alumni Survey (recent baccalaureate graduates) • Fundamentals Examination (national in scope) • Undergraduate student focus group • Senior Exit Survey/Interview • Capstone Projects (teams/projects) • Class grades • Course evaluations	• Major revisions are underway in re-defining explicit outcomes for undergrad and grad programs. • Faculty have revised courses to include newer technologies, including increased use of multi-media and efforts to increase computer availability for student projects. • Student presentations moved to high-tech presentation rooms in ATRC. • Focus advisory groups of students have been formed to provide the department head with information about current issues with the school.
M.S., M.I.E., M.M.S.E., and PhD	• Graduate student focus group • Exit Survey/Interview • Thesis and dissertation defenses • Class grades • Course evaluations	• New faculty hired to provide leadership and additional coverage and depth in IE&M instruction and research. • Plans to redefine coursework structure at undergraduate and graduate levels. • Graduate program revision planned to balance needs for practice-related coursework and theory-related coursework. • Recruiting and communication with graduates will be improved using internet resources.
School of Mechanical and Aerospace Engineering		
B.S. in Mechanical Engineering, Majors Mechanical Engineering, Pre-Medical Option, and Aerospace Engineering Option	• Performance of seniors on national Fundamentals of Engineering Exam • Capstone design course performance of seniors • Exit interviews with all graduating seniors • Feedback from employers • Employment statistics • Feedback from MAE Industrial Advisory Board • Course evaluations by junior and senior students.	• New equipment added to measurements and instruction labs. • New elective course added in mechatronics • New composites lay-up lab, oven curing lab, and aircraft assembly lab added to student instructional facilities • Comprehensive review of undergraduate program was completed. Recommendations will be implemented in 2000-2001. • Increased standards for acceptance into the graduate program. • Proposed plans for providing students with more real-world projects solicited

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

M.S. in Mechanical Engineering	• Final defenses of reports and theses by all degree candidates • Course evaluations by all M.S. students.	from industry.
Ph.D. in Mechanical Engineering	• Final defenses of reports and theses by all degree candidates • Course evaluations by all Ph.D. students	
Mechanical Engineering Technology	• Alumni Survey • Exit Interviews • Fluid Power Certification	• Faculty reviewed survey findings and will consider making possible changes as suggested by alumni. Survey findings will also be discussed with the departments advisory council committee.

College of Human Environmental Sciences

Academic Unit / Degree Program Assessed	Assessment Methods	Uses of Assessment Results
College-wide assessments		
Entering Undergraduates	• College Student Inventory (CSI) • Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI)	• Entry-level assessment using the CSI is continued to identify predictors of persistence and withdrawal among incoming students. • A database of information from the CTDI and CTST is being developed that will allow tracking of scores longitudinally to assess trends in critical thinking disposition and skills • Assessment survey results were reviewed by the HES assessment task force and provided to departments for review and action. The information was summarized and presented to faculty and administration at a faculty retreat. Dean Knaub charged all departments to report summaries of assessment results, utilization and future plans, including data use for curricular and instructional changes. • Assessment information was presented to the CHES Alumni Board and Associates. • The results of the pilot survey of baccalaureate level alumni (five years after graduation) were reviewed by the HES assessment task force for content, format, and recommended modifications. Data from the surveys will be utilized for trend analysis and program improvement. • In the coming year the college assessment task force will focus on analysis of data collected to date and resulting program recommendations.
Midlevel Undergraduates	• Critical Thinking Disposition Inventory (CTDI) • Critical Thinking Skills Test(CTST)	
BS Graduates (1 year out)	• Undergraduate Alumni Survey	
BS Graduates (5 years out)	• Undergraduate Alumni Survey (Pilot)	

Table 14.1. Uses of Assessment Results

PhD & MS Graduates	• Graduate Student Alumni Survey	

Design, Housing, & Merchandising (DHM)

B.S.	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out) • Academic and Design Portfolios • Internship Employer Surveys • Senior Survey • Embedded Course Projects • Two Advisory Boards • Interior Design, Apparel	• Results of the 2000 senior survey will be reviewed during an upcoming retreat. • Changes to major names ("apparel merchandising " major was changed to "merchandising") and new degree option added • Based on the new "interiors merchandising" option, the content of several DHM courses that have traditionally been offered to apparel students is being revised to incorporate 'interiors merchandising" content. • Based on assessment data, the content of two courses was merged and offered as a single course.
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Surveys • Embedded Course Projects	

Family Relations & Child Development   (FRCD)

B.S.	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out) • Senior Survey	• A study of the undergraduate internship program is underway to determine needed changes. • Professors are more focused on competencies (behavioral outcomes). • The entire undergraduate curriculum is being reviewed. Data from assessment surveys are impacting the review process. • Survey summaries will be electronically shared with faculty, discussed in faculty meetings, used by curriculum committees.
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	

Hotel & Restaurant Administration

B.S.	• Alumni Surveys (1 and 5 years out) • Senior Survey • Capstone Course Embedded Assessment of Hospitality Business Skills • Capstone Course Critical Thinking Skills	• Curriculum revision. HRAD faculty used assessment data to revise the curriculum in alignment with the guidelines of the hospitality accreditation organization, CPHA. • A survey of industry employers is being developed. • A plan for course embedded assessment is also being developed using competencies from the certification exams from the American Hotel and Motel Association and the National Restaurant Association.
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey	

Nutritional Sciences

B.S.	• Senior Exit Interview • DPD & Preceptor Survey • Alumni Surveys • 1 year out (after internship) • 5 years out (after internship)	• Assessment data will be presented to NSCI faculty during a fall retreat. • Undergraduate curriculum revision is planned for 2000. • Curriculum changes based on assessment results, including using classrooms better suited for group work, new courses added in food systems administration a counseling and nutrition assessment.
M.S., PhD.	• Alumni Survey • Registered Dietician Exam	

Student and Alumni Satisfaction Assessment

Student and alumni satisfaction assessment evaluates student perceptions of academic and campus programs and services, and results of these assessments provide feedback for improvement of programs and services.

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.

Three major surveys were conducted in 1999-2000 to assess student and alumni satisfaction: (1) the 2000 Survey of Alumni of Baccalaureate Programs, (2) the 2000 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey, and (3) the College Student Survey

2000 Survey of Alumni of Baccalaureate Programs

The 2000 Survey of Alumni of Baccalaureate Programs was conducted to identify institutional strengths and areas for improvement as indicated by recent graduates; to track the career and continuing education trends 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 and February 2000 and targeted 2,910 alumni of baccalaureate programs who graduated between spring 1998 and summer 1999. All 1998-1999 alumni from academic departments or colleges that elected to participate in the survey were included in the target population; this included the entire College of Business Administration, the entire College of Human Environmental Sciences, eleven departments in the College of Arts and Sciences, eight departments in the College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources, and six departments in the College of Engineering, Architecture, and Technology. The survey was administered as a telephone interview and included common questions (related to employment and continuing education) and questions related to program outcomes for each degree program.

2000 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey

The 2000 OSU Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey was conducted to obtain feedback from graduate students about a broad range of topics related to their educational experiences while enrolled in the Graduate College at OSU. The survey was intended to provide data to gauge student perceptions of various aspects of the graduate programs and services, to identify areas where improvements may be needed, and to satisfy State Regent's requirements for assessing current student satisfaction. The survey was conducted in February 2000 and targeted OSU-Stillwater graduate students who were enrolled in January 2000. The OSU Bureau for Social Research administered the survey. The Bureau sent all students in the target population an email message that explained the purpose of the survey and provided an entry code and a direct link to the internet survey.

The College Student Survey

The College Student Survey (CSS) was conducted as a follow-up to the CIRP freshman survey in spring 1999. Data from these two surveys indicate how experiences of seniors were different from their expectations as freshmen, and how students changed during their years at OSU. The survey included 27 questions about senior students' satisfaction with their educational experiences; results

of this portion of the survey may be used for student satisfaction assessment. The CSS was administered and coordinated by the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs with assistance from the Assessment Office. The survey was mailed to 2,191 OSU students classified as seniors in spring 1999, and 295 seniors completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 13%.

Other Assessments of Student Satisfaction

In addition to these university-wide surveys, many academic units conduct their own surveys of student satisfaction as part of their program outcomes assessment. In 1999-2000, 18 academic units conducted their own senior surveys that included items related to student satisfaction. Results of these surveys are described in the individual assessment reports submitted by each college, department, or degree program (this report, pages 69-200). 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 1999-2000 student satisfaction assessment?

The 2000 Survey of Alumni of Baccalaureate Programs

Response Rate. Almost 1,600 telephone interviews with OSU alumni were completed, resulting in a response rate of 54.4%. 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 81.7%.

Residency. An estimated 74% of the alumni who participated in the survey were living in Oklahoma, and 26% 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. Seventy-six percent of alumni reported that they were employed. Most alumni reported working for large corporations (40%) or small corporations or businesses (30%); 10% were employed by government agencies, and 11% were employed by educational institutions. Alumni most frequently reported that their annual salary was in the range of $26,000 to $35,000 per year. Ninety-three percent of employed alumni reported that their OSU education had prepared them very well or adequately for their current position.

Continuing Education. Twenty-seven percent of alumni were enrolled in graduate programs or professional schools. Almost 60% of these were enrolled in OSU graduate programs. Seventy-one percent were pursuing master's or doctoral degrees, 9% were pursuing law degrees, 7% were pursuing medical degrees, 4% were pursuing business degrees, and 4% were attending schools of veterinary medicine. Ninety-four percent of alumni who were attending graduate or professional school stated that their OSU education had prepared them very well or adequately for their continued education.

Overall Satisfaction. Over 97% of alumni reported that they were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with their overall educational experience at OSU. Ninety-five percent stated that they were very satisfied or somewhat satisfied with the quality of education in their major field of study. Over 90% of alumni reported that they were very well or adequately prepared in terms of computer skills, writing skills, and their abilities to identify and solve problems. Most alumni also stated that their OSU education had contributed to their understanding of responsible citizenship, diverse cultures, and current social and political issues.

2000 Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey

Response Rate. A total of 1,025 graduate students completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 29%.

Overall Satisfaction. Sixty-seven percent of graduate students stated that they were very satisfied/satisfied with their educational experiences at OSU, and an additional 22% indicated that they were somewhat satisfied. About 12% of students indicated some dissatisfaction with their overall educational experience at OSU ('somewhat dissatisfied', 'dissatisfied', or 'very dissatisfied').
Admissions / Orientation. Over 70% of graduate students reported that they were very satisfied/satisfied with the admissions process when they entered graduate school at OSU. Fifty-

four percent of graduate students strongly agreed/agreed that they received adequate information to help them become oriented to campus programs and services.

Student Services and Administrative Offices. Overall, graduate students were satisfied with both student services and administrative offices. With respect to administrative offices, students were generally very satisfied/satisfied with the helpfulness of the offices in responding to their concerns or questions. And for those students who used specific student services, they were also generally very satisfied/satisfied with those services.

Graduate Student Resources. Fifty-three percent of graduate students were very satisfied/satisfied with computer resources available in their academic department; 56% of students were very satisfied/satisfied with the email services available to them on this campus; 63% of students strongly agreed/agreed that the library resources at OSU had met their needs as graduate students; and 52% of students strongly agreed/agreed that the research resources in their academic department had met their needs as graduate students.

Academic Program Climate / Quality. Sixty-seven percent of graduate students were very satisfied/satisfied with the overall quality of their academic program. Seventy-five percent of students were very satisfied/satisfied with their relationships and interactions with faculty.

Relationships with Advisors. Students were generally very satisfied with their relationship with their advisors; 85% of graduate students strongly agreed/agreed that their advisor was approachable; 79% strongly agreed/agreed that their advisor takes sufficient time to address questions or concerns; and 74% strongly agreed/agreed that their advisor provided constructive feedback on their work.

Assistantships. Eighty-six percent of graduate students said that they received some form of financial assistance. Seventy-three percent of students said they had an assistantship; 39% of students had a research assistantship; 35% had a teaching assistantship; and 13% had some other type of assistantship. Of those with teaching assistantships, 71% strongly agreed/agreed that they were provided with adequate information and resources to perform their teaching responsibilities.

Student Life. Sixty-two percent of graduate students were very satisfied/satisfied with the recreational and fitness opportunities available to them; 46% were very satisfied/satisfied with the entertainment, arts, and music available to them; 57% were very satisfied/satisfied with their opportunities for involvement in campus organizations; 86% were very satisfied/satisfied with safety and security on campus; and 78% were very satisfied/satisfied with their relationships and interactions with other graduate students.

Campus Climate / Diversity. Sixty-two percent of graduate students strongly agreed/agreed that OSU is a friendly campus towards those with culturally diverse backgrounds. However, 29% of students stated that they had *experienced* some type of discrimination at OSU and 45% stated that they had *observed* discrimination at OSU.

Health Insurance / Daycare. Forty-three percent of graduate students strongly agreed/agreed that they had adequate health care coverage for themselves; however, 40% strongly disagreed/disagreed that they had adequate coverage. Sixty percent of graduate students strongly agreed/agreed that they have delayed or not sought health care due to cost. Of those who responded to the survey item related to daycare, 72% strongly agreed/agreed that they were concerned about finding good daycare for their children while attending graduate school.

Reasons for attending OSU. The most important factors cited as reasons for attending OSU were cost (75% said this was very important/important), availability of financial assistance (70% said this was very important/important), and reputation of a particular degree program (66% said this was very important/important).

College Student Survey

A total of 295 OSU seniors completed the College Student Survey, resulting in an overall response rate of 13%. The following table shows the percentages of students who reported college activities as <u>very satisfactory</u> or <u>satisfactory</u>:

Interaction with other students	88%	Ability to find a faculty or staff mentor	63%
Overall college experience	87%	Humanities courses	63%
Courses in your major field	83%	Social science courses	62%
Class size	83%	Laboratory facilities and equipment	61%
Library facilities	80%	Opportunities for community service	61%
Availability of internet access	80%	Relevance of coursework to everyday life	58%
Computer facilities	77%	Financial aid services	57%
Amount of contact with faculty or staff member	75%	Academic advising	54%
General education courses	74%	Job placement services for students	47%
Campus health services	69%	Quality of computer training / assistance	46%
Recreational facilities	68%	Tutorial help or other academic assistance	46%
Science and mathematics courses	67%	Student housing	43%
Sense of community on campus	65%	Career counseling or advising	40%
Leadership opportunities	64%		

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

Results of the alumni survey were provided to academic units in May 2000, just a few weeks before the Program Outcomes Assessment Reports were due in the Office of University Assessment. Therefore, only a few academic units included this data or planned uses of the results in their program outcomes assessment reports. Uses of results from this survey will be detailed in the next academic year's outcomes assessment reports. Deans, department heads, and faculty assessment coordinators have provided positive comments indicating the usefulness of the survey results, particularly information on student continued education and career tracks. The Office of University Assessment plans to continue surveying alumni of baccalaureate programs bi-annually. Surveys of alumni of graduate programs will be conducted in alternate years.

Results of the Graduate Student Satisfaction Survey and the College Student Survey were not made available until late summer 2000. Hence, the data and appropriate uses of results are still being considered. The Graduate College, however, has already reported planning changes in enrollment procedures and orientation programs based on the results of the Graduate Student Satisfaction survey.

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.

19. What were the analyses and findings from the 1999-2000 graduate student assessment?

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

Graduate student assessment is considered a part of the Program Outcomes Assessment conducted in each academic unit. Similarly, Graduate student assessment methods, numbers of students assessed, results of assessments, and uses of results of assessment are described and summarized in the section on Program Outcomes Assessment. Details of the results of graduate student outcomes assessment are described in the individual assessment reports submitted by each college, department, or degree program (this report, pages 69-200).

In addition to outcomes assessment for graduate programs, the Graduate College and Office of University Assessment conducted a survey of Graduate Student Satisfaction in 2000. Results of this assessment of graduate student satisfaction are described and summarized in the section on Student and Alumni Satisfaction Assessment.

Special Assessment Projects

Assessment of CEAT Academic Excellence Workshops

In spring 2000, the Office of University Assessment and CEAT Director for Student Academic Services coordinated an assessment of the CEAT Academic Excellence Workshops. The assessment was designed to gain feedback on student perceptions of the workshops, workshop attendance, and factors that students perceive as impacting their overall academic performance.

An online survey was conducted in April 2000 and targeted students who were enrolled in PHYS 2014, PHYS 2114, and MATH 2145 during fall 1999. A total of 134 CEAT students completed the survey, resulting in a response rate of 21%. Results of the assessment indicate that student perceptions of the workshops are very positive. Workshops for the physics courses received more positive responses than the workshops for the math course, but overall, 80% of respondents stated that the workshops helped them improve their grades in those courses, more than 80% stated that the workshops helped them understand the concepts from these courses, and 79% stated that the workshops helped them organize information so that they can better understand and solve problems. The assessment also identified some factors that prevent students from attending, including time/schedule conflicts and workshop locations, and other areas for improvements. Results of the assessment were used to refine the workshops for fall 2000, and will continue to be used to improve this academic service for students.

Assessment of the Impact of a University-Wide Tutoring Program for Undergraduates

University Academic Services received assessment funds in 1999-2000 to continue their assessment of free, campus-wide tutoring for undergraduate students at OSU. The tutoring service was evaluated using a Pre-Tutoring Questionnaire and a Post-Tutoring Survey.

The results of the Pre-Tutoring Questionnaire revealed that students from all OSU colleges used the free-tutoring program. Fifty-seven percent of students seeking free tutoring offered through UAS had also sought help from other campus academic assistance programs, including the Math Learning Resources Center, the Writing Center, and the Chemistry Lab. Although some students provided positive comments about these resources, the most common reasons cited for seeking alternative tutoring was that these services did not provide enough individual attention or that these resources were overcrowded. Students also stated that the most important factors to them regarding tutoring programs were: same tutors for each session, length of tutoring session, tutoring offered in the evening, and tutoring costs. Overall, the results of this assessment indicate that although existing tutoring resources are good, a variety of services are needed to meet the unique concerns of a large and diverse undergraduate population.

The results of the Post-Tutoring Survey indicated that students found the UAS free tutoring program to be very helpful. Student comments support the helpfulness and positive impact of this service on student academic success. Another important aspect of this program is the importance of the peer relationships generated by the tutoring program. Tutors, typically undergraduate and graduate students, serve as ombudsmen for their students when misunderstandings and confusion occur on course assignments and materials. These types of relationships and interactions can have a profound impact on retention for students who are struggling to meet an academic challenge.

Assessment of the CASNR Freshmen in Transition (FIG) : A Living Group Program

Freshmen in Transition is a new retention program implemented in fall 2000. A small grant was provided to this program to develop assessments to evaluate the academic impact of this program for College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources (CASNR) freshmen. The program involves 72 CASNR freshmen who live together in the same residence hall and participate as a group in campus events, tutoring sessions, intramural sports, community service, and interactions with faculty members. The program is aimed at promoting academic and leadership excellence. The assessment of this program will compare the academic success of FIT students with other CASNR and OSU students, as well as evaluating their development in areas of leadership and service. The assessment is designed to be a longitudinal cohort study and, as such, will continue until 2003-2004.

Other Assessment Studies

- The Honors Program 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 University Honors Program 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 programs and services. Results of these assessments can be obtained from the Office of the Vice President of Student Affairs.

Appendix A. OSU Assessment Council Policy Statement On Program Outcomes Assessment

OSU requires that all academic programs conduct Program Outcomes Assessment to comply with the assessment mandates of the Oklahoma State Regents for Higher Education and the North Central Association (NCA – the accrediting organization). <u>Each academic unit is required to have a brief assessment plan</u> on file with the Office of University Assessment that describes expected student learning outcomes <u>for each degree program</u> and the methods used to evaluate those outcomes. <u>Academic units are also required to file brief annual reports</u> describing their assessment activity from the previous year.

Assessment of student learning in all academic units can be a beneficial tool for facilitating dialogue about the curriculum and encouraging continuous programmatic improvement throughout a campus. Assessment refers to the systematic collection, review, and use of information about educational programs undertaken for the purpose of improving student learning and development (Palomba and Banta 1999). Assessment is *not* a review of faculty performance. Program Outcomes Assessment provides feedback to an academic unit on the performance of its curriculum; thereby allowing informed decisions regarding the need for changes. Assessment is, therefore, an integral part of the commitment at OSU to sustain and enhance academic quality and the student educational experience.

The Assessment Council supports the idea that academic units are best suited to determine how to assess their students' learning outcomes and how to use assessment results for program improvement. The Assessment Council and Office of University Assessment work to facilitate program outcomes assessment by providing information, guidelines, and financial resources to conduct effective assessment and by coordinating assessment at the program and institutional level.

The Assessment Council encourages academic units to develop and implement Program Outcomes Assessment with the following concepts in mind. These characteristics form the basis for providing feedback to academic units regarding assessment methods and uses of results.

- ✓ Program Outcomes Assessment is based on a process in which faculty have identified the desired student outcomes that are consistent with the objectives of the academic unit. Assessment <u>focuses on evaluating student achievement</u> of these expected learning outcomes. Assessment results <u>must not</u> be used for RPT evaluations or annual appraisals of faculty or staff.

✓ Program Outcomes Assessment seeks to help faculty understand and improve student learning by asking <u>key questions</u> such as "What should graduates of this program know or be able to do?", "Have the graduates of our program acquired this learning?", and "How can student learning, or our curriculum, be improved?".

✓ Program Outcomes Assessment should <u>provide feedback</u> to the academic unit and <u>contribute to program development.</u> Assessment should not simply be viewed as collecting data for program evaluation; it should be viewed as integral to ongoing self-evaluation, development, and improvement of the program.

✓ Program Outcomes Assessment should include a <u>variety of measures</u> that are suited to evaluate the unique learning objectives in the unit.

✓ Assessment should optimally include <u>direct and indirect measures</u> of student learning. <u>Direct measures</u> include a capstone experience, senior project, portfolio assessment, standardized tests, certification and licensure exams, locally developed exams, exams blind scored by multiple scorers, juried review of student performances and projects, external evaluation of student performance in internships. For graduate programs, direct measures also include faculty review of theses and dissertations. <u>Indirect measures</u> include data from student surveys, alumni surveys, exit interviews, retention and transfer rates, length of time to degree, graduation rates, job placement, and program acceptance.

✓ The same assessment methods do not have to be used every year. Program Outcomes Assessment should be systematic and ongoing; the timetable for implementing assessment measures should be appropriate for the curriculum and resources of the program

✓ Each academic unit should periodically <u>review and evaluate the assessment methods</u> and determine how these methods contribute to program development. Assessment methods may change over time as different concerns emerge regarding the curriculum or student learning.

✓ <u>Assessment reports</u> should be brief summaries of the assessment activities in an academic unit and are requested annually to comply with requirements of the State Regents. The reports should be shared with all faculty in the academic unit and reviewed by the dean of the appropriate college. The reports are used for continued accreditation with the North Central Association and a variety of programmatic accrediting agencies.

(accepted January 2000)

PROGRAM OUTCOMES ASSESSMENT REPORTS

FOR EACH

COLLEGE, SCHOOL, DEPARTMENT, OR ACADEMIC PROGRAM